AI AND TRADEMARK INFRINGEMENT: INTERMEDIARIES AND TRADEMARK INFRINGEMENT IN THE AGE OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE

Saraswi Srinivas, ICFAI Law School, Hyderabad[1]

ABSTRACT

Artificial Intelligence (AI) has changed in many areas in various aspects of modern business, including how they are building brand identity. Many companies now use AI to generate brand names, logos, and plan marketing strategies. These system study large data such as consumer behaviour containing patterns, and existing trademarks. As a result, AI systems can generate numerous branding options within seconds, enabling companies to design innovative marketing strategies with only less human effort.

AI provides many benefits in branding; it also creates legal challenges for trademark law. Traditional trademark doctrines were developed where trademarks were created and used exclusively by human actors. Consequently, existing legal frameworks do not adequately address issues arising from AI-generated branding. Questions relating to ownership, authorship, distinctiveness, and liability have become increasingly relevant as businesses rely on automated systems to create trademarks.

In addition to influencing trademark creation, artificial intelligence is also transforming trademark enforcement. AI-powered monitoring systems are widely used by companies and digital platforms to identify counterfeit goods and unauthorized use of trademarks in online marketplaces. These technologies have enhanced the efficiency of enforcement mechanisms but have also raised concerns regarding accuracy, accountability, and jurisdiction.

This research paper examines the relationship between artificial intelligence and trademark law by focusing on three key areas: the creation of AI-generated trademarks, challenges in trademark registration, and the use of AI in infringement detection and enforcement. Through doctrinal and comparative analysis of legal frameworks in India, the United States, and the European Union, the study evaluates whether current trademark laws are

---

[1] ICFAI Law School, Hyderabad.

capable of addressing the complexities introduced by artificial intelligence. The paper concludes that while traditional trademark principles remain relevant, targeted regulatory reforms are necessary to ensure effective trademark protection in the evolving digital economy.

Introduction

The rapid advancement of artificial intelligence represents one of the most significant technological transformations of the twenty-first century. AI technologies are capable of performing tasks that traditionally required human intelligence, including data analysis, pattern recognition, language processing, and creative design.[2] As these technologies continue to evolve, they are increasingly integrated into various sectors such as healthcare, finance, education, and commerce[3]. One of the most notable areas where AI has begun to exert a significant influence is intellectual property law, particularly in relation to trademark protection.[4]

Trademarks play a fundamental role in modern commercial systems by enabling consumers to identify the origin of goods and services. They serve as indicators of quality and reliability, allowing businesses to build goodwill and maintain a distinctive presence in competitive markets. [5]By granting exclusive rights to trademark owners, the law protects brand identity and prevents consumer confusion. Historically, trademarks have been developed through human creativity and strategic marketing efforts. Designers, marketers, and entrepreneurs have traditionally been responsible for creating distinctive brand elements that represent their businesses.

While this technological innovation provides significant advantages in terms of efficiency and creativity, it also raises complex legal questions. One of the most significant issues concerns the ownership of AI-generated trademarks. When a trademark is produced by an algorithm rather than a human designer, determining the legal owner of the mark becomes problematic. Potential claimants may include the developer of the AI system, the user who generated the trademark, or the organization that deployed the technology.

---

[2] Stuart Russell & Peter Norvig, *Artificial Intelligence: A Modern Approach* 1–3 (4th ed. 2021).
[3] World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO), *WIPO Technology Trends 2019: Artificial Intelligence* 15–22 (2019).
[4] Ryan Abbott, *The Reasonable Robot: Artificial Intelligence and the Law* 83–90 (2020).
[5] Barton Beebe, *Trademark Law: An Open-Source Casebook* 19–24 (8th ed. 2023).

Another major concern relates to trademark infringement. AI systems trained on large datasets may inadvertently generate branding elements that resemble existing trademarks. Such similarities may lead to consumer confusion and potential legal disputes. As AI technologies continue to improve, the likelihood of automated systems producing similar marks may increase, thereby complicating trademark registration and enforcement processes.

Concept and Purpose of Trademarks

Trademark law constitutes an essential component of the broader framework of intellectual property rights. The primary purpose of trademark protection is to enable consumers to identify the origin of goods and services and to distinguish them from those offered by competing businesses. In modern commercial markets, trademarks function as indicators of quality, reliability, and reputation. By protecting distinctive signs associated with particular products or services, trademark law plays a crucial role in facilitating fair competition and preventing consumer deception.

A trademark may consist of various forms of distinctive signs, including words, logos, symbols, letters, numbers, shapes, colors, slogans, or combinations thereof[6]. In certain jurisdictions, even non-traditional marks such as sounds, smells, and product packaging may qualify for trademark protection if they are capable of distinguishing the goods or services of one enterprise from those of another. [7]The broad scope of what may constitute a trademark reflects the evolving nature of modern marketing strategies and consumer communication.

The protection of trademarks serves several important economic and legal functions. First, trademarks help consumers make informed purchasing decisions. When consumers recognize a particular trademark, they associate it with a specific source and expect a certain level of quality. This association reduces the search costs involved in selecting products or services and promotes efficiency in the marketplace.[8]

Second, trademarks protect the goodwill and reputation developed by businesses. Companies invest substantial resources in marketing, advertising, and brand development. Trademark

---

[6] Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights art. 15, Apr. 15, 1994, 1869 U.N.T.S. 299.

[7] World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO), *Introduction to Intellectual Property: Theory and Practice* 130–135 (2018).

