



ISSN: 2583-7753

LAWFOYER INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF DOCTRINAL LEGAL RESEARCH

[ISSN: 2583-7753]



Volume IV | Special Issue I

2026

Special Issue on the International E-Conference on

“Law in the Age of Artificial Intelligence: A Fundamental Perspective”

Organised by KES’ Shri J. H. Patel College of Law, Mumbai, on 24 January 2026

Official Publication Partner: LawFoyer International Journal of Doctrinal Legal Research

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.70183/lijdlr.2026.v4si1.05>

© 2026 LawFoyer International Journal of Doctrinal Legal Research

Follow this and additional research works at: www.lijdlr.com

Under the Platform of LawFoyer – www.lawfoyer.in

After careful consideration, the editorial board of LawFoyer International Journal of Doctrinal Legal Research has decided to publish this submission as part of the publication.

In case of any suggestions or complaints, kindly contact (info.lijdlr@gmail.com)

To submit your Manuscript for Publication in the LawFoyer International Journal of Doctrinal Legal Research, To submit your Manuscript [Click here](#)

KES' SHRI. JAYANTILAL H. PATEL LAW COLLEGE

About the College



KES' Shri. Jayantilal H. Patel Law College is committed to nurturing and empowering students through quality legal education. The college provides an inclusive and academically enriching environment that encourages students to excel in their studies, participate in co-curricular activities, engage in research, and develop a strong sense of civic responsibility.

The college is affiliated to the University of Mumbai, approved by the Bar Council of India, NAAC accredited with 'B++' grade, and ISO 9001:2015 certified. It offers programmes including B.A. LL.B., LL.B., LL.M., and specialised diploma courses.

With qualified and experienced faculty, a strong academic environment, moot court training, research activities and modern infrastructure, the institution seeks to prepare responsible, skilled and socially conscious legal professionals equipped to meet the challenges of a rapidly changing world.

The college functions under the aegis of Kandivli Education Society (KES), an institution established in 1936 with a long-standing commitment to quality, inclusivity and value-based education.

Affiliation	University of Mumbai
Recognition	Approved by the Bar Council of India
Accreditation	NAAC accredited 'B++'
Certification	ISO 9001:2015 certified

KANDIVLI EDUCATION SOCIETY

Established 1936



Kandivli Education Society (KES), established in 1936, has grown from a small educational initiative into a dynamic educational institution serving thousands of students.

With a legacy of quality, inclusivity and value-based learning, KES has expanded its academic presence across various disciplines. Its educational institutions are committed to providing meaningful learning opportunities and fostering academic, professional and personal development among students.

KES' Shri. Jayantilal H. Patel Law College is one of its prominent institutions dedicated to legal education. Through academic excellence, research, practical learning and co-curricular engagement, the college seeks to empower students with the knowledge, skills and values necessary to contribute meaningfully to society.

EDUCATIONAL COMMITMENT

- Quality and inclusive education
- Value-based learning
- Academic and professional development
- Research and practical learning
- Holistic and future-ready education

LAW IN THE AGE OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE

A Fundamental Perspective



ABOUT THE INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE

The International Conference on “Law in the Age of Artificial Intelligence: A Fundamental Perspective” provided an academic platform to examine the transformative impact of Artificial Intelligence on law, legal systems, governance and society.

The conference explored emerging legal and ethical questions relating to Artificial Intelligence, including intellectual property, authorship and ownership, liability, data privacy, cybersecurity, criminal justice, evidence law, human rights, ethics and accountability. It addressed the implications of Artificial Intelligence for legal education, commercial law, regulatory frameworks, policy development, research and scholarly communication.

The conference brought together academicians, research scholars, legal professionals and students to present research, exchange ideas and engage in interdisciplinary discussions. It encouraged meaningful academic dialogue and contributed towards the development of effective, ethical and inclusive legal responses to the rapidly evolving Artificial Intelligence landscape.

Conference	International Conference
Theme	Law in the Age of Artificial Intelligence: A Fundamental Perspective
Date	24 January 2026
Time	10:00 AM onwards
Mode	Online
Organised by	IQAC, Student Research Society and Library Committee
Publication Partner	LawFoyer International Journal of Doctrinal Legal Research [ISSN: 2583-7753]

PRINCIPAL'S MESSAGE

KES' Shri. Jayantilal H. Patel Law College



It gives me immense pleasure to welcome all academicians, research scholars, legal professionals and students to the International Conference on “Law in the Age of Artificial Intelligence: A Fundamental Perspective.”

