Peer - Reviewed & Refereed Journal

The Law Journal strives to provide a platform for discussion of International as well as National Developments in the Field of Law.

# DISCLAIMER

# EDITORIAL TEAM

## Raju Narayana Swamy (IAS ) Indian Administrative Service officer

Dr. Raju Narayana Swamy popularly known as Kerala's Anti Corruption Crusader is the All India Topper of the 1991 batch of the IAS and is currently posted as Principal Secretary to the Government of Kerala . He has earned many accolades as he hit against the political-bureaucrat corruption nexus in India. Dr Swamy holds a B.Tech in Computer Science and Engineering from the IIT Madras and a Ph. D. in Cyber Law from Gujarat National Law University . He also has an LLM (Pro) ( with specialization in IPR) as well as three PG Diplomas from the National Law University, Delhi- one in Urban Environmental Management and Law, another in Environmental Law and Policy and a third one in Tourism and Environmental Law. He also holds a post-graduate diploma in IPR from the National Law School, Bengaluru and a professional diploma in Public Procurement from the World Bank.

## Dr. R. K. Upadhyay

Dr. R. K. Upadhyay is Registrar, University of Kota (Raj.), Dr Upadhyay obtained LLB , LLM degrees from Banaras Hindu University & Phd from university of Kota.He has succesfully completed UGC sponsored M.R.P for the work in the ares of the various prisoners reforms in the state of the Rajasthan.

# Senior Editor

## Dr. Neha Mishra

Dr. Neha Mishra is Associate Professor & Associate Dean (Scholarships) in Jindal Global Law School, OP Jindal Global University. She was awarded both her PhD degree and Associate Professor & Associate Dean M.A.; LL.B. (University of Delhi); LL.M.; Ph.D. (NLSIU, Bangalore) LLM from National Law School of India University, Bengaluru; she did her LL.B. from Faculty of Law, Delhi University as well as M.A. and B.A. from Hindu College and DCAC from DU respectively. Neha has been a Visiting Fellow, School of Social Work, Michigan State University, 2016 and invited speaker Panelist at Global Conference, Whitney R. Harris World Law Institute, Washington University in St.Louis, 2015.

## Ms. Sumiti Ahuja

Ms. Sumiti Ahuja, Assistant Professor, Faculty of Law, University of Delhi,
Ms. Sumiti Ahuja completed her LL.M. from the Indian Law Institute with specialization in Criminal Law and Corporate Law, and has over nine years of teaching experience. She has done her LL.B. from the Faculty of Law, University of Delhi. She is currently pursuing Ph.D. in the area of Forensics and Law. Prior to joining the teaching profession, she has worked as Research Assistant for projects funded by different agencies of Govt. of India. She has developed various audio-video teaching modules under UGC e-PG Pathshala programme in the area of Criminology, under the aegis of an MHRD Project. Her areas of interest are Criminal Law, Law of Evidence, Interpretation of Statutes, and Clinical Legal Education.

## Dr. Navtika Singh Nautiyal

Dr. Navtika Singh Nautiyal presently working as an Assistant Professor in School of law, Forensic Justice and Policy studies at National Forensic Sciences University, Gandhinagar, Gujarat. She has 9 years of Teaching and Research Experience. She has completed her Philosophy of Doctorate in 'Intercountry adoption laws from Uttranchal University, Dehradun' and LLM from Indian Law Institute, New Delhi.

# Dr. Rinu Saraswat

Associate Professor at School of Law, Apex University, Jaipur, M.A, LL.M, Ph.D,

Dr. Rinu have 5 yrs of teaching experience in renowned institutions like Jagannath University and Apex University. Participated in more than 20 national and international seminars and conferences and 5 workshops and training programmes.

# Dr. Nitesh Saraswat

E.MBA, LL.M, Ph.D, PGDSAPM
Currently working as Assistant Professor at Law Centre II, Faculty of Law, University of Delhi. Dr. Nitesh have 14 years of Teaching, Administrative and research experience in Renowned Institutions like Amity University, Tata Institute of Social Sciences, Jai Narain Vyas University Jodhpur, Jagannath University and Nirma University.
More than 25 Publications in renowned National and International Journals and has authored a Text book on Cr.P.C and Juvenile Delinquency law.