[8] William M. Landes & Richard A. Posner, *The Economic Structure of Intellectual Property Law* 167–170 (2003).

protection ensures that competitors cannot unfairly exploit the reputation associated with established brands by using similar marks that may confuse consumers. By granting exclusive rights to trademark owners, the law encourages businesses to invest in quality and innovation.[9]

Third, trademarks contribute to market competition by enabling businesses to differentiate their products and services. In highly competitive industries, strong brand identity is often essential for commercial success. Trademark law therefore supports the development of diverse and competitive markets.[10]

The legal protection of trademarks is typically obtained through registration with national trademark offices. During the registration process, authorities examine whether the proposed mark satisfies legal requirements such as distinctiveness and non-conflict with existing registered marks[11]. Once registered, the trademark owner obtains exclusive rights to use the mark in relation to specific goods or services and may take legal action against unauthorized use.

Despite the long-established principles underlying trademark protection, technological developments have begun to challenge traditional assumptions within this area of law. The increasing use of artificial intelligence in branding and marketing has introduced new complexities regarding the creation and ownership of trademarks.[12] AI systems are capable of generating brand names and logos by analyzing large datasets containing existing trademarks and marketing materials. While such technologies can enhance efficiency in brand development, they also raise questions regarding the originality and distinctiveness of AI-generated marks.

Understanding the conceptual foundations and purposes of trademark protection is therefore essential for evaluating how existing legal frameworks can adapt to technological developments such as artificial intelligence. As the role of AI in commercial branding continues to expand, trademark law must evolve to ensure that it remains capable of protecting both consumers and businesses in an increasingly digital marketplace.

---

[9] 1 J. Thomas McCarthy, *McCarthy on Trademarks and Unfair Competition* § 2:15 (5th ed. 2024).

[10] Dev S. Gangjee, *Relocating the Law of Geographical Indications* 22–25 (2012).

[11] *Trade Marks Act*, No. 47 of 1999, §§ 9–11 (India).

[12] Ryan Abbott, *The Reasonable Robot: Artificial Intelligence and the Law* 83–90 (2020).

Distinctiveness and Consumer Confusion in Trademark Law

Distinctiveness constitutes one of the fundamental requirements for trademark protection. A trademark must be capable of distinguishing the goods or services of one enterprise from those of others in the marketplace. The doctrine of distinctiveness ensures that trademarks fulfill their primary function of identifying the commercial source of products and preventing confusion among consumers.[13] Without this requirement, trademark protection would extend to common words or symbols that should remain available for general use, thereby restricting competition and innovation.

Trademark law traditionally classifies marks into different categories based on their level of distinctiveness. These categories include generic marks, descriptive marks, suggestive marks, arbitrary marks, and fanciful marks[14]. Generic marks refer to common names used to describe a category of goods or services and are not eligible for trademark protection. For instance, a term such as "computer" cannot function as a trademark for computer products because it merely describes the product itself.

Descriptive marks, on the other hand, describe characteristics, qualities, or functions of the goods or services. Although descriptive marks are generally not inherently distinctive, they may acquire trademark protection if they develop what is known as "secondary meaning." [15]Secondary meaning arises when consumers begin to associate a descriptive term with a particular source rather than with the product itself. Through long and consistent use in commerce, descriptive marks may eventually become distinctive.

Suggestive marks occupy an intermediate position between descriptive and arbitrary marks. These marks indirectly suggest qualities or characteristics of the goods or services but require consumers to use imagination or perception to understand the connection. Suggestive marks are generally considered inherently distinctive and are therefore eligible for trademark protection.[16]

Arbitrary and fanciful marks represent the strongest forms of trademarks. Arbitrary marks

---

[13] William M. Landes & Richard A. Posner, *Trademark Law: An Economic Perspective*, 30 J.L. & Econ. 265, 269–72 (1987).
[14] Abercrombie & Fitch Co. v. Hunting World, Inc., 537 F.2d 4, 9–11 (2d Cir. 1976).
[15] Two Pesos, Inc. v. Taco Cabana, Inc., 505 U.S. 763, 769 (1992).
[16] 2 J. Thomas McCarthy, *McCarthy on Trademarks and Unfair Competition* § 11:62 (5th ed. 2024).

consist of common words used in a context unrelated to their ordinary meaning. For example, using the word "Apple" for electronic devices is considered arbitrary because the term has no natural connection to the product. Fanciful marks, on the other hand, are entirely invented words created specifically to function as trademarks. Because such marks possess a high degree of originality, they receive the strongest legal protection.[17]

Closely connected to the concept of distinctiveness is the doctrine of consumer confusion. Trademark law seeks to prevent situations in which consumers are misled regarding the origin of goods or services[18]. When two trademarks are sufficiently similar in appearance, sound, or meaning, consumers may mistakenly believe that the products originate from the same source. Such confusion undermines the purpose of trademark protection and may harm both consumers and businesses.

Courts typically evaluate several factors when determining the likelihood of confusion. These factors may include the similarity of the marks, the similarity of the goods or services, the strength of the existing trademark, the marketing channels used by the parties, and the degree of care exercised by consumers[19]. By analyzing these factors, courts attempt to assess whether the average consumer is likely to be misled.

The emergence of artificial intelligence introduces new complexities into the doctrines of distinctiveness and consumer confusion. AI systems often generate brand names by analyzing linguistic patterns present in large datasets of existing trademarks and commercial terminology. [20]While this process may produce creative branding solutions, it also increases the risk that AI-generated marks may resemble existing trademarks.

