
PROTECTING PRIVACY FROM AI MANIPULATION: NAVIGATING INDIA'S EMERGING REGULATORY FRAMEWORK ON GENERATIVE AI

Aaditya Narayanan V. B.B.A LL.B. School of Law, SASTRA Deemed University,
Thanjavur, Tamil Nadu, India

Ganesh Ram K N. B. Com. LL.B., School of Law, SASTRA Deemed University,
Thanjavur, Tamil Nadu, India

ABSTRACT

Generative AI has forever changed the film industry by allowing filmmakers to rework and reimagine content, without having to reshoot scenes. Commercially efficient, yes; but for the artist, morally compromising, violating authorial consent and performing respect. This paper investigates the fundamental inadequacy of existing laws, as they pertain to AI-based risks faced by classic films in India. Notwithstanding foundational forks and snips from the IT Act 2000 (including the IT Rules 2023, Digital Personal Data Protection Act 2021 and Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita 2021), these instruments were designed long ago when compared to the advancements in AI and do not provide sufficient end-to-end prescription on film-industry-specific standards for regulating synthetic media.

The paper cites high-profile controversies such as the Raanjhanaa unauthorized AI-altered ending and Rashmika Mandanna deepfake cases to illustrate systemic lapses in measures for enforcement, standards of consent, responsibility assignment and avenues for judicial recourse. The research points out to the lack of legal regimes in protecting authors from AI driven alteration and its possibilities in India. A draft amendment to the Information Technology Rules that came out in October 2025 that suggested mandatory AI content labelling and watermarking are recent ideas yet untried, uncertain, forcing, not clear how it will be enforced and what kind of compensation can you give.

The article argues for comprehensive industry legislation that sets standards specifically applicable to the film industry with respect to AI-content edits, mandatory prior-consent requirements for altered legacy films, and self-regulatory agencies. It throws up the necessity of a harmonisation of technological progress & protectionism to Directorial Moral Rights under Section 57 of the Copyright Act, 1957; Performer's Right and narrative authenticity. By transplanting legal discourse from copyright, cyberlaw and

data protection frameworks to the paper provides actionable recommendations for Indian policymakers on cutting-edge legislative reform that enhances both innovation and artistic integrity in an age of AI factured content.

1. Introduction

When Alan Turing argued that Machines could think and imitate just like a humans¹, so convincingly similar that a prudent person cannot differentiate if the response is from a human or a machine, he was subjected to criticism stating that it a machine can only do what it is programmed to do and that machines did not have a “soul”, as it is seen as a measure to term something fit to think and reason Independently. Arguments that were put forth by Turing were substantiated with ELIZA², a natural language processing program, or what we now call as a “Chatbot”. ELIZA interacted with people by going through their questions and answering based on pre-written scripts that was fed. The field of Artificial Intelligence is seeing colossal growth every day, blending into everything that is happening in the contemporary modern world. Use of Artificial Intelligence in film making is no exception.

What normally takes months for an artist to do can be done within minutes, all thanks to the power of Generative AI. But not everyone offers their sincere thanks to the god-powered cyber mind. Just like many developments, this too is a coin with two sides, one commercial and one ethical.

Film making is both a labour and capital investment intensive process. The makers invest lakhs and wait for months to finish a small part of a scene. But, with AI, however, the same can be done in a fraction of a second, that too with minimal resources. The other side of the coin lies in the ethical side of the creator, whose artistic expression, identity, and rights are being compromised when works are produced using AI.

Generative AI, while revolutionizing creativity and production, also poses serious ethical and legal risks. With its ability to create hyper-realistic *deepfake* videos and synthetic voices, it blurs the line between reality and fabrication, making it difficult to distinguish genuine content from AI-generated imitations. This raises major concerns about personality rights, as a person’s

¹ COMPUTING MACHINERY AND INTELLIGENCE By A. M. Turing, Mind 49: 433-460.

² ELIZA — A Computer Program for the Study of Natural Language Communication Between Man and Machine”

likeness, voice, or expressions can be replicated without consent, leading to potential misuse or defamation. In essence, while generative AI accelerates artistic creation, it simultaneously threatens authenticity, privacy, and the moral rights of human creators.

