Page: 1064-1089 *URL: www.lijdlr.com*

LAWFOYER INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF DOCTRINAL LEGAL RESEARCH

ISSN: 2583-7753

LawFoyer International Journal of Doctrinal Legal Research

[ISSN: 2583-7753]

Volume 4 | Issue 1

2026

DOI: https://doi.org/10.70183/lijdlr.2026.v04.46

ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE AND INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY RIGHTS: LEGAL AND ETHICAL IMPLICATIONS

Nilisha Gupta[1] & Shweta Singh[2]

I. ABSTRACT

Artificial Intelligence (AI) is transforming the landscape of Intellectual Property Rights (IPR), raising fundamental questions regarding ownership, inventorship, and the adequacy of existing legal frameworks. Intellectual property rights have traditionally been designed to protect human creativity and innovation, ensuring economic benefits and incentivizing further research and development. However, the increasing autonomy of AI systems in generating inventions, artistic works, trademarks, and trade secrets challenges this human-centric structure. The study traces the evolution of IPR from early copyright and patent laws to international treaties and modern digital protection, demonstrating that legal systems have historically adapted to technological change. Yet AI introduces unprecedented complexities in determining originality, authorship, and enforceability. Several jurisdictions including the US, UK, and EU currently deny assigning IP rights directly to AI systems, though select legal decisions, such as the Australian DABUS ruling, suggest emerging flexibility. These inconsistencies highlight a growing global divide. Key concerns include whether AI-generated output meets originality standards under copyright law, how inventive contribution is assessed in AI-assisted patent filings, and the risk of widespread infringement where AI training uses copyrighted data without consent. Additionally, uncertainty persists surrounding economic impacts such as content devaluation and cross-border enforcement of digital works. The study emphasizes that while AI enhances innovation, efficient IP management, and market competition, it simultaneously threatens traditional creative industries if legal protections are not restructured. Ultimately, the document argues for adaptive global reforms that balance innovation incentives, public access, and ethical governance ensuring that both human and AI-driven creativity can coexist and thrive.

[1] B.A L.L.B 3rd year 6th Semester at GLA University, Mathura (India). Email: nilisha23.23@gmail.com
[2] B.Com L.L.B 3rd year 6th Semester at GLA University, Mathura (India). Email: shwetasingh284403@gmail.com

II. KEYWORDS

Artificial Intelligence (AI), Intellectual Property Rights (IPR), AI-generated Works, Authorship and Inventorship, Legal Reform.

III. INTRODUCTION

Intellectual Property Rights (IPR) form the foundation of global innovation by legally protecting the creations of the human mind ranging from artistic works and technological inventions to brand identities and confidential business information. These protections incentivize creativity, ensure fair commercial returns, and promote economic development across sectors. However, the rapid advancement of Artificial Intelligence (AI) is creating transformative shifts in how intellectual property is produced, managed, and exploited. As AI systems acquire the ability to autonomously generate inventions, music, literature, and designs, the long-standing principle that IP ownership rests solely with natural persons is increasingly being challenged.

The integration of AI into creative and industrial processes introduces novel opportunities for enhanced productivity, data-driven decision-making, and technological breakthroughs. At the same time, it disrupts traditional legal frameworks by blurring the boundaries of authorship, originality, and inventorship. Issues such as copyright protection for AI-generated content, the patentability of machine-derived inventions, the role of AI in branding, and the safeguarding of AI-related trade secrets are now at the forefront of global policy debates.

A. Research Problem

The central research problem addressed in this study is whether existing Intellectual Property Rights frameworks designed primarily around human authorship and inventorship are conceptually and structurally equipped to regulate AI-generated and AI-assisted creations. The absence of uniform legal recognition of AI's role in creative and inventive processes has produced doctrinal ambiguity, jurisdictional inconsistencies, and enforcement challenges. This raises a fundamental question: how

can IPR regimes be recalibrated to accommodate technological autonomy while preserving human accountability, innovation incentives, and ethical governance?

Legal systems across the world are grappling with inconsistent approaches some jurisdictions strictly require human inventors, while others have shown openness toward recognizing AI contributions indirectly through their owners or developers. These divergent positions expose regulatory gaps that risk hindering innovation, increasing infringement, and complicating international enforcement.

Therefore, re-evaluating IPR in the age of artificial intelligence has become a critical necessity. This study explores the intersection of AI and intellectual property law, highlighting the challenges, emerging case laws, ethical dilemmas, and future implications ultimately aiming to guide policymakers toward a balanced and adaptive framework capable of addressing the realities of AI-driven creativity.

B. Research Objectives

The research aims to examine the legal, ethical, and policy implications of Artificial Intelligence on Intellectual Property Rights. It seeks to analyze current IPR frameworks' adequacy in accommodating AI-generated works, identify inconsistencies across jurisdictions, and explore how concepts like originality, ownership, and inventorship are evolving. Further objectives include assessing economic and enforcement challenges posed by AI-generated outputs, evaluating relevant case laws, and proposing adaptive legal reforms. Ultimately, the study aspires to recommend a balanced and future-ready framework that upholds both innovation and fairness while safeguarding human and AI-driven contributions within intellectual property ecosystems globally.