Furthermore, AI-generated marks may lack inherent distinctiveness because algorithms tend to generate words that follow common linguistic patterns or descriptive terminology. As a result, trademark authorities may face difficulties in evaluating the distinctiveness of such marks during the registration process.

These developments highlight the importance of reconsidering traditional trademark principles

---

[17] Barton Beebe, *Trademark Law: An Open-Source Casebook* 214–218 (8th ed. 2023).
[18] *Cadila Health Care Ltd. v. Cadila Pharm. Ltd.*, (2001) 5 S.C.C. 73 (India).
[19] *Polaroid Corp. v. Polarad Elecs. Corp.*, 287 F.2d 492, 495 (2d Cir. 1961)
[20] Ryan Abbott, *The Reasonable Robot: Artificial Intelligence and the Law* 83–90 (2020).

in light of technological innovation. As artificial intelligence becomes more widely used in branding and marketing, legal systems must ensure that the doctrines of distinctiveness and consumer confusion continue to provide effective protection for both consumers and trademark owners.[21]

Evolution of Artificial Intelligence in Commercial Branding

The rapid advancement of artificial intelligence has significantly transformed the manner in which businesses approach marketing and brand development. In the past, branding strategies were largely driven by human creativity, market research, and advertising expertise. Companies invested substantial resources in designing brand names, logos, and promotional campaigns that could effectively communicate their identity and values to consumers. However, the emergence of artificial intelligence technologies has fundamentally altered this traditional process by introducing automated tools capable of generating branding concepts through data-driven analysis.[22]

Artificial intelligence systems operate through complex algorithms and machine learning models that can process large volumes of data. These systems analyse patterns in language, consumer behaviour, and visual design to identify branding strategies that may resonate with target audiences. By examining extensive datasets containing existing trademarks, advertising materials, and market trends, AI systems can generate creative outputs such as brand names, logos, taglines, and product descriptions.[23]

The use of artificial intelligence in branding offers several advantages for businesses. One of the most significant benefits is efficiency. AI-powered tools can generate hundreds or even thousands of potential brand names or design concepts within a short period of time. This capability allows companies to explore a wide range of branding possibilities without investing extensive human effort in brainstorming and creative development.[24]

Another important advantage is the ability of AI systems to analyze consumer data and market

---

[21] World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO), *WIPO Technology Trends 2019: Artificial Intelligence* 60–65 (2019).

[22] Ryan Abbott, *The Reasonable Robot: Artificial Intelligence and the Law* 83–92 (2020).

[23] Pamela Samuelson, *Implications of Artificial Intelligence for Intellectual Property Law*, 21 Stan. Tech. L. Rev. 1, 8–12 (2018).

[24] Ajay Agrawal, Joshua Gans & Avi Goldfarb, *Prediction Machines: The Simple Economics of Artificial Intelligence* 45–50 (2018).

trends. Machine learning algorithms can examine patterns in consumer preferences, purchasing behavior, and social media engagement to identify branding elements that are more likely to attract attention and build brand loyalty[25]. As a result, businesses can make data-driven decisions when selecting brand identities and marketing strategies.

Several technology companies have developed AI-based branding platforms that assist businesses in creating brand names and logos. These platforms typically require users to input information about their industry, target audience, and brand values. The AI system then generates multiple branding suggestions based on linguistic analysis and design principles. Such tools have become increasingly popular among startups and small businesses that may lack the financial resources to hire professional branding agencies[26].

Despite these advantages, the use of artificial intelligence in branding also presents certain challenges. One concern is the possibility that AI-generated branding elements may resemble existing trademarks. Since AI systems rely on datasets containing previously registered trademarks and marketing materials, the outputs produced by these systems may inadvertently replicate elements of existing brands. This similarity may increase the likelihood of trademark conflicts during the registration process.[27]

Another issue relates to the originality and creativity of AI-generated branding. While AI systems can produce innovative combinations of words and visual elements, critics argue that these systems primarily rely on recombining existing patterns rather than creating entirely new concepts. This raises questions regarding the extent to which AI-generated trademarks can be considered genuinely original.[28]

Furthermore, the growing reliance on artificial intelligence in branding raises broader legal and ethical concerns. As AI technologies become more sophisticated, they may play an increasingly significant role in shaping brand identities and influencing consumer perception. This development may require legal systems to reconsider traditional assumptions regarding

---

[25] Erik Brynjolfsson & Andrew McAfee, *The Second Machine Age: Work, Progress, and Prosperity in a Time of Brilliant Technologies* 110–118 (2014).
[26] Daniel J. Gervais, *Artificial Intelligence and Intellectual Property: A Challenge to the Traditional Authors' Rights System*, 5 WIPO J. 1, 9–11 (2013).
[27] Dev S. Gangjee, *AI, Trademarks and the Problem of Similarity*, 15 J. Intell. Prop. L. & Prac. 775, 779–82 (2020).
[28] Ryan Abbott, *Artificial Intelligence, Big Data and Intellectual Property: Protecting Computer-Generated Works in the United Kingdom*, 9 J. Intell. Prop. L. & Prac. 410, 414–16 (2016).

authorship, creativity, and responsibility in trademark law.[29]

In light of these developments, it is evident that artificial intelligence is becoming an integral part of modern branding strategies. While AI offers powerful tools for innovation and efficiency, its integration into the trademark ecosystem also introduces new challenges that must be addressed through appropriate legal frameworks and regulatory policies.[30]

AI-Generated Trademarks and Legal Questions of Ownership

The increasing use of artificial intelligence in branding has introduced significant legal uncertainty regarding the ownership of AI-generated trademarks. Traditional intellectual property frameworks, including trademark law, were developed under the assumption that creative and commercial expressions originate from human authors. However, when an artificial intelligence system autonomously generates brand names, logos, or marketing slogans, determining the legal owner of such outputs becomes a complex issue.[31]

At the core of this debate lies the question of whether AI can be considered a creator in the legal sense. Most intellectual property regimes worldwide recognize only natural or legal persons as rights holders.[32] Artificial intelligence systems, despite their advanced capabilities, are not recognized as legal persons and therefore cannot own intellectual property rights. Consequently, the outputs generated by AI must be attributed to a human or corporate entity.