2. Research Gap

A fundamental research gap exists between AI-driven film alterations and the current legal and regulatory systems in India. While International and Indian policy commentary have begun to address the ethical and technical dangers of AI-altered films – such as misinformation, impersonation, and the sabotage of artistic integrity – most of them accept that India continues to run with a series of general cyber, copyright, and data protection laws, rather than clear, section-specific standards for artificial intelligence-produced or modified cinematic material.³

Indeed, no published research offers comprehensive analysis of authorial consent frameworks for legacy films, the possibility of enforcing digital rights in a world of enclosed synthetic media, or working solutions for collaborative governance between filmmakers, platforms, and overseers. While recent legal developments, such as proposed IT Rule adjustments in 2025 necessitating AI-content labelling and technical verification⁴, offer a good starting point, they are largely untested in court and do not address issues relating to recertification, producer liability, and director moral rights in an AI setting⁵. While the industry and world best practices advocate consent registries, algorithmic transparency, and independent redressal mechanisms, no research in India has examined their feasibility, cost, or user acceptance in the film industry.

There is also a scarcity of research on the enforcement and attribution issues presented by the use of AI models originating from outside Indian jurisdiction—or on the country's capacity to identify, investigate, and redress AI-generated harm in films. Filling these research gaps is critical for policymakers seeking to design sophisticated, culture-centred legal and public policies that guard artist and digital rights while fostering urge cinematic innovation in the era of AI.

³ Ministry of Electronics and Information Technology, "Government Response to Deepfakes and AI-Generated Content," Press Release, December 2023. Retrieved from: <https://www.pib.gov.in>

⁴ Proposed Amendments to the Information Technology (Intermediary Guidelines and Digital Media Ethics Code) Rules, 2021 in relation to synthetically generated information]
Dated: 22nd October, 2025

⁵ Ministry of Electronics and Information Technology, "Draft Amendments to IT Rules 2021: AI-Generated Content Labelling Requirements," October 2025. [Pending finalization]

2.1. Research Problem

India's existing laws do not have any provision relating specifically to the film industry about unauthorized alteration of legacy film endings and creative content with generative AI technologies protections. Although the Information Technology Act 2000, IT Rules 2021, DPDP Act 2023 and Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita 2023 afford broader cyber data protection regimes, they do not have specific provisions to deal with issues posed by AI-induced modification of movies which include but are not limited to whether a film maker's consent is required for use of her films; enforcement of moral rights; safeguarding performer dignity and determination of liability when legacy films are modified to present alternative endings, Impersonation which results in the violation of privacy rights. This lack of regulation is evident from the unauthorised AI modified ending, in the case of film Raanjhanaa and also with regard to Rashmika Mandanna deepfake, but there are no clear legal guidelines to prevent such misuse; neither are there any standards regarding consent, compensation or avenues of independent recovery.

3. Literature Review

As evidenced by the literature on AI-based modifications of classic film in India, the field is characterized by acute regulatory ambiguity, immense ethical tussles, and rapidly changing creative trends. The majority policy research on the issue mentioned a lack of easily enforceable legal benchmarks for questions of creative control and informed consent when merging AI-tools for the editing. For instance, studies like Bhargava's report found that, although India already possess a patchwork of cyber and copyright law, like the IT Act of 2000 and DPDP Act of 2023, the existing legal paradigms were equally unprepared to confront and prevent deepfakes, simulated personality, and the non-consensual reediting of film media. As a result, the authors reported a range of weak links, where the period of responsibility "falls" on producers or distributors, but the "CPBFC approved" label and director's copyright introduce regulatory "coverage-gaps" for both censoring or lawsuit⁶.

As evidenced by journal commentary and legal blogs published over the past year, the controversy aroused by "Raanjhanaa" and other cases has not been over⁷. Studies of practice

⁶Central Board of Film Certification, "Certification Guidelines," Government of India, 2024. Retrieved from: <https://cbfcindia.gov.in>

⁷ Dhanush, "Statement on Raanjhanaa AI-Altered Ending," Official Statement, August 3, 2025.

over the past few years have shown that the use of synthetic media is increasingly popular among filmmakers. However, at the same time, the risk of defamation, obscenity, and hate speech is growing, as is the danger of the erosion of artists from creative expression⁸.

4.The Landscape of AI-Altered Artistic work

Artificial intelligence has revolutionized the space of post-production and added numerous alterations that culturally exceed the conventional paradigm of editing. AI systems implemented in the current filmmaking process revolutionize the industry with their possibilities of automatic modifications, intelligent content analysis, and hyper-realistic alterations that violate the conventional limits of creative individuality and mechanical assistance⁹.