Artificial Intelligence is transforming the way societies function and is increasingly influencing legal systems, governance, professional practices and education. These developments bring significant opportunities as well as complex legal, ethical and social challenges.

This conference provided a valuable platform for intellectual exchange and interdisciplinary dialogue on emerging issues such as data privacy, intellectual property, liability, criminal justice, human rights, ethics and the governance of Artificial Intelligence. The scholarly contributions and discussions during the conference encouraged deeper understanding and promoted responsible approaches to the use of Artificial Intelligence.

I extend my best wishes to all the speakers, researchers, presenters, participants and members of the organising team for a meaningful and intellectually enriching conference.

DR. VIRAL DAVE

I/c. Principal

KES' Shri. Jayantilal H. Patel Law College

ORGANISING COMMITTEE

International Conference on Law in the Age of Artificial Intelligence



I/c. Principal

Dr. Viral Dave

Convenor

Mr. Mahavir Mandot

Co-Convenors

Dr. Shweta Vijendra Pathak

Ms. Priyanka Khakhadia

Ms. Deepanshi Chandarana

Organised by IQAC, Student Research Society and Library Committee

KES' Shri. Jayantilal H. Patel Law College, Mumbai

*Papers presented at the conference are published in the Special Issue of the LawFoyer International Journal of
Doctrinal Legal Research [Volume IV, Special Issue I, 2026]*

INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ISSUES IN AI-DRIVEN WIRELESS COMMUNICATION SYSTEMS: OWNERSHIP OF AI-GENERATED NETWORK DESIGNS AND ALGORITHMS

Kabita Hazarika¹ & Bhargabjyoti Saikia²

I. ABSTRACT

Artificial intelligence (AI) has become a common practice in contemporary wireless communication systems to facilitate automated network design and optimisation. The AI methods are deployed in 5G and 6G networks to produce algorithms for resource allocation, MIMO system beamforming, spectrum sharing, and self-optimising networks. These AI systems do not need much human intervention to create new strategies and network behaviours, unlike conventional rule-based methods, and are trained on network data. Although this type of AI-based design is a great method of enhancing network performance, reliability, and energy consumption, it also poses crucial issues of intellectual property rights (IPR). The current IPR systems largely rely on the idea of human inventorship and authorship, which makes it unclear when the wireless network algorithms or configurations are produced as a result of the AI learning process. This paper looks into major IPR concerns of AI-based wireless communication technology, especially the ownership and protection of AI-generated algorithms and network designs. The paper provides basic and constructive examples, illustrating AI-generated beamforming plans, learning-based spectrum sharing protocols, and self-optimising radio access networks, and explains that AI is no longer a support system, but it is an actor in the generation of technical solutions. An analytical comparison of strategies implemented in India, the United States, and the European Union concerning the doctrinal differences is offered to detect the emerging trends in the law and gaps in policies. The paper avers that existing laws on IPR need to be improved to fit human, AI collaborative innovation in the system of wireless communications. It ends with a policy-related recommendation to

¹ LL.M Student, Apex Professional University, Arunachal Pradesh (India).Email: kabitahazarika94@gmail.com

² Assistant Professor, Department of ECE, DUIET, Dibrugarh University, Assam (India).Email: bjs784164@gmail.com

bring clarity in the law, foster innovation, and get good protection of AI-driven wireless technologies.

II. KEYWORDS

Artificial Intelligence, Wireless Communication, Patent Law, AI Inventorship, Network Algorithms.

III. INTRODUCTION

The history of the development of wireless communication systems has taken a revolutionary step in the context of Artificial Intelligence (AI). Since 5G and, currently, moving to 6G AI technologies are being incorporated in almost every tier of wireless networks, such as better spectrum utilization, enhancement of handover protocols, quality of service (QoS), and the addition of new functionality, such as combined sensing and communication. AI-powered receivers, smart resource allocation systems, and self-optimizing networks are only a few examples of how AI can transform the telecom industry and prove its massive potential.

Concurrently, such integration also produces acute legal and policy issues, especially in regard to intellectual property rights (IPR). With the inception of the AI systems that are going to autonomously create the network designs, protocols, and control algorithms, it is still not defined to whom the resulting products belong. Old IP paradigms presuppose human inventorship and authorship as the major concepts. However, in AI-based design spaces, where machines are not required to have humans near them to formulate technical answers or find optimal architecture designs, these assumptions are becoming questionable.

