



INTERNATIONAL LAW
JOURNAL

**WHITE BLACK
LEGAL LAW
JOURNAL
ISSN: 2581-
8503**

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.

WWW.WHITEBLACKLEGAL.CO.IN

DISCLAIMER

No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored, transmitted, translated, or distributed in any form or by any means—whether electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, scanning, or otherwise—without the prior written permission of the Editor-in-Chief of *White Black Legal – The Law Journal*.

All copyrights in the articles published in this journal vest with *White Black Legal – The Law Journal*, unless otherwise expressly stated. Authors are solely responsible for the originality, authenticity, accuracy, and legality of the content submitted and published.

The views, opinions, interpretations, and conclusions expressed in the articles are exclusively those of the respective authors. They do not represent or reflect the views of the Editorial Board, Editors, Reviewers, Advisors, Publisher, or Management of *White Black Legal*.

While reasonable efforts are made to ensure academic quality and accuracy through editorial and peer-review processes, *White Black Legal* makes no representations or warranties, express or implied, regarding the completeness, accuracy, reliability, or suitability of the content published. The journal shall not be liable for any errors, omissions, inaccuracies, or consequences arising from the use, interpretation, or reliance upon the information contained in this publication.

The content published in this journal is intended solely for academic and informational purposes and shall not be construed as legal advice, professional advice, or legal opinion. *White Black Legal* expressly disclaims all liability for any loss, damage, claim, or legal consequence arising directly or indirectly from the use of any material published herein.

ABOUT WHITE BLACK LEGAL

White Black Legal – The Law Journal is an open-access, peer-reviewed, and refereed legal journal established to provide a scholarly platform for the examination and discussion of contemporary legal issues. The journal is dedicated to encouraging rigorous legal research, critical analysis, and informed academic discourse across diverse fields of law.

The journal invites contributions from law students, researchers, academicians, legal practitioners, and policy scholars. By facilitating engagement between emerging scholars and experienced legal professionals, *White Black Legal* seeks to bridge theoretical legal research with practical, institutional, and societal perspectives.

In a rapidly evolving social, economic, and technological environment, the journal endeavours to examine the changing role of law and its impact on governance, justice systems, and society. *White Black Legal* remains committed to academic integrity, ethical research practices, and the dissemination of accessible legal scholarship to a global readership.

AIM & SCOPE

The aim of *White Black Legal – The Law Journal* is to promote excellence in legal research and to provide a credible academic forum for the analysis, discussion, and advancement of contemporary legal issues. The journal encourages original, analytical, and well-researched contributions that add substantive value to legal scholarship.

The journal publishes scholarly works examining doctrinal, theoretical, empirical, and interdisciplinary perspectives of law. Submissions are welcomed from academicians, legal professionals, researchers, scholars, and students who demonstrate intellectual rigour, analytical clarity, and relevance to current legal and policy developments.

The scope of the journal includes, but is not limited to:

- Constitutional and Administrative Law
- Criminal Law and Criminal Justice
- Corporate, Commercial, and Business Laws
- Intellectual Property and Technology Law
- International Law and Human Rights
- Environmental and Sustainable Development Law
- Cyber Law, Artificial Intelligence, and Emerging Technologies
- Family Law, Labour Law, and Social Justice Studies

The journal accepts original research articles, case comments, legislative and policy analyses, book reviews, and interdisciplinary studies addressing legal issues at national and international levels. All submissions are subject to a rigorous double-blind peer-review process to ensure academic quality, originality, and relevance.

Through its publications, *White Black Legal – The Law Journal* seeks to foster critical legal thinking and contribute to the development of law as an instrument of justice, governance, and social progress, while expressly disclaiming responsibility for the application or misuse of published content.