C. Research Questions

Key questions about the relationship between artificial intelligence and intellectual property rights are the focus of this study:

1. How does AI challenge the traditional notions of authorship and inventorship under existing IPR regimes?

2. Can AI-generated creations qualify for legal protection under copyright and patent laws?
3. What are the implications of recognizing AI as an inventor or author?
4. How do international jurisdictions differ in addressing these challenges?
5. Finally, what legal reforms or harmonized global frameworks are necessary to ensure equitable protection, accountability, and innovation while maintaining ethical governance in the evolving landscape of AI-driven creativity and intellectual property.

D. Research Hypothesis

The hypothesis of this study is that the complexity of authorship, inventorship, and ownership determination brought about by artificial intelligence cannot be adequately addressed by current intellectual property rules. It posits that AI's growing autonomy in creative and inventive processes necessitates a redefined legal framework that extends protection mechanisms beyond human creators. The hypothesis also assumes that without adaptive reforms and international harmonization, inconsistencies in recognizing AI-generated works will lead to legal uncertainty, hinder innovation, and create ethical and economic imbalances. Therefore, modernizing IPR laws to integrate AI within human-centric structures is essential for equitable innovation governance.

E. Research Methodology

This study employs a doctrinal research methodology, analyzing primary sources such as statutes, conventions, and landmark judgments including *Thaler v. Commissioner of Patents* and *Naruto v. Slater*. It also incorporates comparative legal analysis to evaluate global approaches across jurisdictions such as the United States, the United Kingdom, the European Union, and Australia.

In addition, the study examines emerging litigation concerning AI training and copyright law, including *Bartz v. Anthropic, No. 3:24-cv-05417 (N.D. Cal., filed Aug. 2024)*, in which issues of fair use in AI model training were judicially considered, with a

significant summary judgment ruling issued by Judge William Alsup in June 2025.

Secondary sources such as scholarly articles, policy papers, and institutional reports are reviewed to contextualize theoretical and practical perspectives. Qualitative doctrinal analysis is employed to interpret evolving legal standards, while an analytical-descriptive approach is adopted to assess regulatory gaps and propose reforms balancing technological advancement with intellectual property protection.

F. Literature Review

The intersection of Artificial Intelligence and Intellectual Property Rights has generated substantial scholarly debate, particularly regarding inventorship, authorship, and the adaptability of existing legal frameworks. Ryan Abbott argues that patent systems should recognize AI-generated inventions by attributing inventorship to the AI system itself or, alternatively, by adapting statutory interpretation to prevent innovation gaps, emphasizing that denying protection may discourage technological progress.[3] Abbott contends that patent law's objective of promoting innovation would be undermined if AI-generated inventions fall outside the protective regime.

Conversely, Daniel J. Gervais questions the conceptual coherence of extending authorship or inventorship status to non-human entities, cautioning that intellectual property systems are normatively grounded in human creativity and moral agency.[4] Gervais highlights the risks of destabilizing doctrinal foundations if legal personality or authorship is detached from human intentionality. This tension between utilitarian innovation incentives and human-centric legal theory forms a central axis of contemporary debate.

Institutional analyses further enrich this discourse. The World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO), through its AI and IP Policy Dialogues and issue papers, underscores the necessity of international harmonization and transparency in AI

[3] Ryan Abbott, *The Reasonable Robot: Artificial Intelligence and the Law* (2020).
[4] Daniel J. Gervais, *The Machine as Author*, 105 Iowa L. Rev. 2053 (2020)

training data governance.[5] Similarly, the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) emphasize responsible AI innovation, accountability mechanisms, and balanced economic distribution in its policy frameworks.[6] These reports reflect a regulatory trend toward integrating ethical governance with innovation policy.

Comparative scholarship also examines divergent judicial approaches, particularly in the DABUS litigation across the United States, the United Kingdom, Australia, and South Africa, revealing fragmentation in the interpretation of inventorship requirements. Collectively, the literature demonstrates that while reform is widely acknowledged as necessary, consensus remains elusive regarding the normative basis and scope of such reform.

G. Research and Analysis

The analysis reveals critical challenges in applying existing IPR principles to AI-generated works. Under copyright, originality and authorship remain human-centric, while AI's creative autonomy blurs legal attribution. Patent law faces ambiguity in defining inventorship and non- obviousness for AI-assisted innovations. Trade secrets offer protection for algorithms but lack statutory clarity in jurisdictions like India. Internationally, the DABUS and *Naruto* cases expose inconsistencies in recognizing non-human creators. Economically, AI-driven outputs risk devaluing traditional creativity, demanding balanced legal reform. The study concludes that harmonized, flexible legal frameworks integrating AI's role without undermining human accountability are essential.