This problem goes beyond theory in wireless communications. As an example, neural networks or reinforcement learning agents could completely design deep learning-based transceiver designs, AI-optimised signal routing, and automated configuration scripts. Should these creations be patented or be copyrighted? Who should then be the rightful owner: the developer of the AI, the telecom operator who implemented the system, or the person who trained or monitored the AI model?

The stakes are high. Lack of legal certainty might cause firms to be unwilling to invest or commercialise AI-generated innovations, because they fear infringement or

infringe on inadmissible rights. Scientists would not be in a position to appropriate models and outcomes created by AI solutions they assisted in configuring but did not actually design. Meanwhile, regulating bodies and standards are under more and more pressure to revise policy frameworks that were never intended to deal with these complexities.

This paper seeks to investigate these new issues in details with the emphasis being on how AI-created products should be treated under the law with regard to wireless communication systems. In particular, it addresses the patentability, copyright, and trade secret protection of designs and algorithms generated by AI networks of particular interest how the ownership attribution and inventorship criteria are applied. Using the current academic and policy literature, the paper further presents comparative examples of other jurisdictions, including India, the US and the EU and ends its discussion with practical suggestions of action by stakeholders in academia, industry and government.

A. Research Objectives

The primary objectives of this research are:

1. To analyse whether AI-generated network designs and algorithms qualify for protection under existing patent and copyright frameworks.
2. To examine issues of ownership and inventorship in AI-driven wireless technologies.
3. To compare the legal positions of India, the United States, and the European Union regarding AI-related intellectual property.
4. To identify regulatory gaps and propose policy-oriented reforms suited to AI-enabled telecom systems.

B. Research Questions

This study seeks to address the following research questions:

1. Can AI-generated wireless communication algorithms be legally protected under existing intellectual property laws?
2. Who should be recognised as the inventor or owner of AI-generated network designs?

3. Are current intellectual property regimes adequate to address AI-driven innovation in wireless communication systems?
4. What reforms are necessary to ensure legal certainty and innovation protection in AI-based telecom networks?

C. Research Methodology

The methodology used in this research is a doctrinal and comparative approach to law. Statutory provisions, case law and policy documents concerning patent and copyright law in the United States, the European Union and India are analysed by the doctrinal method. The research is based on the legal documents, including the Patents Act, 1970 (India), Copyright Act, 1957 (India), and international legal tools. Also, the comparative analytic method is applied to determine similarities, differences, and gaps in regulations across jurisdictions.

The analysis also incorporates technical illustrations of wireless communication systems that are driven by AI in order to contextualise legal analysis in the real-life technological trends. The hypothesis that underlies this study is that current intellectual property systems, which are designed in a human-centred manner, do not adequately cater to the innovations produced by AI in the wireless communication systems.

IV. AI-GENERATED NETWORK DESIGNS: LEGAL CHALLENGES OF AUTHORSHIP AND INVENTORSHIP

One such legal and philosophical debate is whether AI is an author or an inventor. The laws of most countries (India, the US, and the EU) specify that a human being is the only one who can be an inventor or an author when it comes to patent and copyright law.^{3,4} Consequently, a scenario may arise where AI independently develops an original design, as it will be in a legal grey area, which is technically innovative, but it is not IP protection.

³ F Mazzi, "Authorship in AI-Generated Works" 27(3) *Journal of World Intellectual Property* 410 (2024).

⁴ I Olubiye and O Irumekhai, "AI Authorship and Inventorship: A Legal Inquiry" 12(1) *ALJ* 119 (2024)

There are different opinions that are proposed in the literature. Other researchers suggest broadening the definitions of authorship and inventorship to acknowledge that AI should be considered a co-inventor, particularly when there is a small role played by humans who only have only been the initiators or monitors of the process.^{5,6} Others suggest that the rights are to be transferred to the developer, the operator, or the organisation that trained or deployed the AI system.^{7,8}

This controversy extends to the field of wireless systems to algorithmically specified signal processing schemes, adaptive protocols and configuration strategies, which might not involve clear human authorship.