COPYRIGHT CHALLENGES IN OTT AND STREAMING SERVICES: AN INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY PERSPECTIVE

AUTHORED BY - M. JANANI

BA.LLB, LL.M

Vels School of Law

Vels Institute of Science Technology & Advanced Studies (VISTAS), Pallavaram, Chennai

CO AUTHOR - S. ABITHA

BA.LLB, LL.M

Vels School of Law

Vels Institute of Science Technology & Advanced Studies (VISTAS), Pallavaram, Chennai

ABSTRACT

The rapid expansion of Over-The-Top (OTT) and streaming platforms has reconfigured the global entertainment industry by transforming the manner in which copyrighted works are created, licensed, disseminated, and monetized. Digital streaming has displaced geographically bounded theatrical distribution and cable broadcasting systems, replacing them with on-demand, cross-border access models operating through cloud-based infrastructures. While this transformation has democratized access to creative works and diversified revenue streams for producers and performers, it has simultaneously generated complex copyright challenges that strain traditional intellectual property frameworks. Large-scale digital piracy, cross-border infringement, intermediary liability ambiguity, licensing fragmentation, digital rights management circumvention, and the integration of artificial intelligence into content production collectively expose structural gaps within existing copyright regimes.

This paper critically analyses these evolving challenges through the lens of intellectual property law, examining statutory frameworks including the Copyright Act, 1957, the Information Technology Act, 2000, and international instruments such as the Berne Convention and the WIPO Copyright Treaty. It evaluates the adequacy of existing doctrines in regulating communication to the public, reproduction in digital environments, and platform accountability in algorithm-driven ecosystems. The study argues that traditional copyright doctrines, designed

for tangible reproduction and territorial enforcement, require doctrinal reinterpretation and legislative reform to accommodate technological realities. Sustainable governance in the streaming era demands enhanced intermediary responsibility, international harmonisation mechanisms, AI-specific regulatory clarity, and a proportionate balance between innovation, public access, and creators' economic rights.

INTRODUCTION

The evolution of digital technologies has fundamentally altered the economic and legal architecture of media consumption. OTT platforms operate through internet-based infrastructures that bypass traditional broadcasting channels, enabling subscribers to stream audiovisual works at their convenience across multiple devices. This transformation marks a shift from ownership-based models, such as DVD purchases or physical cinema tickets, to subscription-based access models grounded in digital transmission.

Historically, copyright law emerged in response to technological innovations such as the printing press and later mechanical reproduction systems. Its foundational principles—territoriality, authorship, fixation, and exclusive economic rights—were conceptualized within an environment where copies were tangible and distribution channels were geographically bounded. The streaming ecosystem, however, is characterized by cloud storage, content delivery networks, real-time compression technologies, and algorithmic personalization systems that transcend territorial boundaries.

In the OTT environment, a cinematographic film may be stored simultaneously across distributed server networks and accessed by millions of users in different jurisdictions. The legal implications of such simultaneous access complicate traditional enforcement mechanisms. Territorial licensing agreements, historically negotiated on a country-by-country basis, encounter friction when consumers use technological tools such as virtual private networks to bypass geographic restrictions.

Furthermore, streaming platforms increasingly integrate artificial intelligence into their operational architecture. AI systems curate recommendations, generate subtitles, personalize user interfaces, and in some cases contribute to creative production processes. These developments challenge the human-centric conception of authorship embedded within copyright jurisprudence and require reconsideration of originality standards, derivative work

doctrines, and liability allocation.

The OTT revolution therefore presents not merely incremental legal challenges but structural tensions between traditional copyright theory and digital technological realities. In addition to altering distribution models, OTT platforms have also reshaped bargaining power within the creative economy. Traditional studio systems exercised centralized control over production, marketing, and exhibition. In contrast, streaming platforms function simultaneously as producers, distributors, and exhibitors, vertically integrating the content supply chain. This consolidation intensifies copyright concentration, where a limited number of digital platforms control extensive content libraries through long-term licensing agreements or exclusive ownership. Such consolidation raises concerns regarding market dominance, competition law intersections, and potential monopolistic control over copyrighted works.

Furthermore, the data-driven architecture of OTT services introduces a novel dimension to copyright economics. Platforms rely heavily on user analytics, viewing patterns, and algorithmic personalization to determine content acquisition strategies. While copyright traditionally protects creative expression, the commercial value in streaming ecosystems increasingly lies in user data and behavioural insights. This intersection between copyright law and data governance suggests that intellectual property regulation must consider broader digital policy frameworks to ensure fair competition and equitable access.