IV. WHAT IS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY?

What are Intellectual Property Rights The legal rights that are bestowed upon people or

[5] World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO), *WIPO Conversation on Intellectual Property (IP) and Artificial Intelligence* (Issue Papers and Revised Issues Paper, 2020–2023).
[6] Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), *OECD Principles on Artificial Intelligence* (2019)

organizations in accordance with intellectual property rights or creative inventions are known as intellectual property rights (IPR). The ability to control and profit from their creations is granted by these rights. In general, there are various categories into which intellectual property rights fall:

1. **Copyright**: Plays, music, art, and literature are among the creative works of authors that are protected by copyright. This includes photos, music, movies, and books. The exclusive right to reproduce, distribute, perform, and exhibit one's work is granted under copyright.
2. **Patents:** A patent gives the owner the exclusive right to prevent anybody from creating, using, or selling an invention for a predetermined period of time, usually 20 years. An invention must be new, non-obvious, and practical in order to be eligible for a patent.
3. **Trademarks:** Symbols, names, logos, and phrases that set one product or service apart from another are protected by trademark law. By preventing others from using a confusingly similar mark in commerce, trademark rights enable the owner to preserve the mark's goodwill and reputation.
4. **Trade Secrets**: Trade secrets protect unique information that gives a business a competitive advantage. This category may include formulas, processes, techniques, or other information that is frequently unknown or readily identifiable to others and is safeguarded by suitable mechanisms to preserve secrecy.
5. **Industrial Design:** Industrial design preserves the product's aesthetic appeal or ornamental elements. This page uses a variety of categories, such as decorations, patterns, and combinations.

By motivating people and businesses to devote time, money, and effort to developing novel concepts, goods, and services, intellectual property rights contribute significantly to innovation, creativity, and economic expansion. Additionally, these

rights offer legal means of settling conflicts and enforcing intellectual property ownership.

V. IMPORTANCE OF IPR

Individually developed concepts and inventions are protected under intellectual property rights. They must be protected at all costs because without them, there would be no room for additional research and development costs because people would start stealing ideas and ruining the foundation of any new product or service that enters the market, which is known as innovation. In addition to helping people protect their intellectual property, these rights give them a variety of options for using them to grow their businesses without worrying about the idea of being stolen or duplicated. The optimal use of these intellectual property rights is made possible by the ability to launch a chain of businesses from a single location of one's choosing while maintaining total control and power.

Businesses profit from the asset class of intellectual property through the sale of protected goods and services, franchising, and licensing. In the event of a merger or acquisition, protected intellectual property assets significantly increase a company's value. The importance of intellectual property is also shown by export markets. There are two options: either explore for franchise agreements with foreign companies or export protected intellectual property. It is crucial to keep in mind that the biggest corporations in the world, such as Apple, Microsoft, and Blackberry, which are valued at billions of dollars, have established a robust revenue stream because of their enormous intellectual property. The biggest advantages might come from having a strong portfolio of intellectual property that can be used to increase income through licensing streams.

VI. HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT OF IPR

Over ages, the idea of intellectual property rights, or IPR, has changed as a result of the need to safeguard human ingenuity and creativity. Its origins can be found in

ancient societies where artists were given more basic types of protection. The Lex Rhodia, for example, gave advances in marine trade, little legal sanction in ancient Rome, suggesting the earliest ideas of private rights.

Although there were no official legal safeguards during the Middle Ages, the copying of manuscripts in monasteries mirrored early copyright-like procedures. With the Venetian Patent Statute of 1474, which gave inventors temporary exclusivity over their creations, Renaissance Venice saw the emergence of the first notable legal codification. This was the first step in acknowledging innovation as a resource that could be protected by law.

The Statute of Monopolies (1624) in England, which placed a strong emphasis on the public interest and restricted monopolies to legitimate inventions, prevented the misuse of royal patent licenses and established the foundation for contemporary patent law. The first modern copyright law was later the Statute of Anne (1710), which established the limited-term protection principle and granted authors the sole right to publish their works.

The necessity for international cooperation as industrialization developed resulted in historic treaties. The Berne Convention for the Protection of Literary and Artistic Works (1886) established the principle of national treatment for foreign creators and standardized copyright protections, while the *Paris Convention for the Protection of Industrial Property (1883)* made it easier for member nations to recognize each other's patents and trademarks.

Globalization and the emergence of digital media brought additional complications in the 20th century. The United States' Digital Millennium Copyright Act (DMCA, 1998) addressed digital rights management and online piracy by making it illegal to get around DRM technology and giving internet service providers safe harbor protections.

The advent of revolutionary technologies in the 21st century, such as blockchain, biotechnology, AI, and software, put conventional IPR frameworks to the test. While

open- source licensing and Creative Commons models challenged the inflexibility of traditional IP protection, software patents and digital media rights gained prominence. Because the internet has no geographical boundaries, enforcing intellectual property rights is a worldwide problem that calls for legal harmonization and collaboration across jurisdictions.

Ethical quandaries were brought about by biotechnology, particularly in relation to synthetic biology and gene patents. The commodification of life and its effects on healthcare research and access were discussed by legal scholars and policymakers. With its transparent and decentralized ledger systems, blockchain technology started to impact copyright enforcement through digital asset monitoring and smart contracts.