Several possible claimants may assert ownership over AI-generated trademarks. The first potential claimant is the developer of the artificial intelligence system. Developers design and train the algorithms that enable AI to generate branding outputs. From this perspective, it could be argued that the developer should hold rights over the outputs produced by the system because the algorithm itself represents the product of their technical and creative efforts.[33]

A second possible claimant is the user of the AI system. In many situations, businesses or individuals use AI-powered platforms to generate brand names or logos. These users typically

---

[29] WIPO, *Revised Issues Paper on Intellectual Property Policy and Artificial Intelligence* 13–18 (2020).
[30] Graeme B. Dinwoodie & Mark D. Janis, *Trademark Law and Theory: A Handbook of Contemporary Research* 5–8 (Edward Elgar 2008).
[31] Ryan Abbott, *The Reasonable Robot: Artificial Intelligence and the Law* 83–94 (2020).
[32] Daniel J. Gervais, *Artificial Intelligence and Intellectual Property: A Challenge to the Traditional Authors' Rights System*, 5 WIPO J. 1, 4–6 (2013).
[33] Pamela Samuelson, *Allocating Ownership Rights in Computer-Generated Works*, 47 U. Pitt. L. Rev. 1185, 1198–1203 (1986).

provide input parameters such as industry type, brand values, or product descriptions. Because the user initiates and directs the creative process, some scholars argue that the user should be considered the rightful owner of the AI-generated trademark.[34]

A third possibility is that ownership should belong to the organization deploying the AI system in commercial activities. In corporate environments, AI tools are often used by employees as part of broader branding strategies. In such cases, it may be appropriate to attribute ownership to the company that integrates AI-generated outputs into its commercial operations.[35]

The absence of clear legal rules regarding AI-generated trademarks creates uncertainty for businesses seeking to register such marks. Trademark registration systems typically require applicants to demonstrate ownership and intention to use the mark in commerce. When the mark is generated by AI, questions may arise regarding whether the applicant can legitimately claim authorship or originality.[36]

Another concern relates to potential liability for infringement. If an AI system generates a trademark that closely resembles an existing mark, determining responsibility becomes difficult. Should liability fall upon the AI developer, the user, or the organization that adopted the mark for commercial purposes? Without clear legal standards, resolving such disputes may prove challenging for courts and regulators.[37]

Some scholars have suggested that intellectual property law should adopt a pragmatic approach by attributing ownership of AI-generated outputs to the human or entity that exercises control over the AI system[38]. This approach recognizes that artificial intelligence functions as a tool rather than an independent creator. Under this framework, businesses using AI to generate branding materials would be responsible for ensuring that the resulting trademarks comply with existing legal requirements.

Ultimately, the issue of ownership in AI-generated trademarks highlights the broader challenge

---

[34] Ryan Abbott, *Artificial Intelligence, Big Data and Intellectual Property: Protecting Computer-Generated Works*, 9 J. Intell. Prop. L. & Prac. 410, 414–18 (2016).
[35] Graeme B. Dinwoodie & Mark D. Janis, *Trademark Law and Theory: A Handbook of Contemporary Research* 7–10 (Edward Elgar 2008).
[36] *Trade Marks Act*, No. 47 of 1999, §§ 18, 28 (India).
[37] Dev S. Gangjee, *AI, Trademarks and the Problem of Similarity*, 15 J. Intell. Prop. L. & Prac. 775, 780–83 (2020).
[38] Ryan Abbott, *I Think, Therefore I Invent: Creative Computers and the Future of Patent Law*, 57 B.C. L. Rev. 1079, 1095–1100 (2016).

of adapting traditional legal doctrines to rapidly evolving technological environments. As artificial intelligence continues to influence commercial creativity, lawmakers and courts will need to develop clear guidelines that balance innovation with legal certainty.[39]

Challenges in Registration of AI-Generated Trademark

The increasing use of artificial intelligence in branding has created new challenges for trademark registration systems around the world. Trademark offices traditionally evaluate applications based on established legal criteria such as distinctiveness, non-deceptiveness, and the absence of conflict with previously registered marks[40]. However, AI-generated trademarks introduce complexities that may not be adequately addressed by existing registration procedures. As businesses increasingly rely on automated systems to create brand identities, trademark authorities must adapt their examination practices to address the unique characteristics of AI-generated marks.[41]

One of the primary challenges in registering AI-generated trademarks is the issue of similarity with existing marks. Artificial intelligence systems are typically trained on large datasets that include thousands of existing brand names and trademarks. These datasets allow the algorithms to identify linguistic patterns and design structures that are commonly associated with successful brands. While this approach enables AI systems to generate creative branding suggestions, it also increases the possibility that the generated mark may resemble an already registered trademark.[42]

Such similarities can lead to rejection of trademark applications during the examination process. Trademark offices conduct comprehensive searches to determine whether a proposed mark conflicts with previously registered marks that may create a likelihood of confusion among consumers.[43] If an AI-generated mark closely resembles an existing trademark in appearance, pronunciation, or meaning, the application may be refused. This problem may become more frequent as AI tools generate large numbers of brand names based on similar linguistic patterns.