# Subhrajit Chanda

BBA. LL.B. (Hons.) (Amity University, Rajasthan); LL. M. (UPES, Dehradun) (Nottingham Trent University, UK); Ph.D. Candidate (G.D. Goenka University)

Subhrajit did his LL.M. in Sports Law, from Nottingham Trent University of United Kingdoms, with international scholarship provided by university; he has also completed another LL.M. in Energy Law from University of Petroleum and Energy Studies, India. He did his B.B.A.LL.B. (Hons.) focussing on International Trade Law.

## *ABOUT US*

WHITE BLACK LEGAL is an open access, peer-reviewed and refereed journal providededicated to express views on topical legal issues, thereby generating a cross current of ideas on emerging matters. This platform shall also ignite the initiative and desire of young law students to contribute in the field of law. The erudite response of legal luminaries shall be solicited to enable readers to explore challenges that lie before law makers, lawyers and the society at large, in the event of the ever changing social, economic and technological scenario.

With this thought, we hereby present to you

# NAVIGATING AUTHORSHIP AND INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY RIGHTS IN THE AGE OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE

AUTHORED BY - ANTRIKSH PURI

## Abstract

The paper addresses the intricate and ever-changing link between artificial intelligence (AI) and intellectual property rights (IPR), a subject that is becoming more and more relevant as AI continues to transform the creative industries. The study looks at the problems that AI-generated work presents, including ownership, authorship, and the suitability of traditional legal rules that were first created with human writers in mind. By highlighting flaws in existing laws, such as the Indian Copyright Act of 1957 and the Patents Act of 1970, that do not favor non-human creators, the essay draws attention to the moral and legal difficulties of assigning authorship to independently created AI works. The study also examines the role of case law, including instances in which courts have struggled to categorize AI creations, revealing jurisdictional disparities, and the need for unambiguous precedents.

Additionally, it highlights the collaborative aspect of AI creation, which challenges the traditional framework of originality and creativity by involving a variety of participants in content creation, including programmers, data scientists, and even the AI system itself. The paper aims to guide stakeholders and policymakers toward flexible legal frameworks that balance innovation with the protection of intellectual property rights by addressing moral dilemmas and providing workable recommendations.

In order to address the difficulties and ambiguities posed by AI-generated content, it concludes by calling for global consensus and comprehensive legal reforms. The article lays the groundwork for a robust, future-proof legal framework by proposing a balanced strategy that encourages innovation while equally defending the intellectual property rights of AI systems and human creators.

## <u>Introduction: Exploring the Complexities of Authorship and Intellectual Property Rights in the Age of Artificial Intelligence</u>

In the evolving technological landscape, artificial intelligence (AI) has emerged as a revolutionary force that is transforming industries and redefining the boundaries of creativity and innovation. As AI systems become more sophisticated, their ability to generate content that mimics human creativity raises serious questions about authorship and intellectual property rights. Navigating these complex issues requires a nuanced understanding of the interplay between AI-generated works and existing legal frameworks. At the heart of this investigation is the question of authorship: Who owns the rights to a work of art, music, or literature created by AI? Traditional intellectual property laws were designed with human creators in mind and presented challenges when applied to works created by machines. This dilemma is exacerbated by the collaborative nature of AI development, where multiple actors—including programmers, data scientists, and even the AI systems themselves—participate in the creation process.

In the evolving landscape of technology, synthetic intelligence (AI) has emerged as a progressive force, reworking industries and redefining the bounds of creativity and innovation. As AI structures come to be an increasing number of state-of-the-art, their ability to generate content material that mimics human creativity increases sizable questions about authorship and intellectual assets rights. Navigating those complex problems calls for a nuanced know-how of the interplay between AI-generated works and present criminal frameworks.

At the coronary heart of this exploration lies the question of authorship: Who owns the rights to a piece of artwork, tune, or literature created by means of an AI? Traditional intellectual belongings legal guidelines were designed with human creators in thoughts, posing demanding situations whilst carried out to works generated by machines. This predicament is compounded through the collaborative nature of AI improvement, wherein a couple of entities—together with programmers, records scientists, and even the AI systems themselves—contribute to the advent process.