4.1. Automated Editing and Content Analysis

AI-powered editing systems use machine learning algorithms to automate traditional labour-intensive editing tasks. Object recognition technology is used to identify important moments of the video, quickly detect poor clips' quality, and classify vast libraries of footage with little to no human oversight. Fully-automated video editing platforms conduct real-time analysis, including synchronizing audio and video, applying colour correction, creating transitions between scenes, and even generating and integrating captions in the video. For instance, IBM Watson technology has demonstrated the emotional capability and image responsiveness to make data-driven choices about the selection of video footage.

4.2. Dialogue Replacement and Lip-Sync Technology

Advanced AI lip-sync technologies have fundamentally transformed automated dialogue replacement (ADR). AI systems for dialogue modulation allow one to alter dialogues directly to existing footage without needing actors to re-do them at the studio. Generative Adversarial Networks (GAN) instruct neural networks to function competitively, producing synthetic content while simultaneously evaluating the veracity of what's being generated. As a consequence, GAN-generated visuals resemble real faces with video-based textures, lighting,

⁸ "AI Adoption in Indian Film Industry: Survey Report," Film Industry Association of India, 2024.

⁹ "AI Technologies in Film Production: Technical Overview," Integrated Video Analytics, 2024. Retrieved from: <https://www.integratedvideoanalytics.com>

and animation, rendering it indistinguishable from real speech¹⁰. For example, Flawless AI allows for dialogue problems to be resolved, material to be localized, and footage to be altered after filming finishes, even in the presence of occlusions and complex lighting conditions. It is a paradigm shift. Language can now be manipulated, transliterated, and individualized in a manner that is so quick and dramatic, that it is surreal.

4.3. Visual Effects, Colour Grading, and Restoration

Another area of application where the potential of AI can be fully realized is AI colour correction systems. AI automatically analyses each frame of a video, calculating brightness, contrast, saturation, and hue to create professionally balanced, visually pleasing footage. Tools that include the capabilities of a neural engine eliminate the need to individually adjust white balance, correct exposure, and apply individual visual styles to segments from one recording, but filmed under various conditions – AI can carry them out automatically. This is possible because machine learning models are trained on a large dataset of professionally graded content which allows the system to identify the nuances of colours that are invisible to the human eye. AI brings a whole new level of transformation to film restoration. Machine learning algorithms automatically detect and repair damaged areas in deteriorating recording. For example, Integrated Video Analytics uses neural engine interpolation models to eliminate scratches, dust, and flicker while retaining film grain and its motion. These systems restore lost frames by analysing the motion and visual continuity of surrounding frames. This process takes minutes rather than manual labour, which would take hours.

4.4. Object Manipulation and Audio Enhancement

Inpainting tools using advanced AI can take out objects or altered background issues in active footage and maintain the appearance, texture, and continuity when intelligently keeping up with the background. AI-driven technologies can present creative new ways which exclude unwanted disruptive elements and production equipment while maintaining a natural, uninterrupted look around the necessity for reshooting. It has also revolutionized audio processes with powerful new neural models that strip audio stems, recreate omitted ambiance, and synthesize Foley. Controllers utilize AI-assisted digital audio workstations to alter spatial

¹⁰ I. Goodfellow et al., "Generative Adversarial Networks," *Communications of the ACM*, vol. 57, no. 11, pp. 86–93, 2014.

characteristics and re-balance the dialogue but first recording voices, while simultaneously performing automated noise reduction and silence detection.

4.5. Generative AI and Content Creation

Generative AI systems are revolutionizing scriptwriting, developing bespoke stories, and creating whole video sequences from text prompts¹¹. By leveraging the Vision Transformer architecture, content creation-based tools are enabling filmmakers to integrate a wide range of artistic genre examples, automatically convert storyboards into animated rendering, and adjust subjects through easy text prompts. For instance, the AI-enabled de-aging technology seen in films offered actors the opportunity to embody their younger selves without the traditional CGI process taking months to complete, transforming on cassette instantly. Although productive, such capabilities raise questions about authenticity and creative authority.