---

[39] WIPO, *Revised Issues Paper on Intellectual Property Policy and Artificial Intelligence* 20–24 (2020).
[40] *Trade Marks Act*, No. 47 of 1999, §§ 9–11 (India).
[41] Ryan Abbott, *The Reasonable Robot: Artificial Intelligence and the Law* 83–95 (2020).
[42] Dev S. Gangjee, *AI, Trademarks and the Problem of Similarity*, 15 J. Intell. Prop. L. & Prac. 775, 778–82 (2020).
[43] *Cadila Health Care Ltd. v. Cadila Pharm. Ltd.*, (2001) 5 S.C.C. 73 (India).

Another significant issue concerns the distinctiveness of AI-generated trademarks. Many AI systems generate brand names by combining common words, descriptive phrases, or existing linguistic patterns. As a result, the outputs may lack the level of originality required for trademark protection. Trademark law generally requires that a mark be capable of distinguishing the goods or services of one enterprise from those of others. [44]Marks that merely describe the nature, quality, or function of a product may not qualify for protection unless they acquire distinctiveness through extensive commercial use.

AI-generated trademarks may therefore face difficulties during examination because algorithms often prioritize clarity and relevance rather than uniqueness. For instance, an AI system may generate a brand name that directly describes the product's features or industry sector. While such names may be effective from a marketing perspective, they may not meet the legal threshold required for trademark registration.

Another challenge relates to the volume of applications that may result from AI-driven branding tools. Artificial intelligence can generate hundreds or even thousands of potential brand names within a short period of time[45]. Businesses may submit multiple applications in order to secure trademark protection for several AI-generated options. This increase in the number of applications may place additional pressure on trademark offices and complicate the examination process.

Furthermore, the absence of clear regulatory guidelines concerning AI-generated trademarks creates uncertainty for both applicants and examiners. Most trademark statutes were drafted before the widespread use of artificial intelligence in branding and therefore do not explicitly address the role of automated systems in the creation of trademarks.[46] As a result, trademark offices must rely on traditional legal principles when assessing AI-generated marks.

To address these challenges, some scholars have suggested that trademark authorities should adopt AI-assisted examination tools capable of identifying similarities between proposed trademarks and existing registrations more efficiently. By integrating technological tools into the registration process, trademark offices may improve their ability to manage the growing

---

[44] Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights art. 15(1), Apr. 15, 1994, 1869 U.N.T.S. 299.
[45] Ajay Agrawal, Joshua Gans & Avi Goldfarb, *Prediction Machines: The Simple Economics of Artificial Intelligence* 45–51 (2018).
[46] WIPO, *Revised Issues Paper on Intellectual Property Policy and Artificial Intelligence* 18–23 (2020).

number of applications and maintain the integrity of trademark systems.

The challenges associated with registering AI-generated trademarks illustrate the broader need for legal systems to adapt to technological innovation. As artificial intelligence becomes increasingly integrated into branding practices, regulatory frameworks must evolve to ensure that trademark registration procedures remain effective, efficient, and fair.[47]

Artificial Intelligence and Trademark Infringement Risks

The rapid development of artificial intelligence has not only transformed the process of creating trademarks but has also increased the risk of trademark infringement. As businesses increasingly rely on AI-based tools to generate brand names, logos, and marketing content, the likelihood that AI-generated outputs may resemble existing trademarks has become a significant concern. Unlike traditional branding processes that involve careful human research and legal review, AI systems generate outputs through automated analysis of large datasets. This automated process may inadvertently produce marks that are confusingly similar to existing trademarks, thereby creating legal risks for businesses.[48]

One of the primary reasons for the increased risk of infringement lies in the way artificial intelligence systems are trained. Machine learning algorithms are typically trained using extensive datasets that include previously registered trademarks, brand names, advertising slogans, and product descriptions[49]. These datasets allow AI systems to identify patterns and structures commonly associated with successful branding strategies. However, because the training data includes existing trademarks, the AI system may unintentionally reproduce elements of those marks when generating new branding suggestions.

This phenomenon is particularly concerning in industries where branding patterns are highly standardized. For example, technology companies often use short, distinctive names with modern linguistic structures, while pharmaceutical companies frequently rely on scientific-sounding brand names. When AI systems analyze these patterns, they may generate names that resemble existing trademarks within the same industry. Such similarities may lead to consumer

---

[47] Graeme B. Dinwoodie & Mark D. Janis, *Trademark Law and Theory: A Handbook of Contemporary Research* 10–14 (Edward Elgar 2008).

[48] Ryan Abbott, *The Reasonable Robot: Artificial Intelligence and the Law* 90–98 (2020).