The fundamental goals of IPR have not changed despite this evolution: to safeguard artists, encourage innovation, and strike a balance between intellectual rights and public access. Nonetheless, the procedures and legal interpretations have consistently changed to take into account the evolving social and technical environment. IPR is at a turning point in its history, necessitating flexible legal structures that can protect both economic and ethical interests while allowing for quick innovation.

VII. WHAT IS ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE?

The conceptual foundations of artificial intelligence were significantly advanced by Alan Turing in his landmark 1950 paper, *Computing Machinery and Intelligence*, which explored whether machines could simulate human reasoning. However, the term "Artificial Intelligence" was formally coined by John McCarthy in 1955 in the proposal for the Dartmouth Summer Research Project on Artificial Intelligence (held in 1956), co-authored with Marvin Minsky, Nathaniel Rochester, and Claude Shannon.

This proposal marked the formal institutional beginning of AI as a distinct field of academic inquiry. AI has no universally acknowledged definition that all practitioners can agree upon. Others define artificial intelligence (AI) as a computer system that can rationally solve complex issues or take the right action to accomplish its goal in real-

world situations. Some define AI as a computerized system that exhibits behavior typically assumed to require intelligence. Logical reasoning, knowledge representation, planning and navigation, *natural language processing (NLP), machine learning (ML), deep learning (DL),* expert systems, robotics, and artificial neural networks are all included in artificial intelligence (AI) according to the problem area.

A. Artificial Intelligence's Place in Creation

Artificial intelligence (AI) technologies, particularly machine learning and deep learning, have demonstrated remarkable promise in creating artistic and musical works as well as literary works and inventions. Large volumes of data are analyzed by AI systems to generate outputs that can replicate human ingenuity. This section explores the workings of AI systems, the kinds of outputs they generate, and the consequences of assigning ownership and authorship to these works.

VIII. AI AND IPR

In recent years, there has been much discussion on the relationship between *artificial intelligence (AI) and intellectual property rights (IPR).* IPR has historically been awarded to human creators and innovators in recognition of their intellectual achievements for both individual and social gain. This includes copyrights, patents, trademarks, designs, and geographical indications. But the emergence of AI, which is currently revolutionizing a number of fields like technology, governance, and commerce, calls into question this human-centered paradigm. Whether AI-generated works should be protected by intellectual property rights is a major question.

Others suggest using the "Work for Hire" doctrine, even though many legal systems including those in the US, UK, and NZ maintain that only natural persons are capable of possessing intellectual property rights. This theory, which is acknowledged by Section 101 of the U.S. Copyright Act, permits employers to possess the rights to works produced by employees they have hired. It implies that AI creations may also be ascribed to the owner or developer of the AI. This strategy might incorporate AI into

current legal frameworks without requiring significant changes. Whether AI may be acknowledged as a legal entity with the capacity for creativity and innovation is a topic of further discussion.

Different jurisdictions have taken different positions. The IP Office in New Zealand and the U.S. Patent Office have both denied patent applications that name AI (like DABUS) as the inventor, pointing out that there are no laws that give machines property rights. In Australia, a single-judge decision of the Federal Court in *Thaler v Commissioner of Patents* [2021] FCA 879 initially held that an AI system (DABUS) could be recognized as an inventor under the Patents Act 1990 (Cth). However, this position was overturned by the Full Court of the Federal Court of Australia in *Commissioner of Patents v Thaler* [2022] FCAFC 62, which held that an "inventor" must be a natural person. The High Court of Australia subsequently refused special leave to appeal in November 2022, thereby affirming that, under Australian law, only a natural person may be recognized as an inventor.

In South Africa, a patent listing DABUS as inventor was granted in 2021 by the Companies and Intellectual Property Commission (CIPC). However, South Africa operates a depository system without substantive examination of patent applications. The grant was therefore administrative in nature and did not result from a judicial determination recognizing AI inventorship.

Accordingly, the prevailing legal position in both jurisdictions aligns with the broader international approach that inventorship under patent law requires a natural person, notwithstanding earlier or administrative developments that suggested interpretative flexibility. It is becoming more and more important to comprehend how AI affects intellectual property law as it develops.

IX. IMPACT OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE ON THE IPR'S

The need for IPR protection grew as new technologies and artificial intelligence developed. IPR adaptation has been under constant pressure because to the digital

revolution of the late 20th century and the internet's rise as a global communication medium. AI helps with licensing, enforcement, search and analysis, and the management of intellectual property assets. However, there are a number of ethical and legal concerns raised by utilizing AI to produce and profit from intellectual property, such as patentability, ownership, and data infringement. Copyright protection The field of the junction of AI and IP is one that is changing quickly and needs serious thought and investigation. AI is transforming the creation, management, and protection of intellectual property.

One of the main issues with employing AI to generate IP is ownership. Ownership is typically ascribed to human innovators or creators under intellectual property systems. However, the more AI is employed, the more complicated ownership becomes. Copyright law encourages artistic expression since it grants authors the sole right to their works. Because copyright law gives authors the sole right to their creations, it promotes artistic expression. Without a doubt, artificial intelligence has had and will continue to have an impact on the field of intellectual property, and there may be two aspects to the relationship between the two. In the field of intellectual property, it can prove to be both a threat and an advantage.