4.6. Challenges and Implications

Nonetheless, AI-driven post-production challenges may be overwhelming, its implied transformative capabilities seem hardly restricted. The major disadvantage lies in the potential homogeneity of the AI-generated content. Thus, the trends formulated by AI will be followed by numerous creators, eventually leading to disciplined storyline deserted from a human touch, which is undoubtedly responsible for the aura of a narrative. The limited application of such technology, where consistent results are achieved in simple contexts and inability to apply knowledge to other complicated situations lack the understanding of artistic and historical contexts necessary for the choice. There is an array of ethical questions regarding AI implementation since the latter displaces employees, misappropriates the IP, and violates the artwork integrity. Unfortunately, the AI regulation lacked from the legislative point of view, allowing for debatable decisions as in the case of the unauthorized and AI-redacted *Raanjhanaa* ending¹². AI technologies appear to be beneficial for the commercial industries since they enhance creative capabilities. However, a thoughtful policy framework must be designed to ensure the compliance with privacy and art rights.

¹¹ Wired Staff, "The \$50 Million Movie 'Here' De-Aged Tom Hanks With Generative AI," Wired, November 2024. Retrieved from: <https://www.wired.com>

¹² "Raanjhanaa Re-Release Row: Producers vs. Creators," The Federal, August 2025.

5.Cyber Law and Regulatory Frameworks in India Overview: IT Act, 2021 IT Rules, DPDP Act 2023, relevant sections of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita

The current Indian cyber law landscape consists of specialized and inter-related laws targeted at technology-enabled crimes, vital data safeguarding, and online content monitoring. While these laws are fed with technology-neutrality and, hence, could be of potential relevance for AI-generated film content, they were developed before the facilitation of generative AI and commonly ignore any specific concerns associated with AI-facilitated composing of cinematographic works. First, the most highlighted legal documents on the issue are Information Technology Act 2000, IT Intermediary Guidelines and Digital Media Ethics Code Rules 2021, Digital Personal Data Protection Act 2023, and Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita 2023.

5.1. Information Technology Act, 2000: Foundational Cyber Law Framework

The IT Act 2000 is the basic cyber law in India and creates criminal exposure for cybercrimes. Various aspects of the IT altered film content are relevant source code contains reference to actor-generated film. Section 66C punishes identity fraud if committed by making false use of electronic signature or unique identity feature. When AI systems use actor identities or digital avatars unlawfully, this section will undoubtedly be appropriate. Section 66D criminalizes impersonation using computer tools, integrating deepfake performances based on actors. Section 66E penalizes the privacy of images wrongfully captured, published, or transferred, a critical section for non-consensual depiction of AI algorithms or use of personal movie footage¹³.

Sections 67 and 67A criminalize transmitting pornographic content material by electronic means, which can be suitable for creating inappropriate film content. Section 69A authorizes the government to issue regulation ordering intermediaries to delist violations of public peace or sovereignty from hosting, which can be worthy of controversial materially twisted by the practitioner. Section 79 offers restricted third-party immunity to intermediaries that are reasonably supervising the content and deleting it when they have real-time information. IT Act's broad technology-neutral framework theoretically encompasses AI-generated criminal

¹³ Ministry of Electronics and Information Technology, "Advisory on Deepfakes and Misinformation," December 26, 2023. Retrieved from: <https://www.pib.gov.in>

exposure, its predicates are based on traditional digital. Law enforcement has continued to use identical detection technology, resulting in law enforcement gaps.¹⁴

5.2. IT Rules 2021: Intermediary Obligations and Recent October 2025 Amendments

The IT Intermediary Guidelines and Digital Media Ethics Code Rules 2021 include such due diligence obligations for digital platforms. Rule 3 stipulates the necessity to publish content policies, create grievance redressal mechanisms with 24-hour acknowledgment timing and 15-day resolution timing. Moreover, platforms identified as SSMLs are obliged to appoint CCOs and exercise proactive moderation. The second one is October 2025 draft amendments, which is a milestone for AI regulation¹⁵.

According to such amendments, all AI-generated or AI-modified content should be labelled in a way that covers not less than 10% of the visual display area or not less than 10% duration of the audio display. The information should also contain a watermark and metadata identifier, and traceability information should disseminate. More importantly, the relevant platforms need to sign user declarations whether the content is AI-created, and AI determination tools should verify this information. In case of failure to comply with AI content labelling and verification, the loss of Section 79 safe harbour is presupposed, and the platform loses platform immunity, and their hosters will be proactively liable.

This framework, while awaiting the closure of public feedback on November 6, 2025, establishes the first complete AI content regulation in India.