[49] Stuart Russell & Peter Norvig, *Artificial Intelligence: A Modern Approach* 24–30 (4th ed. 2021).

confusion and potential trademark disputes.[50]

Another factor contributing to infringement risks is the speed and scale at which AI can generate branding outputs. Traditional branding processes typically involve extensive research and evaluation before a final brand name is selected. In contrast, AI-powered tools can generate hundreds or even thousands of potential brand names within seconds. While this capability increases efficiency, it also increases the probability that some of the generated names may conflict with existing trademarks.[51]

The rise of generative AI technologies has further intensified these concerns. Modern generative AI models are capable of producing not only text-based brand names but also visual logos and marketing content. These outputs may incorporate design elements that resemble protected trademarks. For instance, an AI-generated logo may unintentionally replicate the colour scheme, typography, or design style of an existing brand. Such similarities may raise legal questions regarding trademark infringement and brand dilution.[52]

Digital marketplaces and online platforms have also amplified the impact of AI-generated trademark infringement. In the digital economy, businesses can rapidly launch new products and brand identities through e-commerce platforms and social media channels. If an AI-generated trademark closely resembles an existing mark, the resulting confusion may spread quickly across digital markets. This rapid dissemination can cause significant harm to both consumers and trademark owners.[53]

Another important issue relates to liability in cases of AI-generated infringement. When a human designer creates an infringing trademark, legal responsibility typically falls upon the individual or company using the mark. However, when an AI system generates the infringing mark, determining liability becomes more complex. Potentially responsible parties may include the developer of the AI software, the user who generated the mark, or the company that adopted

---

[50] Dev S. Gangjee, *AI, Trademarks and the Problem of Similarity*, 15 J. Intell. Prop. L. & Prac. 775, 780–84 (2020).

[51] Ajay Agrawal, Joshua Gans & Avi Goldfarb, *Prediction Machines: The Simple Economics of Artificial Intelligence* 45–52 (2018).

[52] Pamela Samuelson, *Implications of Artificial Intelligence for Intellectual Property Law*, 21 Stan. Tech. L. Rev. 1, 15–19 (2018).

[53] Graeme B. Dinwoodie & Mark D. Janis, *Trademark Law and Theory: A Handbook of Contemporary Research* 11–15 (Edward Elgar 2008).

the mark for commercial use.[54]

As artificial intelligence becomes more integrated into commercial branding, the risk of trademark infringement will likely continue to increase. Businesses that rely on AI-generated branding must therefore exercise caution and conduct thorough trademark searches before adopting such marks. Legal systems may also need to develop new regulatory frameworks to address the unique challenges associated with AI-generated trademark infringement.[55]

Comparative Legal Analysis: AI and Trademark Law in India, the United States, and the European Union

The rapid integration of artificial intelligence into commercial branding has created complex legal questions that different jurisdictions are beginning to address in various ways. Although trademark laws around the world share common principles such as distinctiveness, likelihood of confusion, and protection of goodwill the emergence of AI-generated branding raises issues that existing legal frameworks were not specifically designed to resolve.[56] A comparative examination of trademark systems in India, the United States, and the European Union reveals both similarities and differences in how these jurisdictions may respond to the challenges posed by artificial intelligence.[57]

India

In India, trademark protection is primarily governed by the **Trade Marks Act, 1999**, which provides the legal framework for the registration, protection, and enforcement of trademarks. The Act defines a trademark broadly as a mark capable of being represented graphically and capable of distinguishing the goods or services of one person from those of others.[58] This definition is flexible enough to accommodate evolving forms of branding, including non-traditional marks such as shapes and colors.

However, Indian trademark law does not explicitly address the issue of AI-generated trademarks. The registration process assumes that trademarks are created and adopted by

---

[54] Ryan Abbott, *Artificial Intelligence, Big Data and Intellectual Property: Protecting Computer-Generated Works*, 9 J. Intell. Prop. L. & Prac. 410, 415–18 (2016).
[55] WIPO, *Revised Issues Paper on Intellectual Property Policy and Artificial Intelligence* 22–27 (2020).
[56] Graeme B. Dinwoodie & Mark D. Janis, *Trademark Law and Theory: A Handbook of Contemporary Research* 3–7 (Edward Elgar 2008).
[57] Ryan Abbott, *The Reasonable Robot: Artificial Intelligence and the Law* 108–112 (2020).
[58] *Trade Marks Act*, No. 47 of 1999 (India).

identifiable human or corporate entities. When an applicant files a trademark application, they must declare ownership and intention to use the mark in commerce. In the context of AI-generated branding, the ownership requirement may raise questions about whether the applicant genuinely created the mark or merely selected it from outputs generated by an algorithm.[59]

Indian courts have historically taken a pragmatic approach to trademark disputes, focusing primarily on consumer confusion and commercial impact rather than the method through which the mark was created[60]. As a result, it is likely that Indian courts would treat AI-generated trademarks similarly to human-created trademarks, provided that the applicant claims ownership and uses the mark in commerce. Nevertheless, as AI technologies become more prevalent, Indian policymakers may eventually need to clarify the legal status of AI-generated branding.

United States

The United States has one of the most developed trademark systems in the world, governed primarily by the **Lanham Act**. Under U.S. law, trademarks are protected when they function as indicators of source and are used in commerce. The United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO) evaluate trademark applications based on factors such as distinctiveness and likelihood of confusion.