A. Artificial Intelligence and Patents

Deeply troubling issues about the fundamental concepts of inventorship, novelty, and non- obviousness are brought up by the junction of AI and patent law. The assumption made by traditional patent law that inventors are human is being challenged by the growing number of creative solutions produced by AI systems on their own. An important weakness in the current legal frameworks is highlighted by the controversy regarding whether AI systems may or should be acknowledged as inventors. Furthermore, because AI outputs may surpass conventional human creativity, their reliance on large datasets and iterative computing processes makes it more difficult to assess innovation and non-obviousness. Investment in cutting-edge AI technologies is discouraged by the absence of clear criteria addressing the patentability of AI-generated

inventions, which increases the risk of legal challenges.

The intricacy of these problems is demonstrated by recent court cases, such as the *DABUS (Device for the Autonomous Bootstrapping of Unified Sentience)* dispute. Citing current legal requirements for human inventors, courts have repeatedly rejected the idea that AI might be an invention. These decisions, however, ignore the fact that AI systems frequently make substantial contributions to the creative process, which calls for changes to patent frameworks to account for these contributions. Without these changes, stakeholders could deal with ongoing uncertainty, which would impede both economic expansion and technical advancement.

B. AI and Copyright

Conventional copyright law does not recognize works created by AI. It can only be used to protect original human inventions. The author of a piece of literature, art, or music is given the only right to sell, use, and transfer it under copyright protection. The court concluded that a machine-generated product qualified for copyright protection is, in turn, the result of human production. The fact that mechanical activity is not regarded as creative further diminished their level of defense. Thus, copyright would be problematic for works produced by AI systems if they were subjected to such a rigid stance.

The topic of whether copyright will belong to the programmer, the AI system, or the software will come up as artificial intelligence develops and we create computers with human intelligence that can generate creative work on their own. Only human producers of creative works are now protected by copyright. Nonetheless, some academics have supported the idea of granting copyright to authors who are not human. They argue that the concept of "authorship" should be broadened to encompass both human and non- human authors. Giving credit to an AI-generated piece is still debatable.

C. AI and Trademark

AI is being used more and more in India's numerous industries for positions like brand management, marketing, and advertising. AI systems are therefore capable of creating or registering trademarks. However, trademarks generated by artificial intelligence are not specifically covered by the Indian Trademark Act, 1999. Eliminating consumer uncertainty about a brand's identity, appearance, packaging, or other distinctive features is the aim of trademark law. It's difficult to predict how AI can violate a brand, and issues like copyright and patent infringement may occur.

A few cases have raised the issue of trademark infringement in relation to AI. As artificial intelligence (AI) becomes more widely used in payment and security systems as well as retail and commercial structures, this issue is expected to improve. It's important to keep in mind that Indian trademark law requires that a mark be distinct and unlikely to be confused with already-registered trademarks, even though using AI to the trademark registration process may improve efficiency and accuracy.

Therefore, in order for any AI-generated trademark to be registered, it is essential that it meet these requirements. When AI is used to create a trademark, the ownership issue could surface. A trademark is normally considered to belong to the person who owns and controls the artificial intelligence system, unless a specific agreement is in place that assigns ownership to another person. All things considered, even if the field of utilizing AI to register trademarks is still in its infancy, it is obvious that for trademarks created by AI to be acceptable for registration and protection, they must adhere to the same legal standards as those created by humans.

D. AI and Trade Secrets

AI and Trade Secrets in India, there isn't any legislation that addresses trade secrets related to artificial intelligence. The common law of confidentiality, the Indian Contract Act of 1872, and other rules and regulations, however, govern trade secret protection. New problems of ownership and protection are being raised by the increasing prevalence of AI-generated trade secrets, such as software code or innovative chemical

compounds. As AI develops, new alliances and partnerships are emerging, which, if not handled carefully, could raise the possibility of trade secret theft.

By signing non-disclosure agreements (NDAs) with their partners, contractors, and employees, businesses can safeguard their artificial intelligence (AI) trade secrets under the Indian Contract Act. NDAs have the authority to restrict the use and disclosure of private information. In general, firms can use a combination of legal and contractual remedies to protect their sensitive knowledge, even if India does not have a specific statute that addresses trade secret protection in respect to AI. To make sure that the applicable laws and regulations are observed, businesses should consult with legal experts.

X. CURRENT LEGAL FRAMEWORKS COPYRIGHT LAW AND AI-GENERATED

In the era of AI-generated material, copyright law which was initially meant to safeguard works made by humans is confronted with serious difficulties. The main query is whether orks produced by AI systems are covered by current copyright laws. Human authorship is required by copyright law in the majority of jurisdictions. For instance:

The U.S. Copyright Office has declared that it will "register an original work of authorship, provided that the work was created by a human being." Cases like Naruto v. Slater (the "monkey selfie" case), which highlighted the importance of human authorship, supported this viewpoint.

1. **European Union:** According to rulings by the Court of Justice of the European Union (CJEU), copyright protection is applicable to works that imply human involvement and represent the author's original intellectual production.
2. **United Kingdom:** The Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 in the United Kingdom states that the author of computer-generated works is "the person by whom the arrangements necessary for the creation of the work are undertaken."