THEORETICAL FOUNDATIONS OF COPYRIGHT IN DIGITAL CONTEXTS

The incentive theory of copyright posits that granting exclusive rights encourages creative production by ensuring economic return. In the context of OTT platforms, significant financial investments are made in original programming, including high-budget films and series. Digital piracy undermines these investments by facilitating unauthorized distribution, thereby weakening economic incentives.

However, copyright also embodies public interest principles. The social utility of creative works depends upon accessibility and dissemination. Streaming platforms have significantly enhanced access to cultural content across diverse regions, often introducing regional films to global audiences. Excessive enforcement measures that restrict technological innovation may

undermine these public interest benefits.

The technological neutrality principle suggests that copyright law should apply consistently across technologies without discriminating between physical and digital formats. Yet streaming technology differs fundamentally from physical distribution. It involves transient reproduction, real-time communication, and algorithmic mediation. Whether traditional doctrines can remain technologically neutral without reinterpretation remains a central theoretical concern.

Regulatory theory further emphasizes that digital platforms operate not merely as passive intermediaries but as gatekeepers exercising algorithmic control over visibility and monetization. This expanded role raises normative questions regarding platform accountability and responsibility in copyright enforcement. A further theoretical dimension emerges from the economic analysis of copyright. The streaming economy operates predominantly on subscription-based models rather than unit sales. Consequently, copyright valuation shifts from individual work sales to aggregated content libraries designed to retain subscribers over time. This alters the incentive structure underlying copyright law. Instead of rewarding singular blockbuster works, platforms invest in sustained content production pipelines to maintain subscriber loyalty. The traditional model of exclusive distribution windows and scarcity-based pricing is gradually replaced by abundance-driven subscription models.

Additionally, critical copyright scholarship emphasizes that exclusivity must remain proportionate to its social cost. In digital environments where marginal reproduction costs approach zero, rigid enforcement of exclusive rights may appear economically inefficient. Yet complete erosion of exclusivity risks undermining investment incentives. The streaming context thus demands recalibration of exclusivity principles to align with digital cost structures and platform-based monetization strategies.

REPRODUCTION AND COMMUNICATION TO THE PUBLIC IN STREAMING

The right of reproduction traditionally refers to the making of copies in material form. In digital environments, reproduction may occur through temporary buffering, caching, or server-side storage. When a user streams content, fragments of the work are temporarily stored in the device's memory. Whether such ephemeral storage constitutes reproduction under statutory

definitions remains debated.

Communication to the public has become the central right implicated in streaming. Digital transmission allows simultaneous access to works by large audiences without physical distribution. However, communication in streaming contexts is mediated by algorithms, subscription authentication systems, and digital compression technologies. The complexity of these processes complicates attribution of liability when infringement occurs.

Moreover, streaming platforms often generate previews, thumbnails, and trailers automatically. These derivative elements involve partial reproduction of copyrighted material. Determining whether such uses fall within implied licenses or constitute independent acts of reproduction requires nuanced analysis. The concept of “making available” has become particularly significant in streaming jurisprudence. OTT platforms do not always actively transmit works; instead, they host and make works accessible for on-demand retrieval by users. The distinction between active transmission and passive availability may influence liability determinations in cross-border disputes. Courts increasingly examine whether hosting content on servers accessible to the public constitutes communication to the public even absent direct transmission.

Furthermore, streaming often involves adaptive bitrate technology, which dynamically adjusts video quality based on internet speed. This technical fragmentation of content into data packets challenges traditional notions of copying, as no single permanent copy may exist on user devices. The fragmentation of digital content into encrypted segments complicates forensic analysis and evidentiary standards in infringement proceedings.

DIGITAL PIRACY AND ENFORCEMENT CHALLENGES

Digital piracy has evolved from peer-to-peer file sharing networks to sophisticated IPTV operations and streaming mirror sites. Unauthorized retransmission of subscription-based content significantly impacts revenue models dependent on subscriber retention. The speed of digital dissemination exacerbates enforcement challenges, as infringing copies may proliferate globally within minutes.