Additionally, the proliferation of AI-generated content material has sparked debates approximately originality and creativity. Can a work produced with the aid of an set of rules be considered authentic if it draws from a sizeable database of pre-current substances? This question intersects with worries approximately copyright infringement, as AI structures can also inadvertently reflect existing works with out proper attribution.

This paper aims to delve into those multifaceted troubles, imparting a comprehensive review of the legal, ethical, and realistic implications of AI-generated content material. By examining cutting-edge case law, regulatory frameworks, and enterprise practices, we are looking for to illuminate the path ahead for creators, legal practitioners, and policymakers inside the age of artificial intelligence.

## Literature Review

### Historical Foundations and the Rationale for Establishing Intellectual Property Rights in the Age of Artificial Intelligence

India's colonial background and post-independence legal growth are closely linked to the country's evolution of intellectual property (IP) rights. One of the earliest significant legislative attempts to protect ideas and designs in the country was the Indian Patents and Designs Act of 1911, which was heavily influenced by British patent laws. The creation of more comprehensive intellectual property laws in the next decades was made possible by this original framework. Over the years, India's intellectual property laws have advanced significantly in response to the changing needs of the country's economy and society. The Patents Act 1970 was a legislative landmark that granted extensive protection to inventions and fostered innovation. Similarly, human creativity was protected by the 1957 Copyright Act, which also made sure that creators could profit from their work.

However, the emergence of artificial intelligence (AI) has presented these traditional frameworks with new difficulties. AI systems are now more sophisticated and capable of producing content on their own in a variety of domains, including software, music, art, and literature. Basic concerns about authorship and ownership of works produced by AI are brought up by this new capability of the technology. Due to the absence of AI-specific laws, the current Indian intellectual property law framework is still lacking and ambiguous when it comes to AI-generated content. This legislative gap has sparked intense discussions among attorneys,

legislators, and other interested parties on how the law should adapt to the novel aspects of AI-generated content.

The need to provide clarity and protection in this rapidly changing technological environment is what led India to implement intellectual property regulations for works created using AI. As artificial intelligence continues to develop and becomes more significant in the production of content, intellectual property rights must also keep up with the times. This entails reconsidering not only the ideas of authorship and ownership, but also the moral and practical implications of protecting work produced by artificial intelligence. Do the copyright rights belong to the AI itself, the person who feeds the AI data, or the AI creator, for instance, if an AI software produces a piece of art? These are complex matters that require careful consideration.

The goal of ongoing stakeholder interaction is to construct legal frameworks that balance the interests of the public, AI developers, and human creators. Promoting innovation while avoiding the potential of AI to undermine the rights of human creators requires a balanced strategy. To develop a framework that is efficient and adaptable, policymakers and attorneys are taking into account various models and precedents from other countries. This entails looking at comparative legal research, international agreements, and input from multidisciplinary sources.

The process of changing India's intellectual property laws to accommodate AI-generated works is complex and continuous. It seeks to provide all stakeholders involved in the creative process with the necessary clarity and protection. India can make its intellectual property rights regime strong and relevant in response to the rapid speed of technology development by creating a responsive and well-balanced legal framework. This would allow for innovation and protect the results of both human and AI-based creativity.

**Judicial Interpretation and its Role in Shaping Authorship and Intellectual Property Rights in the Era of Artificial Intelligence**

India's current intellectual property legislation such as the Copyright Act of 1957, the Patents Act of 1970, and the Trademarks Act of 1999 were all framed with human creators in mind. This means that these laws do not effectively cover the specific problems associated with AI-generated content. India's Copyright Act, for example, defines an author as being the person who creates a work, which suggests human authorship. As a result, AI works occupy a gray

area because there is no provision in place for attributing the contribution of independent AI systems.

Human authorship is implied by *Section 2 of the Indian Copyright Act,* 1957, which defines "author" as the person who creates a work. In the context of AI-generated material, this presents a problem because AI systems create artistic works on their own without direct human assistance. There are legal difficulties surrounding authorship and ownership as a result of the Act's lack of specific provisions for AI-generated works. This disparity calls for a reassessment of the current framework in order to handle the special features of content produced by artificial intelligence and guarantee that intellectual property laws develop in step with technology, offering protection and clarity to all parties concerned.