Similar to India, U.S. trademark law does not specifically address AI-generated trademarks. However, the legal framework emphasizes the commercial use of trademarks rather than the creative process behind their development. As long as a business adopts and uses a mark in commerce, the method by which the mark was created whether by a human designer or an AI system may not significantly affect its eligibility for protection.[61]

Nevertheless, the growing use of AI in branding has attracted attention from policymakers and intellectual property scholars in the United States. Discussions surrounding AI-generated content have already emerged in copyright and patent law, suggesting that similar debates may

---

[59] Daniel J. Gervais, *Artificial Intelligence and Intellectual Property: A Challenge to the Traditional Authors' Rights System*, 5 WIPO J. 1, 12–15 (2013).
[60] *Cadila Health Care Ltd. v. Cadila Pharm. Ltd.*, (2001) 5 S.C.C. 73 (India).
[61] 1 J. Thomas McCarthy, *McCarthy on Trademarks and Unfair Competition* § 3:2 (5th ed. 2024).

eventually arise within trademark law as well.[62]

European Union

The European Union has also begun exploring the implications of artificial intelligence for intellectual property law[63]. Trademark protection in the EU is governed by the **European Union Trade Mark Regulation**, which provides a harmonized system for trademark registration across member states.[64]

The EU Intellectual Property Office (EUIPO) has shown interest in incorporating artificial intelligence into trademark administration, particularly in areas such as trademark searches and examination processes. AI tools are already being used to assist examiners in identifying similarities between proposed marks and existing trademarks.[65]

Although EU trademark law does not currently contain specific provisions regarding AI-generated trademarks, European policymakers have been more proactive in regulating artificial intelligence generally. The European Union's broader efforts to regulate AI technologies may eventually influence how intellectual property systems address AI-generated branding.[66]

Comparative Observations

A comparative analysis of these three jurisdictions suggests that existing trademark frameworks are largely capable of accommodating AI-generated trademarks, at least in the short term. Because trademark law focuses primarily on consumer perception and commercial use rather than authorship, the fact that a mark was generated by artificial intelligence may not significantly affect its legal status.[67]

However, the increasing use of AI in branding may eventually require more explicit legal guidance. Issues relating to ownership, liability, and automated infringement detection may

---

[62] Ryan Abbott, *I Think, Therefore I Invent: Creative Computers and the Future of Patent Law*, 57 B.C. L. Rev. 1079, 1107–1112 (2016).
[63] European Commission, *Artificial Intelligence and Intellectual Property: Policy Perspectives* 9–12 (2021).
[64] Regulation (EU) 2017/1001 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 14 June 2017 on the European Union Trade Mark.
[65] EUIPO, *Artificial Intelligence and Intellectual Property: Study on the Impact of AI on IP Systems* 21–25 (2020).
[66] European Commission, *Proposal for a Regulation Laying Down Harmonised Rules on Artificial Intelligence (Artificial Intelligence Act)* COM (2021) 206 final.
[67] 1 J. Thomas McCarthy, *McCarthy on Trademarks and Unfair Competition* § 3:2 (5th ed. 2024).

become more prominent as AI technologies continue to evolve. Policymakers in India, the United States, and the European Union may therefore need to consider whether existing trademark laws should be updated to address the unique challenges associated with artificial intelligence.[68]

The Future of Trademark Law in the Age of Artificial Intelligence

The rapid advancement of artificial intelligence is likely to reshape trademark law in profound ways over the coming decades. As AI technologies become increasingly integrated into commercial activities, branding strategies, and intellectual property management, legal systems will face growing pressure to adapt existing frameworks to address new technological realities. The future of trademark law will therefore depend on how effectively policymakers, courts, and regulatory institutions respond to the challenges and opportunities presented by artificial intelligence.[69]

One of the most significant developments expected in the future of trademark law is the **increasing use of artificial intelligence by trademark offices themselves**. Intellectual property authorities across the world are already experimenting with AI-based tools to assist in trademark searches, examination procedures, and conflict detection[70]. These tools can analyze vast databases of registered trademarks and identify similarities between marks with far greater speed than traditional manual searches. As AI technologies continue to improve, trademark offices may increasingly rely on automated systems to enhance the efficiency and accuracy of trademark examination processes.

In addition to assisting examiners, artificial intelligence may also transform the **way businesses approach trademark clearance and risk assessment**. Companies may begin using advanced AI tools to conduct comprehensive trademark searches before adopting new brand identities. Such systems could analyze global trademark databases, linguistic patterns, and market conditions to identify potential conflicts with existing marks. By providing early warnings about possible infringement risks, AI-powered legal tools may help businesses avoid costly

---

[68] Ryan Abbott, *The Reasonable Robot: Artificial Intelligence and the Law* 112–118 (2020).
[69] Ryan Abbott, *The Reasonable Robot: Artificial Intelligence and the Law* 118–123 (2020).
[70] EUIPO, *Artificial Intelligence and Intellectual Property: Study on the Impact of AI on IP Systems* 30–34 (2020).

trademark disputes.[71]

Another important development in the future of trademark law involves the **growing complexity of brand creation in digital environments**. As generative AI models become more sophisticated, they may produce increasingly creative and diverse branding outputs. These outputs may include not only brand names and logos but also dynamic digital identities, interactive brand experiences, and personalized marketing content. The emergence of such advanced branding techniques may require trademark law to expand its understanding of what constitutes a protectable mark.[72]

The rise of virtual environments and digital platforms may also influence the future of trademark protection. With the expansion of online commerce, virtual marketplaces, and immersive digital spaces, businesses may increasingly use trademarks in purely digital contexts. AI-generated branding could play a major role in these environments, where digital identities evolve rapidly and new forms of consumer interaction emerge. Trademark law may therefore need to adapt to protect brands operating within virtual ecosystems and emerging technological platforms.[73]

International cooperation will likely become increasingly important in addressing the global implications of artificial intelligence in trademark law. AI-generated trademarks can be created and deployed across multiple jurisdictions almost instantly through digital platforms. However, trademark rights remain largely territorial, meaning that protection must typically be obtained separately in each jurisdiction. As cross-border commerce continues to expand, policymakers may explore new mechanisms for harmonizing trademark regulations and improving international coordination among intellectual property authorities.[74]

Another critical aspect of the future of trademark law concerns the development of **clear legal guidelines for AI-generated branding**. Legislators may need to clarify issues relating to ownership, liability, and the role of artificial intelligence in trademark creation. Such reforms

---

[71] Ajay Agrawal, Joshua Gans & Avi Goldfarb, *Prediction Machines: The Simple Economics of Artificial Intelligence* 68–73 (2018).