Courts have responded by issuing dynamic injunctions that authorize blocking of mirror websites without initiating separate proceedings. However, enforcement remains reactive.

Rogue operators frequently shift domains or hosting locations to evade detection. The transnational nature of servers further complicates jurisdictional enforcement.

The economic consequences of piracy extend beyond corporate losses. Reduced revenue affects royalty payments to actors, writers, technicians, and independent creators. Thus, piracy poses systemic risks to the sustainability of creative industries. The monetization of piracy has evolved significantly. Many rogue streaming websites generate advertising revenue or subscription fees by distributing unauthorized content. This commercial dimension distinguishes modern piracy from earlier peer-to-peer sharing models and reinforces the argument that piracy constitutes organized economic activity rather than casual infringement. Additionally, piracy frequently exploits jurisdictional loopholes. Operators may register domains in one country, host servers in another, and target audiences in multiple jurisdictions simultaneously. This multi-layered structure complicates enforcement and requires coordinated international responses. The absence of harmonized procedural mechanisms for cross-border injunctions remains a major obstacle in combating large-scale digital infringement.

INTERMEDIARY LIABILITY AND PLATFORM GOVERNANCE

The doctrine of safe harbour provides conditional immunity to intermediaries that remove infringing content upon acquiring actual knowledge. In India, Section 79 of the Information Technology Act, 2000 governs intermediary liability. However, OTT platforms increasingly perform active roles in curating and recommending content through algorithmic systems designed to maximize engagement.

The distinction between passive hosting and active facilitation becomes blurred when algorithms prioritize certain content, potentially amplifying infringing material. Determining whether such algorithmic promotion constitutes participation in infringement presents doctrinal challenges.

Comparative jurisprudence has explored knowledge standards and the scope of intermediary immunity. Courts have recognized that imposing excessive liability may stifle innovation, yet inadequate accountability may undermine enforcement. Achieving equilibrium between innovation and responsibility remains central to digital copyright governance. Algorithmic governance introduces subtle forms of control that may influence infringement outcomes.

Recommendation systems are designed to maximize watch time and user engagement. If infringing content generates high engagement metrics, algorithms may inadvertently amplify its visibility. This raises normative concerns regarding whether platforms should be required to integrate copyright-sensitive parameters into recommendation engines.

Furthermore, the increasing use of automated content detection tools introduces due process concerns. Erroneous takedowns may suppress lawful content, including parody, commentary, or fair dealing uses. Therefore, intermediary governance must incorporate transparent appeal mechanisms to ensure procedural fairness while maintaining robust copyright enforcement standards.

TERRITORIALITY, LICENSING, AND MARKET FRAGMENTATION

Copyright remains territorially structured, with protection granted under national laws. OTT platforms negotiate licensing agreements for specific territories based on market potential and contractual arrangements. However, digital technologies undermine territorial exclusivity.

Virtual private networks enable consumers to access content licensed for other regions, thereby challenging contractual enforcement. Fragmented licensing may also lead to delayed releases in certain jurisdictions, encouraging piracy. The mismatch between territorial copyright doctrine and global digital access underscores the need for harmonised regulatory approaches. International cooperation through treaties such as the Berne Convention and the WIPO Copyright Treaty seeks to provide minimum standards of protection. Yet practical enforcement disparities persist among jurisdictions. The territorial fragmentation of rights also intersects with linguistic and cultural considerations. Streaming platforms increasingly invest in localized content production to comply with regulatory quotas and capture regional markets. Such investments reshape copyright ownership patterns, as platforms often retain exclusive rights to original productions across multiple territories.

Simultaneously, global streaming access challenges the principle that copyright is strictly territorial. While treaties harmonize minimum protection standards, substantive differences in enforcement mechanisms persist. As streaming platforms expand into emerging markets, disparities in judicial efficiency and enforcement capacity may create uneven protection landscapes.