The Indian Copyright Designs and Patents Act's Section 9 emphasizes the human element of authorship while safeguarding original works. However, with AI systems now creating material on their own, this clause is being called into doubt. The problem of ownership and protection of work produced by AI is still unclear because the Act does not yet take AI into account as an author. By questioning and updating established legal frameworks, this void can promote creativity while also introducing legal ambiguities.

According to *Sections 17(a) and (b) of the Indian Copyright Act*, the original owner of a copyright is typically the author of the work. While Section 17(b) addresses circumstances where a work is created for hire or under a contract, giving ownership to the employer or the person who commissioned the work, Section 17(a) makes it clear that the author, as the creator of the work, is the owner of the copyright.

However, the actual implementation of these regulations is hard due to the development of AI technology. The traditional definition of authorship is challenged by AI systems, which are capable of producing content on their own in a wide range of creative domains. There is a significant legal vacuum regarding the ownership and protection of works produced by AI since the Act does not acknowledge AI as a creator. Reexamining the existing frameworks is necessary because to the uncertainty around who owns the copyright to content produced by AI—the user, the AI developer, or anybody else.

*Kashif Qureshi and Ors v. Navigators Logistics Limited (2018) (254) DLT 307*
The Delhi High Court's decision in this case mostly concerned trade secrets and copyright violations. Navigators Logistics Limited, the complainant, argued that its trade secrets and customer lists were being exploited by former employees and leaked to other companies. According to the Copyright Act of 1957, the court deliberated whether the plaintiff's data qualified as original literary works.

The case's principles apply to authorship rights disputes involving AI, even if it did not specifically address AI-generated content. When determining whether to grant copyright protection, the court insisted on uniqueness and human authorship. This aligns with broader legal debates on the applicability of present copyright laws to AI-generated works that lack direct human creativity.

*The Ankit Shani's 'RAGHAV' Case*, With his painting Suryast, renowned Indian intellectual property lawyer and artist Ankit Sahni played a key role in highlighting the complex debate surrounding the authorship of AI-generated works. An AI program called RAGHAV (Robust Artificially Intelligent Graphics and Art Visualizer) was used to create the artwork. Sahni used Vincent van Gogh's The Starry Night as a point of reference while combining his own original photographs as part of his creative process. RAGHAV was instrumental in producing the finished piece of art, which showcased a beautiful fusion of machine learning capabilities and human creativity.

Sahni registered with the U.S. Copyright Office (USCO) and named RAGHAV and himself as co-authors in an attempt to have Suryast protected by U.S. Copyright Law. His approach highlighted how AI's role as a collaborative collaborator in the creative process is evolving. Sahni argued that RAGHAV was a purely supportive process, with his extensive creative input providing the composition's intellectual foundation. He took care to emphasize that human-supplied information and stylistic choices had a significant impact on the AI output.

The USCO rejected the copyright request despite these assertions. The requirement of human authorship, a fundamental principle of copyright law, served as the foundation for its decision. According to the USCO, the essential component of human creativity was absent from the AI-generated artwork. This decision demonstrated how traditional legal systems are hesitant to

give non-human entities authorship rights, particularly in cases where significant human involvement influences the creative process.

An excellent illustration of the philosophical and legal problems raised by AI's application in creative fields is the Suryast case. It raises important issues regarding the boundaries of authorship, the role of human creativity, and the extent to which AI tools can be acknowledged as co-creators. The case also highlights the shortcomings of the existing copyright structures, which were primarily established to address human-centered creativity and have not yet changed to take into consideration the unique characteristics of AI-generated works.

This legal strategy reflects a broader worldwide trend wherein copyright authorities and courts have been hesitant to recognize AI-generated works as protected. The ramifications of such decisions extend beyond the realm of intellectual property law and touch on topics such as innovation policy, financial incentives for AI development, and the broader philosophical discussion around AI autonomy.