V. PATENTABILITY AND INVENTORSHIP IN AI-DRIVEN TELECOM SYSTEMS

The leading IP regime in the protection of technical innovations is the patent law which depends on the identification of an inventor. In AI-generated innovations (a deep neural network to construct channel estimation methods or autonomous optimisation algorithms) it is hard to tell who made the invention.

The outputs of AI cannot be patented in the majority of jurisdictions unless there is some identifiable human input, which qualifies as an inventive step.^{9,10} There is no explicit provision of non-human inventors under the Patents Act of 1970 in India. This poses a question mark regarding the patentability of AI-generated innovations in communication systems, especially in designs where the model-generated code or architecture was not written explicitly by a human.^{11,12}

⁵ R Matulionytė and J Lee, "Copyright in AI-Generated Works" 19(1) Script-Ed 5 (2022)

⁶ Olubiyi and Irumekhai, *supra* note 2

⁷ R Almarzoqi and M Albakjaji, "The Patentability of AI Invention" 13(1) International Journal of Service Science Management Engineering and Technology 1 (2022).

⁸ Mazzi, *supra* note 1

⁹ *Ibid.*

¹⁰ Matulionytė and Lee, *supra* note 3

¹¹ Olubiyi and Irumekhai, *supra* note 2

¹² P Picht and F Thouvenin, "AI and IP: From Theory to Policy" 54(6) IIC 916 (2023)

Other writers suggest reform: permit patenting AI when it is a human tool or establish a distinct system of registration of inventions by AI.^{13,14,15}

VI. COPYRIGHT AND SOFTWARE IN AI-BASED WIRELESS NETWORKS

Besides patenting, copyright is also commonly applied to safeguard software, documentation, and technical illustrations. The copyright law also relies on the idea of human authorship, and the majority of legal systems do not consider AI-generated works as copyrightable.^{16,17}

This poses a problem for the protection of:

1. AI-generated configuration files and policy scripts;
2. auto-written simulation code;
3. generative-AI-produced software-defined networking (SDN) code; and
4. AI-generated network documentation or diagrams.

According to the existing law, a human cannot be recognised as the creator, and thus such outputs do not enjoy copyright protection, which puts developers at risk of abuse or theft.^{18,19}

The issue of authorship and copyright is even more complicated in collaborative environments (e.g., Open RAN), in which numerous organisations donate AI modules.

VII. TRADE SECRETS, DATA OWNERSHIP, AND LICENSING

In the absence or inappropriateness of patent or copyright protection (e.g. because of disclosure requirements), trade secrets are frequently used by companies to safeguard AI-related innovations. This is especially true of:

¹³ B Mahesh et al., "Investigating the IPR Implications of AI" 7(3) International Journal for Multidisciplinary Research (2025)

¹⁴ Mazzi, *supra* note 1.

¹⁵ R Tovar and D Pinto, "Reconceptualizing Inventorship for AI" 5(5) AI and Ethics 4475 (2025).

¹⁶ E Israhadi, "The Impact of Developments in Artificial Intelligence on Copyright and IP Laws" 11(11) Journal of Law and Sustainable Development (2023).

¹⁷ N Nguyen and D Quan, "AI and Inventorship Under Patent Law" 8(1) Vietnamese Journal of Legal Sciences 25 (2023)

¹⁸ Nguyen and Quan, *supra* note 15

¹⁹ P Zhang and M Boullos, "Generative AI in Healthcare: IP Issues" 15(9) Future Internet 286 (2023)

1. Architectures and model weights.
2. Training feature sets and training data.
3. Artificial intelligence configurations.
4. Optimisation methods specific to the customer.

In competitive industries such as telecommunications (where providing competitive benefits can lead to loss of business), protection of trade secrets is preferred. But this also brings about issues of transparency, particularly over such critical infrastructure as the public telecom systems.²⁰

In the multi-stakeholder setting (i.e., industry coalitions, O-RAN forums), the lack of well-defined licensing frameworks for AI-generated products leads to tensions. The developers and vendors have to negotiate agreements that not only involve the source code but also the training data, learned behaviors and artificial intelligence outputs.^{21,22}

VIII. LEGAL FRAMEWORKS: INDIA AND COMPARATIVE GLOBAL APPROACHES

A. India

Artificial intelligence is not yet an inventor or author in the Indian intellectual property law. The Patents Act, 1970, as well as the Copyright Act, 1957, are essentially founded on the premise that humans create. Even though the inventions made by AI can be registered in the name of a human inventor, it is unclear who has undertaken the inventive or creative contribution. Remarkably, section 2(d)(vi) of the Indian Copyright Act, 1957 provides that, in relation to a computer-generated literary, dramatic, musical or artistic work, the person who causes the work to be created is treated as the author. This provision may offer a doctrinal basis for attributing authorship to the human who directs or causes an AI-assisted output. However, authorship attribution does not by itself establish copyrightability, since the work must also satisfy the Indian originality standard.