This method provides a possible framework for authorship assignment in AI-generated content.

These frameworks are under pressure, meanwhile, as AI systems' creative processes grow more independent. Among the main concerns are:

1. **Originality threshold**: How to assess whether an AI-generated piece satisfies the copyright protection standard for originality.
2. **Ownership and authorship:** Determining who has the right to be in charge - the AI system itself, the user, or the AI creator.
3. **Terms of protection:** Does the regular copyright term apply to works created by artificial intelligence?

XI. PATENT LAW AND AI-ASSISTED INVENTIONS

Similar issues are being faced by patent law, especially with regard to the idea of inventorship. Important concerns and developments include:

1. **AI as an inventor:** Due to the need for human inventors, patent offices in the US, EU, and UK denied applications in 2020 that named an AI system (DABUS) as the inventor.
2. **AI-assisted inventions:** The topic of how to handle inventions in which AI was heavily involved but still guided by humans is gaining traction.
3. **Creative step assessment:** Given AI's ability to digest enormous volumes of data quickly, it is unclear how to measure the creative step or non-obviousness of inventions produced by AI.
4. **Requirements for disclosure:** ensuring that AI-assisted inventions are adequately disclosed, especially when machine learning algorithms are used in the invention process.

XII. TRADE SECRET PROTECTION FOR AI ALGORITHMS

To secure AI technology, trade secret law has grown in significance, especially for businesses looking to protect their training data and algorithms. Important things to think about are:

1. **Secrecy measures:** The steps taken to maintain the secrecy of AI algorithms and datasets.
2. **Economic value:** Demonstrating the economic value derived from keeping the AI technology secret.
3. **Reverse engineering:** The legality of reverse engineering AI systems, which may be more challenging given their black-box nature. 4. Employee mobility: Managing trade secret protection in light of employee turnover in the AI industry.

XIII. TRADEMARK LAW IMPLICATIONS

Compared to other areas of IP, trademark law is less directly affected by AI, although there are still several new concerns:

1. **AI-generated trademarks:** The possibility that AI systems could produce original brand names and logos, which could lead to concerns over authorship and distinctiveness.
2. **AI in trademark searches and registration:** AI is being used to speed up the registration process and do more thorough trademark searches.
3. **AI and likelihood of confusion:** AI systems may be able to determine trademark similarity and confusion likelihood more precisely than conventional techniques.
4. **Virtual assistants and trademark use:** Inquiries concerning the potential effects on trademark rights and consumer perception of virtual assistants' use of trademarks in their responses.

The swift progress of artificial intelligence technology is putting these existing legal frameworks to the test. It's becoming increasingly obvious that to effectively handle the difficulties presented by AI in intellectual property, modifications or fresh strategies

could be required.

XIV. CHALLENGES IN PROTECTING IP RIGHTS IN AI-GENERATED CONTENT TECHNICAL AND PRACTICAL CHALLENGES

There are many technical obstacles in the way of implementing efficient IP protection for AI- generated material, chief among them being provenance tracking and content authentication. It becomes extremely challenging to detect illegal derivatives or establish originality timelines when nearly infinite variations of content can be produced with only little rapid alterations. Digital watermarking, blockchain registration, and fingerprinting systems are examples of current technology solutions that provide partial answers but have serious scalability and efficacy issues. Furthermore, enforcement systems face ongoing difficulties as a result of the rapid expansion of AI generation skills, which frequently surpasses technical protection measures.

XV. ECONOMIC IMPLICATIONS AND MARKET DISRUPTION

The economic impact of AI content generation presents substantial challenges across creative industries. Traditional compensation models based on clear creator attribution and licensing arrangements struggle to accommodate collaborative human-AI creation processes

The potential market flooding effect of low-cost, rapidly produced AI content threatens to devalue creative works across sectors, with studies suggesting potential revenue displacement ranging from 15-40% across various creative markets. Furthermore, the concentration of economic benefits among AI system developers rather than a broader creative ecosystem raises significant concerns about industry sustainability and creative diversity.

XVI. CROSS-BORDER ENFORCEMENT ISSUES

Cross-border enforcement of intellectual property rights in AI-generated content presents substantial legal and practical obstacles. Divergent national approaches to AI authorship, inventorship, and originality create jurisdictional inconsistencies, enabling regulatory arbitrage and forum shopping. Content protected in one jurisdiction may lack protection in another, thereby undermining predictability and legal certainty.

The borderless nature of digital dissemination further complicates enforcement, as AI-generated works can be instantaneously reproduced and distributed across multiple territories, rendering traditional territorial remedies less effective. Questions of jurisdiction, applicable law, and recognition of foreign judgments become increasingly complex in disputes involving AI systems operating across borders.

Additionally, the multi-layered structure of AI ecosystems comprising model developers, platform providers, deployers, and end users creates evidentiary and attribution challenges when determining liability. The absence of harmonized international standards heightens enforcement fragmentation, underscoring the need for coordinated global frameworks and mutual recognition mechanisms to ensure effective cross-border IP protection in the AI context.