## Current Legal Landscape: Navigating Authorship and Intellectual Property Rights in the Age of Artificial Intelligence

In India, the intersection of intellectual property rights (IPR) with artificial intelligence (AI) represents a rapidly evolving legal and technological frontier. The traditional concepts of authorship and ownership are called into question by the growing use of AI technology in creative and innovative processes, necessitating a reevaluation of existing legal frameworks. India is in the best position to address these issues and establish a culture that will foster development and innovation because it is a vibrant center of technological achievement.

In India, artificial intelligence has advanced quickly, particularly in fields like digital infrastructure, healthcare, and agriculture. Government initiatives like the National AI Strategy, which emphasizes the ethical and inclusive use of AI technologies, have made this possible. However, the use of AI in creative and inventive fields has brought up a number of complex issues regarding the suitability of the current IPR regulations. For instance, AI-generated works are in a legal limbo because the Copyright Act of 1957 and the Patents Act of 1970 were designed with human authorship and inventorship in mind.

The authorship of works produced by AI is not specifically addressed by India's current legal system. Originality is a need for protection under the Copyright Act, and authorship has historically been connected to human creators. When AI systems produce original content on their own without human assistance, this causes confusion. At the same time, the Patents Act requires a "true and first inventor" to apply for a patent; this requirement disqualifies AI systems since they are not considered legal persons. These limitations highlight the need for regulatory changes to recognize the unique characteristics of AI works.

India has made headway in examining the effects of AI on IPR despite all of these obstacles. Recognizing AI as a co-author or co-inventor of collaborative processes is one of the strategies proposed by legal experts and politicians to address these concerns. Another trend is the growing interest in adopting international best practices, such as the "Innovation Oversight" method, which emphasizes the value of human supervision in the innovative and creative processes including AI.

Attention should also be paid to the ethical and policy implications of AI and IPR. A careful balance must be struck between preserving human ingenuity and using AI to promote innovation. When granting intellectual property rights over works produced by AI, policymakers must take into account the broader social environment, which includes issues of justice, accessibility, and the possibility of monopolization.

## Ethical Dilemmas at the Intersection of Intellectual Property Rights and Artificial Intelligence: Challenges and Considerations

Scholarly debate has focused on authorship, ownership, and responsibility in relation to the ethical ambiguity surrounding the intersection of artificial intelligence (AI) and intellectual property rights (IPR). The SLIIT Journal of Humanities and Sciences article by Chaga Bihari Mahingoda provides a thorough analysis of these topics, emphasizing the necessity of striking a balance between managing the complexities of AI-led innovation and intellectual property.

Given the lack of clear legal frameworks, Mahingoda's work draws attention to the ethical issues highlighted by AI-generated works. The authorship assignment is one of the main points of concern. The use of AI-generated content raises questions regarding the right to assign intellectual property rights to such content because traditional IPR rules are predicated on the notion of human creativity. According to Mahingoda, this ambiguity not only undermines the protection of human creators but also allows for exploitation, as companies or developers may

claim ownership of AI products without taking into account the cooperative nature of human-AI interactions.

Mahingoda's book also addresses the issue of accountability for AI-generated content. Attributing ownership to AI systems or their developers raises serious ethical issues because it could lead to monopolization and an unequal distribution of benefits. Mahingoda emphasizes the necessity of human involvement in the creative and innovative processes utilizing AI while putting forth a framework that offers accountability and transparency.

The use of AI under the IPR framework has larger societal implications, according to literature. Data privacy, algorithm bias in AI, and the potential for abuse of AI-generated content are all crucial ethical concerns. Mahingoda suggests creating flexible legal frameworks to address these problems and encourage creativity. He emphasizes that ethical standards and international cooperation are essential to the equitable and inclusive use of AI in IPR systems.

**Unraveling the Complex Interplay Between Intellectual Property Rights and Artificial Intelligence: Challenges and Opportunities**

Artificial Intelligence (AI) is changing the boundaries of creativity, innovation, and IPR law, making the relationship between IPR and AI more complex than ever. Analyzing this intersection highlights the challenges AI presents for autonomous content production, ranging from inventions to artistic works, in challenging traditional IPR frameworks.