²⁰ I Rafid et al., "Hydra-RAN: Perceptual Networks for 6G" 12 IEEE Access 2162 (2024).

²¹ Ibid.

²² A Giannopoulos et al., "Supporting Intelligence in Disaggregated Open Radio Access Networks" 10 IEEE Access 39580 (2022)

In *Eastern Book Company v. D.B. Modak*, the Supreme Court of India adopted the “skill and judgment” test, rejecting mere “sweat of the brow” while not requiring a high degree of creativity. Applied to AI-assisted wireless network designs, this means that copyright protection would be stronger where a human meaningfully selects, directs, curates, or arranges AI-generated configurations, rather than merely accepting an autonomous machine output. Nevertheless, the application of section 2(d)(vi) and the *Modak* originality standard to highly autonomous AI systems remain interpretatively unsettled.²³

NIPR Policy (2016) and the further AI strategy documents in India recognise that technological advances might necessitate this shift in the existing IP framework, but there are no concrete statutory guidelines that have been presented so far as to deal directly with the relationships between AI and IP. Simultaneously, the Government of India, in one of the releases of the Press Information Bureau (2024), has claimed that the existing legal system, which is already established in the Patent Act and Copyright Act, is already deemed to be equipped to defend AI-generated works and other related innovation, and that no urgent necessity exists to establish a special category of AI-specific intellectual property rights.²⁴ This is an indication of a policy choice of taking advantage of and modifying the existing legal regimes instead of a *sui generis* AI-IP regime.

B. European Union

Authorship requirements of AI-generated works are not clearly stated in the EU copyright in the Digital Single Market Directive (Directive 2019/790). Instead, the human authorship offline of the EU copyright law is based on the jurisprudence of the Court of Justice of the European Union (CJEU), especially *Infopaq International A/S v. Danske Dagblades Forening*,²⁵ which held that the protection of copyright must be based on the intellectual work of the author.²⁶

²³ *Eastern Book Company v. D.B. Modak*, (2008) 1 SCC 1.

²⁴ Ministry of Commerce & Industry, Government of India, “Existing IPR regime well-equipped to protect AI generated works, no need to create separate category of rights,” Press Information Bureau, PRID: 2004715, 9 February 2024.

²⁵ *Infopaq International A/S v. Danske Dagblades Forening*, Case C-5/08, Judgment of 16 July 2009 (Court of Justice of the European Union)

²⁶ *Mazzi*, *supra* note 1

This anthropocentric model means that the fully autonomous AI-created works might not be eligible to be copyrighted until a human creative involvement is provided. Besides, transparency requirements of AI-generated content were introduced in the EU AI Act (Regulation 2024/1689), which comes into effect in August 2024.²⁷ Although the AI Act does not directly enforce intellectual property rights, it has an impact on the field of governance and disclosure practices with regard to AI outputs, which in turn influences the IP-related consideration indirectly.

C. United States

The application of a human-centred approach to authorship and inventorship has been upheld by courts and administrative bodies in the United States. In *Thaler v. Perlmutter*, the District Court for the District of Columbia held that human authorship is a fundamental requirement for copyright protection, and that a work generated autonomously by an AI system without human creative contribution is not eligible for copyright registration. This position was subsequently affirmed by the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit in *Thaler v. Perlmutter*, 130 F.4th 1039 (D.C. Cir. 2025).²⁸

It is similar to the U.S. Copyright Office's March 2023 policy guidance, *Copyright Registration Guidance: Works Containing Material Generated by Artificial Intelligence*, which provides that works containing AI-generated material may be registered only to the extent that they include sufficient human authorship, while material generated solely by AI must be excluded from the copyright claim.²⁹ Equally, AI systems are not recognised as inventors under United States patent law, as confirmed in the *DABUS* litigation.