5.3. DPDP Act 2023: Data Protection for Biometric and Personal Information

The Digital Personal Data Protection Act 2023 authorizes processing of personal data, and if such data includes photos and recordings of acts, voice information, the same¹⁶. AI developers and film producers are subject to the legal responsibility of protecting the accuracy and implementing security measures to remove data after a specific period. Children's data require verified consent to the parent's legal guardian. The data principal reserves the right to access,

¹⁴ "Cyber Law Enforcement Capacity in India: Technical Challenges Report," Indian Cyber Crime Coordination Centre, 2024.

¹⁵ "IT Intermediary Guidelines and Digital Media Ethics Code Rules, 2021," Government of India. Retrieved from: <https://meity.gov.in>

¹⁶ "Digital Personal Data Protection Act, 2023: Comprehensive Overview," Ministry of Electronics and Information Technology, Government of India, 2023. Retrieved from: <https://www.pib.gov.in>

rectify, and erase the data, and the law is evaluated based on the complaint through the apex body Data Protection Board of India, which is newly instituted.

There are critical enforcement gaps regarding cross-border data transfers when foreign AI models are trained on Indian film content without appropriate consent frameworks or transparency mechanisms¹⁷.

5.4. Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita 2023: AI cybercrime provisions

The BNS, effective from 1 July 2024, replaces the Indian Penal Code and applies to protect against emerging AI threats. Section 111 (2) covers organized cybercrime, Section 353 (3) addresses misinformation and disinformation ("New Section"); thus, AI based content might spread false narratives., and Section 356 (4) captures defamatory within content. Sections 75, 77, 78, and 79 include sexual offenses that apply to non-consensual AI intimate imagery¹⁸.

However, the BNS does not recommend specific provisions that AI-dependent content may raise concerns such as deepfake fraud or other algorithmic manipulation. Law enforcement agencies rarely have the technical understanding or knowledge required to prosecute complex AI-related offences. Although India's cyber law foundation addresses the essential concerns, it requires specialized reform to respond adequately to emerging AI threats. The development of comprehensive AI legislation based on the IT Act model is critical to establishing effective protection of artistic integrity that also respects the technological neutral and innovation preservation.

6. Deepfakes, Consent, and Digital Rights

6.1. Legal risks of AI-altered endings: Impersonation, reputational harm, misinformation

In India, AI-altered film endings and deepfake techniques are particularly legally dangerous because of the legally protected underlying impersonation, the reputational economic damages for the processes' creator, and the misinformation spread in both cases. The deepfake technology can authentically alter video and audio to depict actors, directors, or public figures speaking or doing things they never approved of, causing reasonable harm to their reputation

¹⁷ "DPDP Act Enforcement and Cross-Border Data Transfer Challenges," Data Protection Board of India, 2024.

¹⁸ "Cyber Crime Punishments under BNS: Implementation Report," MyJudix Legal Research, February 2024. Retrieved from: <https://www.myjudix.com>

and economic status, prompting legal action¹⁹. After the developing popularization, the Indian government has proposed a draft regulation requiring AI-generated content to be clearly labelled on social media and intermediaries for technical identification measures and making platforms ensure it or be fined. However, enforcing these rules is difficult because determining legitimate artistic reimagining from malicious distortion is difficult.

In essence, the creation of synthetic film or video can disregard or erase crucial concepts of consent and privacy rights. When the work of a creator is mutilated, or the likeness, voice, or persona of an individual is misused without consent, legacy film editing frequently fails both these notions. Though high-profile instances like *Amitabh Bachchan vs Rajat Nagi and Ors.*, *Anil Kapoor vs Simply life and Ors*²⁰ and *Rashmika Mandanna*²¹, have highlighted the enhanced judicial protectionism of celebrity rights and dignitary interests, most of them afford relief utilizing general causes of privacy, defamation and personality rather than aimed legislation for synthetic media. However, notwithstanding the inventions of both technical and legal efforts to protect digital rights and consent in film editing, the structure of India still lacks defined legal standards suitable for deepfakes and AI-altered storytelling to fulfil the complicated challenge of ensuring dignity and informed consent in an age of synthetic creativeness and digital manipulation.