XVII. TRANSPARENCY AND DISCLOSURE REQUIREMENTS

For IP protection systems, putting in place efficient disclosure rules for AI-generated content is a major challenge. Transparency regarding possible copyright infringement in the training process is limited by the intricacy of generative models, which frequently render complete disclosure of training sources technically impossible [36]. Current efforts to require AI content labeling are met with opposition from industry stakeholders worried about competitive disadvantages and practical enforcement challenges. Debates about whether technical specifics, training data sources, or just the fact that AI is involved should be revealed are at the heart of the ongoing controversy about the proper extent of disclosure obligations.

XVIII. INTERNATIONAL PERSPECTIVE

The ownership of AI-generated IP is a complex issue that calls for a comparative analysis of the IP rules that are now in place in many different countries. Even though different countries' intellectual property laws have many similarities, there are also significant differences that may affect who owns and is responsible for AI-generated intellectual property. According to US patent law, the inventor must be a human. This suggests that AI systems cannot be considered inventors and that the proprietor of IP generated by AI would probably be the person or organization who developed the AI system. On the other hand, the European Patent Convention does not require that the inventor be a human, which means that artificial intelligence (AI) systems could be acknowledged as inventors.

Copyright laws vary greatly between countries and can have a significant impact on who owns intellectual property created by AI. The person or organization that developed the AI system would probably be the proprietor of works created by AI since copyright law in the US grants title to the inventor of a work. The creator of the work is granted ownership by copyright law throughout the European Union, but it also recognizes "moral rights," which grant the creator particular rights about the work, such as the right to be identified as the author.

AI-generated IP ownership and attribution can be significantly impacted by differences in international intellectual property laws. Synchronizing national intellectual property laws is essential to ensure clarity and uniformity in ownership and attribution across borders as AI plays a bigger role in IP generation.

XIX. CASE STUDIES – OWNERSHIP ISSUES

1. **The DABUS case:** In 2018, two inventions a food container and a light beacon created by an AI system named DABUS were submitted for patents in the US, UK, and Europe. The applications were denied on the grounds that, according to current patent rules, an AI system cannot be named an inventor. The case, which is currently on appeal, might have a big impact on who owns and gets credited with intellectual property created by AI.

2. **Qualcomm v. Apple:** In 2017, Qualcomm sued Apple, claiming that the corporation had violated many patents pertaining to smartphone technology. One of the contested patents dealt with an AI-powered power management system intended to prolong smartphone battery life. Apple argued that the patent lacked human inventiveness since it relied on an algorithm created by artificial intelligence. The court ultimately decided in Qualcomm's favor, concluding that Apple had violated the patent and that it was legitimate. This case serves as an example of the challenges in determining whether AI-generated concepts are unique as well as the potential consequences for patent disputes involving AI technology.
3. **Samsung Electronics Company v. Image Processing Technologies LLC:** In 2016, Image Processing Technologies LLC sued Samsung Electronics Co. for allegedly violating its patents on image processing technologies. Samsung argued that the patent lacked human inventiveness since it relied on an algorithm created by artificial intelligence. The court ultimately decided in favor of Image Processing Technologies LLC, concluding that Samsung had infringed upon the patent and that it was valid. This case emphasizes how important it is to protect AI-generated ideas through intellectual property rights, regardless of whether humans were directly involved.
4. **Thaler v. Commissioner of Patents (2021):** In this landmark case, Stephen Thaler sought recognition for his AI system, DABUS, as the author of two patent applications in Australia. The Australian Patent Office rejected the application because the inventor had to be a real person. Thaler challenged the ruling, claiming that the inventions were produced by the AI system on its own. In the end, the Federal Court of Australia decided in Thaler's favor, finding that the existing patent legislation did not specifically call for a human inventor. This case highlights the ongoing debate over the definition of "inventor" in patent law and the potential for AI to be recognized as a creator.

5. **Naruto v. Slater (2018):** In this instance, wildlife photographer David Slater left a camera unsecured, and a monkey named Naruto used it to take a number of pictures. The main issue in the lawsuit was whether Naruto could be regarded as the photographer in accordance with US copyright laws. The Ninth Circuit Court emphasized that copyright protection is exclusive to human authors by ruling that animals cannot own copyright. The difficulties of assigning authorship and ownership to non- human producers, such as AI systems, are highlighted by this case.
6. **U.S. Copyright Office Guidance on AI-Generated Works (2019):** The U.S. Copyright Office published guidelines in 2019 stating that works created by AI without human intervention are not protected by copyright. This suggestion was based on the notion that copyright protection requires a human author. The decision, which denies legal protection to works created by AI, has significant implications for artists who employ AI technologies. This advice reflects the current status of the law and the need for revision to account for the reality of AI-generated innovation.