The current position is reflected in the USPTO's Revised Inventorship Guidance for AI-Assisted Inventions, effective from November 28, 2025, which rescinded the February 2024 guidance in its entirety. The revised guidance clarifies that inventorship in AI-assisted inventions must be assessed under the traditional conception standard

²⁷ Regulation (EU) 2024/1689 of the European Parliament and of the Council laying down harmonised rules on artificial intelligence (Artificial Intelligence Act), 2024 OJ L 1689/1

²⁸ *Thaler v. Perlmutter*, 687 F. Supp. 3d 140 (D.D.C. 2023), *aff'd*, 130 F.4th 1039 (D.C. Cir. 2025).

²⁹ U.S. Copyright Office, *Copyright Registration Guidance: Works Containing Material Generated by Artificial Intelligence*, 88 Fed. Reg. 16,190, 16,190-94 (Mar. 16, 2023).

and that only natural persons may be named as inventors. It further explains that the Pannu factors are relevant only where joint inventorship is claimed among multiple natural persons, and not where a single human inventor uses an AI system as a tool. Accordingly, the United States approach remains human-centred, but it now treats AI assistance within the ordinary conception inquiry rather than through a separate or modified Pannu-based framework.³⁰

D. International Demand of Convergence

Researchers underline the necessity of global standardisation of the treatment of AI-generated IP. Given that wireless technologies have national-border spans and national standards (e.g., 3GPP, ITU), a lack of consistency in IP treatment of designs generated by AI can result in legal ambiguity and clashes in authorisation.^{31,32}

IX. AI-BASED WIRELESS SYSTEMS APPLICATION EXCERPTS

A. Open RAN and Modular Design:

Open RAN encourages interoperability and modular AI development, but it also raises complex IP questions regarding ownership of AI models, trained parameters, xApps/rApps, and AI-generated network-control outputs. For example, an AI-enabled xApp deployed in a near-real-time RAN Intelligent Controller may optimise handover thresholds, interference classification, or beam-management policies across a multi-vendor network.

If such an xApp is trained on operator data but developed by a vendor and later generates a novel network-configuration strategy, it becomes difficult to identify whether the protectable contribution lies in the source code, the trained model, the operator's dataset, or the AI-generated configuration itself. This example directly reflects the authorship and inventorship issues discussed earlier: the AI may produce

³⁰ United States Patent and Trademark Office, Revised Inventorship Guidance for AI-Assisted Inventions, 90 Fed. Reg. 54408 (Nov. 28, 2025). See also *Pannu v. Iolab Corp.*, 155 F.3d 1344, 1351 (Fed. Cir. 1998).

³¹ Picht and Thouvenin, *supra* note 10

³² Tovar and Pinto, *supra* note 13

the technical optimisation, but legal ownership must still be traced to human developers, deployers, contractual assignees, or trade-secret holders.^{33,34}

B. AI-Enabled Receivers

AI-enabled receivers, particularly those using meta-learning and real-time optimisation, may generate or refine receiver architectures in response to changing channel conditions. For instance, a hybrid model-based deep receiver may learn from limited pilots or prior channel experience and adapt its detection strategy without a human engineer manually redesigning each processing step. In such a case, the legally relevant output may include the trained model, the adaptation logic, the generated signal-processing configuration, and the software code implementing the receiver.

The IP question is therefore not merely whether the receiver is technically innovative, but whether the inventive or creative contribution can be attributed to a natural person who designed, selected, trained, or materially directed the AI system. This makes AI-enabled receivers a practical example of the broader problem of assigning ownership where human contribution and autonomous machine optimisation are closely intertwined.³⁵

C. Combined Sensing/Communication Hydra-RAN

Combined sensing and communication systems, such as perceptual or Hydra-RAN-type architectures, rely on AI to make real-time decisions about sensing, spectrum use, beam direction, and communication-resource allocation. A concrete example would be an AI system that continuously learns from environmental data and autonomously adjusts beamforming or sensing patterns for vehicles, users, and connected devices.