India's regulatory response to deepfakes and AI-generated media in film is similarly hampered by significant legal loopholes and a lack of robust, AI-specific standards. The recent draft amendments to the Information Technology Rules, 2021 present a positive change, proposing a solid definition for synthetic content which including deep fakes, algorithmically altered images, and AI-edited film scenes, be labelled and watermarked prior to publication, as well as implemented. For their part, labels must account for at least 10% of the visual display area or audio track and platforms are required to perform technical verification and collect user declarations of AI involvement. However, the reforms fail to tackle issues of enforceability, liability-determination, and the minimal threshold of recognized authenticity. For instance, enforcement is left to automated moderation and user honesty, both of which leave a lot to be desired; most creators of advanced deepfakes work anonymously or outside national

¹⁹ "Deepfakes and Reputational Harm: Indian Case Law Analysis," Indian Express, November 2023.

²⁰ 2023 SCC OnLine Del 6914

²¹ "Rashmika Mandanna Deepfake Case: Main Accused Arrested," Times of India, January 19, 2024. Retrieved from: <https://timesofindia.indiatimes.com>

jurisdiction, which complicates investigation and prosecution.

A dedicated AI law and a statutory distinction between high-risk and artistic AI-generated content are also absent in India; hence, many legacy film edits and synthetic media outputs fall in between existing regulations. It allows producers and platforms to escape liability for editing AI scenes while leaving the director, performers, and viewers without effective options for creative misuse or reputational harm. In addition, the operational issue is the challenging technical implementation of conditional access – watermarking, persistent metadata, and machine-readable labelling. It is particularly problematic for small creators and regional producers because the cost of implementation is burdensome.

Lastly, without the global best practices in licensing, oversight, and appeals commonly observed abroad, policymakers cannot support innovation while ensuring the safety of the people. Vague guidelines can open the door to arbitrary enforcement; they could also stifle freedom of expression if enforced too broadly, as exemplified by experience with licensing schemes, prior restraint, and the right to challenge regulatory decisions. More importantly, India's defences against deepfakes and the use of AI in art are fragmented. The dearth of information regarding liability, attribution, and the ability to enforce these guidelines puts both creativity and the individual liberties of users at stake in the digital space.

7. Proposals

7.1. Need for reforms

The country's cyber and data protection framework, including the Information Technology Act 2000 and the Digital Personal Data Protection Act 2023 is wholly insufficient to preserve privacy which in a lot of cases, is clearly violated through artificial intelligence. The DPDP Act regulates the processing of personal information with consent and does not permit behavioural monitoring of children. However, the legislation was mostly focused on preventing businesses from misusing information for commercial benefit. The IT Act permits penalties to be imposed for a violation of the provisions governing data security or privacy violations. Still, no statutory instruments are recognized for the challenges generated through synthetic media or algorithmic control.

First and foremost, critical enforcement gaps are evident in applicability to legacy film updates.

The DPDP Act lacks a compensatory regime for data principals injured by AI-enhanced and modified works. In addition, the DPDP Act and the IT Act exempt personal data from unauthorized government access for national security justification, presenting a risk that top-secret creative contracts and performance data could be utilized without adequate judicial review.

To address these deficiencies demands urgent sectoral and legislative action. The government is compelled to build business-specific regulatory structures for AI-modified films which go above familiar cyber and privacy law to ensure decisional authority, dramatic integrity, and narrative authenticity. Nonetheless, the specialized legislation in AI content provenance, algorithmic transparency, and an enforceable consent registry is the vital concluding step.

8. Conclusion

The emergence of generative AI technologies enabling unprecedented cinematic content alteration presents complex legal, ethical, and creative challenges demanding immediate regulatory attention. While India possesses foundational cyber law provisions in the Information Technology Act 2000 and emerging data protection standards in the DPDP Act 2023, these frameworks prove manifestly inadequate addressing AI-specific film alteration contexts. The Raanjhanaa controversy, Rashmika Mandanna deepfake case, and high-profile personality rights litigation involving Amitabh Bachchan and Anil Kapoor collectively demonstrate urgent necessity for comprehensive AI content governance frameworks. The proposed October 2025 IT Rules amendments mandating AI content labelling and watermarking represent meaningful progress, yet implementation gaps and enforcement challenges persist. Critical deficiencies remain regarding consent protocols specificity, liability attribution clarity, and appeals mechanism transparency. Effective reform requires sectoral legislation establishing film-industry-specific consent standards, independent self-regulatory organizations, transparent consent registries, and multi-stakeholder governance structures balancing innovation with artistic integrity protection. May the Proposed amendments, in all certainty, sow a seed for the law to adapt themselves to the evolving era of Artificial Intelligence and protect the citizens from the adverse impacts.