XX. CHALLENGES IN APPLYING IP LAW TO AI

AI and intellectual property (IP) interact in complex ways. AI systems are often trained on protected content, which raises questions about infringement and fair use. Recent high-profile lawsuits in the US, such as Bartz v. Anthropic, examine whether it is fair use to utilize copyrighted material to train an AI model. Lawmakers in the US have even suggested combining privacy and copyright safeguards. For instance, the *AI Accountability and Personal Data Protection Act*, introduced by Senators Josh Hawley and Richard Blumenthal in July 2025, proposes the creation of a statutory cause of action enabling individuals to seek redress where their copyrighted works or personal data are used in AI training without authorization.

This hypothetical tort serves as an example of how IP and privacy concerns might coexist in AI since both a creator's copyright and an individual's data rights would

require protection against unapproved AI use.

Similar discussions are taking place in Europe and India. Data and content rights are taken into consideration in the upcoming AI Act from the EU and the debates around the Digital Services Act. It is debatable whether AI training violates the sui generis database right that the EU has historically provided to preserve data collections. Non-personal data, on the other hand, falls more into the category of data governance than privacy, even though it may overlap with IP content.

Conversely, AI-generated outputs present fresh intellectual property problems: Who is the owner of the copyright to works of art or inventions produced by AI? Non-human creators have been denied copyright by some jurisdictions (such as the United States and the United Kingdom), while others remain unsure. IP regulations affect data use even if they do not directly regulate privacy. For example, if an AI output or input is protected by copyright, using it may necessitate licensing or expose one to liability. The data accessible for AI and the incentives to uphold authors' rights are thus indirectly shaped by IP legislation.

XXI. SUGGESTIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In light of the challenges posed by Artificial Intelligence to existing Intellectual Property frameworks, several policies and legal reforms are recommended to ensure a balanced and forward-looking approach. First, national and international legislation must explicitly address the legal status of AI in the context of authorship and inventorship. While full personhood for AI may not be appropriate, introducing a concept of *"AI-assisted creation"* can ensure that human contributors or developers retain accountability while acknowledging the machine's role. Second, international harmonization through organizations such as WIPO is essential to prevent jurisdictional inconsistencies and legal uncertainties.

A global treaty or model law could establish common standards for recognizing and protecting AI-generated works. Third, patent laws should be re-evaluated to

accommodate inventions autonomously developed by AI, with clear disclosure norms to ensure transparency and public interest. Fourth, the use of emerging technologies such as blockchain can enhance the traceability and protection of AI- generated intellectual property, providing an efficient enforcement mechanism. Finally, ethical guidelines must accompany legal reforms to prevent misuse, ensure data integrity, and balance innovation with social responsibility. India, in particular, should proactively amend its Copyright Act and Patent Act to include AI-related provisions, promote innovation, and safeguard creators' rights. By integrating legal adaptability, ethical oversight, and international cooperation, nations can build a sustainable and inclusive IPR regime suited for the AI-driven future.

XXII. CONCLUSION

One of the most significant legal frontiers of the twenty-first century is the junction between intellectual property rights and artificial intelligence. As AI transcends its role from a mere tool to an autonomous creator and innovator, traditional legal frameworks grounded in human authorship and inventorship are being stretched to their conceptual limits. This research underscores that existing IPR regimes, while robust in protecting human ingenuity, are ill- equipped to accommodate the complexities of machine-generated creativity. The absence of uniformity across jurisdictions further exacerbates legal ambiguity, risking both innovation, stagnation and ethical imbalance.

To navigate this paradigm shift, it is imperative that lawmakers, policymakers, and international organizations collaborate to evolve adaptive, technology-neutral frameworks. Such reforms must safeguard human accountability while recognizing AI's contributory role in creative and inventive processes. Additionally, embedding ethical principles, transparency standards, and equitable access within AI governance will ensure that technological progress aligns with justice and societal welfare.

The future of intellectual property must thus rest on a delicate equilibrium one that rewards human intellect, embraces artificial innovation, and fosters an inclusive

ecosystem of creativity and progress. In essence, the reimagination of IPR in the age of AI is not merely a legal necessity but a moral imperative to preserve the integrity of innovation in an increasingly intelligent world.

XXIII. REFERENCES

1. Abbott, Ryan. *The Reasonable Robot: Artificial Intelligence and the Law.* Cambridge University Press, 2020.
2. European Patent Convention, Oct. 5, 1973, 1065 U.N.T.S. 199.
3. Gervais, Daniel J. "The Machine as Author." *Iowa Law Review* 105 (2020): 2053–2106.
4. McCarthy, John, Marvin Minsky, Nathaniel Rochester & Claude Shannon. *A Proposal for the Dartmouth Summer Research Project on Artificial Intelligence.* Aug. 31, 1955.
5. Naruto v. Slater, 888 F.3d 418 (9th Cir. 2018).
6. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). *OECD Principles on Artificial Intelligence.* 2019.
7. Thaler v. Commissioner of Patents [2021] FCA 879 (Austl.).
8. Commissioner of Patents v. Thaler [2022] FCAFC 62 (Austl.).
9. U.S. Copyright Office. *Compendium of U.S. Copyright Office Practices.* 3rd ed., 2021.
10. World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO). *WIPO Conversation on Intellectual Property and Artificial Intelligence: Revised Issues Paper.* 2020–2023.