The resulting value may lie not only in the original algorithm but also in the learned behaviours, optimised configuration rules, model weights, and network-specific decision policies generated during deployment. These outputs raise difficult IP questions because they may be commercially valuable but may not fit neatly within patent or copyright categories unless sufficient human conception, authorship, or

³³ Giannopoulos et al., *supra* note 20

³⁴ Rafid et al., *supra* note 18

³⁵ T Raviv et al., "Online Meta-Learning for Hybrid Receivers" 22(10) IEEE Transactions on Wireless Communications 6415 (2023)

control can be shown. In such cases, trade-secret protection, contractual allocation of rights, and carefully documented human technical input may become essential mechanisms for protecting AI-generated wireless-network innovation.³⁶

X. SUGGESTIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

To address the issues mentioned above, the following recommendations may be proposed:

1. To Policymakers and Legislators:

- Introduce authorship and AI-related inventorship in the IP laws, e.g., by introducing AI-related provisions or exceptions.^{37,38}
- Assign domain-specific IP policies to critical infrastructure domains (e.g. telecom and healthcare) that must not be endangered by innovation in terms of safety and openness.^{39,40}
- IP license models of AI modules and outputs, along with training data, should be promoted, in particular within modular architectures like Open RAN.⁴¹

2. To Developers and Researchers:

- Document human contributions in the artificial intelligence processes as a way of making patent/ copyright claims.^{42,43}
- Enact open, modular licensing to the products of AI-driven systems, and impose any limitations/disclosure requirements on setups, models, and code.⁴⁴
- Evaluate trade secret safeguards of acquired model parameters, network designs and data streams where patents are ineligible.^{45,46}

³⁶ Rafid et al., *supra* note 18

³⁷ Mazzi, *supra* note 1

³⁸ Picht and Thouvenin, *supra* note 10

³⁹ Nguyen and Quan, *supra* note 15

⁴⁰ Olubiyi and Irumekhai, *supra* note 2

⁴¹ Rafid et al., *supra* note 18.

⁴² Matulionytė and Lee, *supra* note 3

⁴³ Olubiyi and Irumekhai, *supra* note 2

⁴⁴ Giannopoulos et al., *supra* note 20

⁴⁵ Almarzoqi and Albakjaji, *supra* note 5

⁴⁶ Rafid et al., *supra* note 18

3. In the instance of Industry and Standards Bodies:

The principles of intellectual property (IP) in the technical specifications should also be clearly included by industry and standards bodies, especially concerning AI components to be used in O-RAN and software-defined radio systems. Clear IP guidelines can prevent conflicts, clarify ownership, and ensure equitable utilisation of technologies.

Simultaneously, they are supposed to favour open licensing models and interoperable design models. This will promote innovation, enhance cooperation among the stakeholders, guarantee appropriate safeguarding of the intellectual property rights, and facilitate the technological advancement.^{47,48}

XI. CONCLUSION

The purpose of the paper was to conduct a review of the intellectual property concerns posed by AI-generated inventions in the field of wireless communication systems and in the context of patent and copyright law, ownership, and inventorship. To study whether the existing IP regimes are adequate to accommodate AI-driven network designs, identify ambiguities in the doctrines of jurisdictions, and propose helpful regulatory recommendations to AI-driven telecommunications environments were the research questions.

In the analysis, it is possible to observe that the current intellectual property systems existing in India, the United States and the European Union are still entrenched in their human nature of form. Legal frameworks of patent and copyright in those jurisdictions presuppose recognisable human invention or authorship and, therefore, demand a conceptual rethink where AI systems themselves come up with algorithms, optimisation tactics or network configurations. Governments, as the 2024 policy position by India claims, are confident that existing legislation can be modified to fit.

Nevertheless, there are grey areas in the doctrine, particularly in attributing the contribution to creativity and the rights to the works produced with the help of AI or produced by AI. Such uncertainties are not only theoretical in the wireless

⁴⁷ Ibid.

⁴⁸ Raviv et al., *supra* note 31

communication systems industry. AI applications in beamforming, spectrum management, self-optimising networks, and modular Open RAN architectures indicate that AI is becoming more of a participant in technical design and less of a passive computational tool.

This modification complicates the first assumption of IP law. Even though the existing IP frameworks provide principles that might be applied to form the basis underpinning innovation that AI assists, instances where autonomy or semi-autonomous AI systems occur remain, although artificial intelligence vagueness in doctrines is observed. The existence of such ambiguities shows that there are ambiguities that can be solved by interpretation rather than redrawing the structure. The findings, therefore, indicate that it is not necessarily important to create an AI-IP *sui generis* regime in the short run.

Yet, further interpretative elucidation, formal records of human-made and industry-centred regulatory clarification have to be used to create legal certainty. This will involve the need to streamline the concepts of the doctrines with the technological reality, so that there is an unending motivation to come up with innovations to maintain the intellectual property systems unbroken in the AI-based wireless communications.