DIGITAL RIGHTS MANAGEMENT AND TECHNOLOGICAL PROTECTION

Digital rights management systems are technological responses to piracy. Encryption, watermarking, and anti-screen capture technologies attempt to prevent unauthorized copying. Legal protection against circumvention is mandated by international instruments.

Nevertheless, DRM systems are imperfect. Circumvention tools circulate widely, and enforcement against individual infringers may be economically inefficient. Furthermore, strict DRM measures may conflict with fair use or accessibility rights. Balancing technological protection with user freedoms remains a delicate regulatory challenge. Watermarking technology has emerged as a supplementary enforcement tool. By embedding invisible identifiers within streamed content, platforms can trace the source of unauthorized leaks. Such forensic techniques strengthen evidentiary standards in litigation. However, watermarking may raise privacy concerns if linked to individual subscriber identities.

Moreover, DRM enforcement intersects with accessibility obligations. Visually or hearing-impaired users may require adaptive technologies that interact with protected content. Overly rigid DRM systems may unintentionally hinder accessibility compliance, necessitating careful regulatory balancing.

ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE AND AUTHORSHIP

Artificial intelligence has begun to influence content production within OTT platforms. AI tools assist in script development, editing, visual effects, and recommendation systems. Some systems can independently generate audiovisual content using machine learning models.

Under existing copyright law, authorship is attributed to natural persons. The legal status of AI-generated works remains ambiguous. If AI-generated content lacks human authorship, it may fall outside copyright protection. Alternatively, attribution may be assigned to programmers or users, raising questions regarding originality and creative control.

AI training datasets often include copyrighted works. If generated outputs replicate protected stylistic elements, derivative infringement claims may arise. Regulatory frameworks have yet to provide comprehensive guidance regarding AI-generated content, leaving platforms exposed

to litigation risk.

Deepfake technologies further complicate matters by enabling digital replication of performers. Such uses implicate moral rights, performance rights, and personality rights, intersecting with copyright doctrines. The integration of generative AI tools within content production raises questions concerning joint authorship. When human creators collaborate with AI systems that generate substantial portions of audiovisual content, determining the threshold of human contribution necessary for copyright protection becomes increasingly complex. Courts may need to articulate new originality standards that reflect hybrid human-machine creativity.

Additionally, the economic impact of AI-assisted production may alter labour markets within creative industries. Automation of editing, scripting, and animation processes could reduce production costs while simultaneously displacing human contributors. Intellectual property regulation must therefore be considered within broader socio-economic frameworks that address technological displacement.

COMPARATIVE PERSPECTIVES AND INTERNATIONAL HARMONISATION

Comparative analysis reveals varying approaches to digital copyright enforcement. Some jurisdictions adopt strict intermediary liability standards, while others prioritize platform immunity to encourage innovation. The European Union's Digital Single Market Directive introduces proactive monitoring obligations, whereas other regimes rely primarily on notice-and-takedown mechanisms.

International harmonisation remains incomplete. While treaties establish minimum standards, enforcement capacity and judicial interpretation differ significantly. Given the global reach of OTT platforms, greater coordination is necessary to ensure consistent protection. The European Union's evolving approach toward platform responsibility reflects a shift from reactive notice-and-takedown systems toward proactive content monitoring obligations. In contrast, other jurisdictions prioritize conditional immunity to protect innovation. These divergent approaches illustrate the absence of global consensus on intermediary governance.

Cross-border enforcement also depends heavily on mutual legal assistance treaties and diplomatic cooperation. However, procedural delays often undermine timely remedies.

Strengthening transnational judicial cooperation remains essential for effective copyright enforcement in streaming environments.

FUNDAMENTAL RIGHTS AND COPYRIGHT BALANCE

Copyright enforcement intersects with constitutional principles such as freedom of expression and access to information. Excessive platform monitoring may chill legitimate speech. Conversely, insufficient enforcement undermines economic incentives for creativity.

Courts increasingly adopt proportionality analysis to balance competing rights. A nuanced approach ensures that enforcement mechanisms do not disproportionately restrict innovation or digital participation while safeguarding creators' interests. Freedom of expression considerations are particularly salient in streaming contexts where user-generated content intersects with copyrighted material. Reviews, commentary videos, and transformative remixes frequently incorporate copyrighted clips. Overzealous enforcement may suppress legitimate creative expression.