[72] Pamela Samuelson, *Implications of Artificial Intelligence for Intellectual Property Law*, 21 Stan. Tech. L. Rev. 1, 25–29 (2018).

[73] Graeme B. Dinwoodie & Mark D. Janis, *Trademark Law and Theory: A Handbook of Contemporary Research* 20–24 (Edward Elgar 2008).

[74] Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights art. 16, Apr. 15, 1994, 1869 U.N.T.S. 299.

could provide greater legal certainty for businesses while ensuring that trademark systems remain capable of addressing technological innovation.[75]

Finally, the future evolution of trademark law will depend on maintaining a balance between **encouraging innovation and protecting consumer interests**. Artificial intelligence has the potential to enhance creativity, improve efficiency, and support economic growth. At the same time, legal frameworks must ensure that AI-generated branding does not undermine the fundamental objectives of trademark law, including the prevention of consumer confusion and the protection of brand reputation.[76]

As artificial intelligence continues to transform the global economy, trademark law will need to evolve in order to remain effective and relevant. By embracing technological innovation while preserving core legal principles, trademark systems can adapt to the changing landscape of digital commerce and ensure the continued protection of brand identity in the age of artificial intelligence.[77]

Conclusion

The rapid development of artificial intelligence has introduced profound changes in the modern commercial landscape, including the way businesses create, manage, and protect their brand identities. As artificial intelligence technologies continue to evolve, they are increasingly being integrated into branding strategies, trademark searches, marketing analysis, and enforcement mechanisms. While these technological innovations offer significant advantages in terms of efficiency, creativity, and market analysis, they also present complex legal challenges that existing trademark frameworks were not originally designed to address.

One of the most important implications of artificial intelligence for trademark law is the transformation of the traditional process of brand creation. AI-powered systems are now capable of generating brand names, logos, slogans, and visual identities by analyzing vast datasets of linguistic and commercial patterns. This development allows businesses to explore numerous branding possibilities quickly and efficiently. However, it also raises important legal

---

[75] Daniel J. Gervais, *Artificial Intelligence and Intellectual Property: A Challenge to the Traditional Authors' Rights System*, 5 WIPO J. 1, 17–20 (2013).
[76] 1 J. Thomas McCarthy, *McCarthy on Trademarks and Unfair Competition* § 2:2 (5th ed. 2024).
[77] European Commission, *Proposal for a Regulation Laying Down Harmonised Rules on Artificial Intelligence (Artificial Intelligence Act)* COM (2021) 206 final.

questions regarding the originality, ownership, and protectability of AI-generated trademarks. Since traditional trademark law assumes that trademarks are created by human actors, the increasing use of automated systems challenges existing legal assumptions regarding authorship and control.

Another significant challenge arises from the risk of trademark infringement associated with AI-generated branding. Because artificial intelligence systems are trained on datasets containing existing trademarks and marketing materials, there is a possibility that the outputs produced by these systems may resemble previously registered marks. Such similarities may lead to consumer confusion and potential trademark disputes. As AI technologies become more widely used in commercial branding, the likelihood of such conflicts may increase, placing additional pressure on trademark registration systems and legal enforcement mechanisms.

At the same time, artificial intelligence has also emerged as a powerful tool for detecting and combating trademark infringement. AI-based monitoring systems can analyze large volumes of online data to identify unauthorized use of trademarks, counterfeit products, and misleading advertisements. By automating the process of monitoring digital marketplaces, artificial intelligence allows trademark owners to respond more quickly and effectively to potential violations. Nevertheless, automated enforcement systems must be carefully designed to ensure accuracy, transparency, and fairness, particularly when decisions made by algorithms affect legitimate businesses.

The comparative analysis presented in this study demonstrates that trademark frameworks in jurisdictions such as India, the United States, and the European Union are generally flexible enough to accommodate AI-generated trademarks in the short term. Because trademark protection is primarily based on consumer perception and commercial use rather than the creative process behind the mark, the fact that a trademark is generated by artificial intelligence may not necessarily prevent it from receiving legal protection. However, the increasing role of artificial intelligence in branding and marketing may eventually require more explicit regulatory guidance.

From a policy perspective, lawmakers and intellectual property authorities must carefully consider how trademark law should evolve to address the challenges associated with artificial intelligence. Clear legal guidelines regarding ownership of AI-generated trademarks, allocation of liability in cases of AI-generated infringement, and the role of digital platforms in trademark

enforcement will be essential for maintaining legal certainty in the evolving digital economy. At the same time, regulatory frameworks must avoid imposing excessive restrictions that could hinder technological innovation and economic development.

By embracing technological innovation while maintaining core legal principles, trademark law can remain an effective instrument for regulating brand protection in the age of artificial intelligence.

In conclusion, the integration of artificial intelligence into trademark systems presents both opportunities and challenges. While AI technologies have the potential to enhance efficiency and strengthen enforcement mechanisms, they also raise complex legal questions that require careful examination. Continued scholarly research, international cooperation, and thoughtful policy development will be essential in ensuring that trademark law remains capable of addressing the realities of an increasingly AI-driven commercial world.