The question of authorship and ownership lies elegantly at the core of all this complication. The idea of human originality and creativity is the foundation of traditional IPR laws, both in the copyright and patent domains. For instance, patent laws require the identification of a human inventor, whereas copyright protection in the majority of legal systems requires evidence of human authorship. Since self-operating systems like generative models and neural networks produce outputs that do not require immediate human participation, the role of AI in creating creative works runs counter to these fundamental concepts.

Additionally, training AI systems for creative work typically requires using pre-existing data sets, some of which contain protected content. This has raised concerns about whether AI's reliance on such material constitutes infringement, even when the results are unique and revolutionary. These problems are made worse by the opaque nature of AI algorithms, which

can make it difficult to determine the source of content produced by AI and determine if it complies with copyright regulations.

The ethical considerations surrounding the recognition of AI-generated works under IPR represent still another level of complexity. Giving AI systems authoring rights raises philosophical questions about human genius and creativity in a society run by machines. It also has real-world applications, such as protecting against monopolization by businesses in control of AI systems and guaranteeing an equitable distribution of the advantages derived from AI-generated content.

Lawyers and academics have proposed a number of solutions to the problems. Because AI-generated works lack human authorship, some argue that they should be considered in the public domain for the benefit of society as a whole. Some people think that human operators or developers who actively work to create and train AI systems should be given authorship. To offer clarity and coherence to this rapidly evolving industry, legislative measures are also being discussed, such as amending copyright and patent laws to specifically mention AI-generated works.

## Conclusion

Navigating copyright and intellectual property rights in the age of artificial intelligence is akin to mapping unknown territories. As AI continues to evolve, so do the challenges and opportunities it brings to the legal landscape, especially when it comes to copyright and intellectual property (IP). This research paper delves into the intricacies of these issues and illuminates gaps, ambiguities and possible solutions.

Examining existing intellectual property laws, we find that traditional frameworks often fall short in addressing the unique nature of AI-generated works. These laws were primarily designed with human authors in mind, leading to significant loopholes when applied to AI-generated creations. Ambiguity regarding the ownership and originality of AI-generated content creates a legal gray area that complicates the enforcement of intellectual property rights.

The ethical and legal issues associated with attributing authorship to AI-generated content further complicate the landscape. Questions arise regarding the originality and creativity of such works, as well as the human element in authorship. Protecting intellectual property rights for AI-generated content requires a delicate balance to ensure that both human creators and AI systems are fairly recognized and compensated for their contributions.

Case law and court precedents provide some guidance on how courts address these issues. An analysis of relevant cases reveals emerging legal principles and different approaches in different jurisdictions. While some courts have recognized the potential for protection of works created by artificial intelligence under existing intellectual property laws, others have emphasized the need for legislative reform to address the unique challenges posed by AI.

Looking ahead, this paper proposes practical recommendations for policy makers and stakeholders. The aim of these recommendations is to improve the protection of copyright and intellectual property rights in the context of artificial intelligence. By creating a comprehensive and adaptive legal framework, we can ensure that the rights of human creators and AI systems are protected, fostering innovation and creativity in the age of AI.

In conclusion, navigating copyright and intellectual property rights in the age of artificial intelligence is a complex and evolving challenge. By addressing gaps and ambiguities in existing laws, addressing the ethical and legal issues of AI authorship, and learning from case law and court precedents, we can create a robust legal framework that supports innovation and protects the rights of all creators.

# **Bibliography**

i.   https://www.barandbench.com/law-firms/view-point/intersection-intellectual-property-rights-ai-generated-works-part-i

ii.   https://www.bloomberglaw.com/external/document/X63ECS0S000000/copyrights-professional-perspective-ai-copyright-protection-for-

iii.   https://www.ijlt.in/post/balancing-indian-copyright-law-with-ai-generated-content-the-significant-human-input-approach

iv.   https://spicyip.com/2023/12/ankit-sahnis-ai-co-authored-artwork-denied-registration-by-us-continues-to-be-registered-in-india.html

   v.　　　https://indiankanoon.org/doc/1693854/

  vi.　　　https://www.juve-patent.com/cases/uk-supreme-court-dabus-named-inventor-patent-stephen-thaler/

 vii.　　　https://www.indiacode.nic.in/handle/123456789/1367

viii.　　　https://www.indiacode.nic.in/handle/123456789/1392?sam_handle=