Therefore, proportionality analysis must carefully distinguish between commercial piracy and transformative uses protected under fair dealing or fair use doctrines. Balancing exclusivity with expressive freedom remains a foundational challenge in digital copyright governance.

FUTURE REGULATORY DIRECTIONS

Sustainable governance in the OTT era requires legislative clarification regarding AI-generated works, refined intermediary liability standards, strengthened cross-border cooperation mechanisms, and expedited judicial remedies. Regulatory frameworks must remain adaptable to technological change while preserving fundamental rights.

Collaborative engagement between governments, platforms, creators, and civil society can promote responsible digital ecosystems. Public awareness initiatives may also reduce piracy by emphasizing ethical consumption. Future regulatory reforms may consider establishing specialized digital copyright tribunals capable of handling streaming-related disputes efficiently. Expedited adjudication mechanisms would reduce litigation costs and enhance enforcement effectiveness.

Additionally, greater transparency in platform reporting regarding takedown requests, algorithmic governance, and licensing practices may promote accountability. Public disclosure frameworks could enhance trust between creators, platforms, and consumers.

CONCLUSION

The rise of OTT platforms marks a transformative phase in global media distribution. While streaming technology enhances accessibility and innovation, it simultaneously exposes structural weaknesses within traditional copyright frameworks. Digital piracy, intermediary liability ambiguity, territorial licensing fragmentation, DRM circumvention, and AI-generated content disputes collectively challenge established intellectual property doctrines.

To ensure the long-term sustainability of the streaming economy, copyright law must evolve in a technologically adaptive, internationally harmonised, and rights-conscious manner. Only through balanced reform can the law protect creative labour while fostering innovation and public access in the digital age. As digital ecosystems continue to evolve, immersive technologies such as virtual reality streaming and interactive media experiences will introduce additional copyright complexities. The convergence of artificial intelligence, data analytics, and digital distribution suggests that copyright law must operate as a dynamic regulatory instrument rather than a static doctrinal framework. Its continued relevance will depend upon its capacity to integrate technological understanding with principled legal reasoning, ensuring both protection of creative labour and equitable access to cultural expression.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE:

1. Goldstein, Paul. 2019. *Goldstein on Copyright*. Wolters Kluwer.
2. Ginsburg, Jane C. 2001. "Copyright and Control over New Technologies of Dissemination." *Columbia Law Review*.
3. Nimmer, Melville B., and David Nimmer. 2023. *Nimmer on Copyright*. LexisNexis.
4. Senftleben, Martin. 2020. "Comparative Copyright Law and the Digital Single Market." *Journal of Intellectual Property Law & Practice*.
5. World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO). 1996. *WIPO Copyright Treaty (WCT)*.
6. World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO). 2003. *Guide to the WIPO Copyright Treaty and the WIPO Performances and Phonograms Treaty*.

7. Lessig, Lawrence. 2006. Code: Version 2.0. Basic Books.
8. Litman, Jessica. 2001. Digital Copyright. Prometheus Books.
9. Samuelson, Pamela. 2017. "Artificial Intelligence and Copyright." Communications of the ACM.
10. Geiger, Christophe. 2018. "The Role of Fundamental Rights in Copyright Law." European Intellectual Property Review.
11. Hilty, Reto M., and Valentina Moscon. 2021. "Digital Platforms and Intermediary Liability in Copyright Law." International Review of Intellectual Property and Competition Law.
12. Urban, Jennifer M., Joe Karaganis, and Brianna Schofield. 2017. Notice and Takedown in Everyday Practice. UC Berkeley Public Law Research Paper.
13. Netanel, Neil Weinstock. 2008. Copyright's Paradox. Oxford University Press.
14. Gervais, Daniel J. 2019. "The Machine as Author." Iowa Law Review.
15. Dinwoodie, Graeme B., and Rochelle C. Dreyfuss. 2010. International Intellectual Property Law and Policy. LexisNexis.