XII. REFERENCES

A. Cases

1. *Eastern Book Company v. D.B. Modak*, (2008) 1 SCC 1.
2. *Infopaq International A/S v. Danske Dagblades Forening*, Case C-5/08, Judgment of 16 July 2009, Court of Justice of the European Union.
3. *Pannu v. Iolab Corp.*, 155 F.3d 1344 (Fed. Cir. 1998).
4. *Thaler v. Perlmutter*, 687 F. Supp. 3d 140 (D.D.C. 2023), *aff'd*, 130 F.4th 1039 (D.C. Cir. 2025).
5. *Thaler v. Vidal*, 43 F.4th 1207 (Fed. Cir. 2022).

B. Statutes, Regulations and Legislative Instruments

1. The Copyright Act, 1957 (India).
2. The Patents Act, 1970 (India).

3. Directive (EU) 2019/790 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 17 April 2019 on Copyright and Related Rights in the Digital Single Market, 2019 O.J. L 130/92.
4. Regulation (EU) 2024/1689 of the European Parliament and of the Council laying down harmonised rules on artificial intelligence, 2024 O.J. L 1689/1.

C. Government, Policy and Administrative Materials

1. Government of India, Ministry of Commerce & Industry, "Existing IPR regime well-equipped to protect AI generated works, no need to create separate category of rights," Press Information Bureau, PRID: 2004715, 9 February 2024.
2. U.S. Copyright Office, Copyright Registration Guidance: Works Containing Material Generated by Artificial Intelligence, 88 Fed. Reg. 16,190, 16,190–94, 16 March 2023.
3. United States Patent and Trademark Office, Revised Inventorship Guidance for AI-Assisted Inventions, 90 Fed. Reg. 54408, 28 November 2025.
4. Government of India, National Intellectual Property Rights Policy, Department for Promotion of Industry and Internal Trade, Ministry of Commerce and Industry, 2016.

D. Books, Journal Articles and Scholarly Literature

1. R. Almarzoqi and M. Albakjaji, "The Patentability of AI Invention," 13(1) *International Journal of Service Science, Management, Engineering, and Technology* 1 (2022).
2. E. Israhadi, "The Impact of Developments in Artificial Intelligence on Copyright and Intellectual Property Laws," 11(11) *Journal of Law and Sustainable Development* (2023).
3. B. Mahesh et al., "Investigating the IPR Implications of AI," 7(3) *International Journal for Multidisciplinary Research* (2025).
4. R. Matulionytė and J. Lee, "Copyright in AI-Generated Works," 19(1) *Scripted* 5 (2022).

5. F. Mazzi, "Authorship in AI-Generated Works," 27(3) *Journal of World Intellectual Property* 410 (2024).
6. N. Nguyen and D. Quan, "AI and Inventorship Under Patent Law," 8(1) *Vietnamese Journal of Legal Sciences* 25 (2023).
7. I. Olubiyi and O. Irumekhai, "AI Authorship and Inventorship: A Legal Inquiry," 12(1) *ALJ* 119 (2024).
8. P. Picht and F. Thouvenin, "AI and IP: From Theory to Policy," 54(6) *IIC – International Review of Intellectual Property and Competition Law* 916 (2023).
9. R. Tovar and D. Pinto, "Reconceptualizing Inventorship for AI," 5(5) *AI and Ethics* 4475 (2025).
10. P. Zhang and M. Boulos, "Generative AI in Healthcare: Intellectual Property Issues," 15(9) *Future Internet* 286 (2023).

E. Technical and Engineering Literature

1. A. Giannopoulos et al., "Supporting Intelligence in Disaggregated Open Radio Access Networks," 10 *IEEE Access* 39580 (2022).
2. I. Rafid et al., "Hydra-RAN: Perceptual Networks for 6G," 12 *IEEE Access* 2162 (2024).
3. T. Raviv et al., "Online Meta-Learning for Hybrid Receivers," 22(10) *IEEE Transactions on Wireless Communications* 6415 (2023).

F. Other Materials

1. U.S. Copyright Office Review Board, Decision concerning registration of a work containing AI-generated material, February 2023.
2. United States Patent and Trademark Office, Inventorship Guidance for AI-Assisted Inventions, February 2024, rescinded by the Revised Inventorship Guidance for AI-Assisted Inventions, 90 Fed. Reg. 54408, 28 November 2025.