A STUDY ON NAVIGATING THE INTERSECTION OF INNOVATION AND COPYRIGHT OF 3D PRINTING IP LAWS

S Keerthana, Tamillnadu Dr. Ambedkar University, Taramani, Chennai

ABSTRACT:

This study review upon the growth of 3D printing technology which opened new horizon in innovation, allowing individuals and industries to design and produce physical objects with ease. Eventually this development pays a paramount issue to the intellectual property (IP) law, particularly in the areas of copyright and patent protection. The advent of accessible and affordable 3D printing had ignited the complex intersection of innovation and copyright by his technological shift in the traditional law. The research focuses on the making of 2D models and shifting liability to the physical products of 3D printing. The research highlight upon the accessibility to the ownership of the 3D printing mechanism. The paper goes beyond the traditional 3D printing to the modern concern of the bio printing which has profound ethical and legal challenges to the existing copyright and patent protection in the IP framework.

Keywords: traditional shift, innovation, physical objects, protection of IP laws, ownership and bio printing.

INTRODUCTION:

The emergence of 3D printing which is also known as additive manufacturing, is changing the way we create things from medical devices to everyday consumer products. By building objects layer by layer from digital designs, the technology have come up with new more possibilities for innovation, personalization, and to way efficient production. It has been boon to the industries like healthcare, manufacturing, and even construction. But as 3D printing becomes more accessible and widely used, it also raises some tough questions especially when it comes to copyright and protecting original ideas in a world where just about anyone can make anything.

3D printing is diming the line between the digital and physical worlds, creating a space where traditional ideas about intellectual property are starting to feel outdated and under pressure. The problem of adapting to the dynamic changes of copyrights law which leading to the copyright infringement as the illegal or unauthorized production and distribution of the creative works of the copyright designs.

The main course of 3D printing is about turning digital designs into real, physical objects. These designs often shared online or made using CAD (computer-aided design) software act like blueprints for whatever gets printed. But as this technology becomes more common, it brings up some legal questions of ownership and the prototype of the manufacturing belongs to the existing designs.

The problematic view of the 3D printing is the way the digital files can be utilized, shared and modified. The imitation of the designs are not that difficult as it involve the click of the internet to commercialize the works. These duplications comes around with the challenges to the traditional IP protections, mainly for the copyrights, patents and trademarks for which the law created to protect the illegal production, and selling of the mind works, inventions and brand indicators.

The 3D printing is useful in various fields, including the aerospace, automotive, health care, fashion, and construction which are more viable and efficient approach to the puzzle of 2D printing. The bio printing of bio materials by the incorporation of live cells had the benefits of more organized and speedy transplantation. The revolutionizing creation of customized medical devices, implants and even created the bio printed tissues and organs. 3D bio printing

are used to construct the tissues for solid organs. The surgeons can use the 3D printing anatomical model in their surgery for the precise of the surgical manner.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS:

1. How does the 3D printing technology challenge traditional copyright protection on digital and physical objects of the 2D designs?

2. To what extend the patent law balance the protecting innovation of the accessibility and reparability of the 3D printing?

3. What are the ethical and legal implications of bio printing and 3D printing of organs in the IP protections?

4. Who holds the authorship and ownership rights on the designing, modelling and printing of 3D objects?

5. What are the legal liability arises on the defective and unsafe product by the 3D printing over the 2D designs?

6. How the international legal frameworks might be necessary for the cross-border IP infringement due to the 3D printing?

RESEARCH OBJECTIVES:

1. To identify the 3D printing technology challenge traditional copyright protection for physical objects

2. To analyze how the patent law adapts to nature of 3D printing

3. To review upon the existing IP law address the authorship and ownership of the collaboration of 3D printing process

4. To explain the ethical and legal complications in the bio printing related to the IP

5. To explore the liability shifting from 2D printing to the 3D printing objects

6. To study on the international IP framework on infringements.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY:

The research is based on the doctrinal method, were as the resources were collected through secondary information. This research involves analyzing and examining the existing literature and other legal materials rather than collecting the primary data. The secondary data sources includes books, research articles, journals, newspaper, e- libraries and other commentaries related to this research topic. The duration of this research was approximately one month and this research is confined to Indian legal legislation.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE:

1. "Intellectual Property Issues in 3D Printing" (**Keyur Asarkar, IJLMH, 2022**)[1]: Basic framing of the IP issues (patents, copyrights) that arise from 3D printing in general. Identifies many infringement risks, especially around copying physical objects, the ambiguity in what constitutes "authorship" of 3D digital designs, and how patent law may or may not cover functional aspects vs ornamental. https://ijlmh.com/paper/intellectual-property-issues-in-3dprinting/?utm_source=chatgpt.com

2. Copyright Issues in 3D printing (**Ira M. Schwartz)**" (2015)[2]: One of the earlier pieces exploring how existing copyright law does/doesn't cover 3D-printed designs, particularly new boundary cases. Provides good foundational understanding of how copyright treats reproductions, derivative works, and what happens when designs are functional, decorative, or a mix. Also discussion of how digital and physical overlap in 3D printing stretches some copyright definitions.

3. **Aggarwal and Verma** (2020)[2]: explore the significant impact that 3D printing has on intellectual property rights in India, highlighting the challenges that arise as this technology continues to evolve. They emphasize the need for legal frameworks that can adapt to the unique issues posed by 3D printing, particularly in the areas of copyright and patent law. Their study suggests that existing IP laws may be inadequate to address the rapid advancements in 3D printing technology.

[1] https://ijlmh.com/paper/intellectual-property-issues-in-3d-printing/?.
[2] https://iciset.in/Paper2601.pdf
https://www.degruyterbrill.com/document/doi/10.9785/cri-2015-0204/html?.

CONTENTS OF THE RESEARCH:

The research contents revolves around the intersection of the innovation and IP navigation from the traditional legal IP domain laws. The capacity to produce the product within the demand requires a high for the warehousing and transportation, which might be affect the authentic way the products are been made through the designs. The contents will give the path to explain the 3D mechanism and the implementation in the world to make it more reliable.

ANALYSIS OF THE QUESTIONS:

1) How does the 3D printing technology challenge traditional copyright protection on digital and physical objects of the 2D designs?

FINDINGS:

The intellectual property law has basis of domain in the copyright, patent and trademark, semiconductors and GI. The copyright protection subsists, in original work of authorship fixed in tangible medium of expression, now known or later developed, from which they can be perceived, reproduced or otherwise communicated.

According to the section 13 of the Indian copyright act of 1957,

Section 13: Works in which copyright subsists,

(1) Subject to the provisions of this section and other provisions of this Act, copyright shall subsists throughout India in the following classes of works, that is to say,-

(a) original literary, dramatic, musical and artistic works;

(b) cinematograph films; and

(c) [sound recording

Copyrights law provides creators with exclusive right to reproduce, distribute, and display their works, preventing unauthorized use by others. In the world of 3D printing, copyright issues are becoming more complicated especially when it comes to the digital files and models that act as blueprints for printed objects. These files are often shared online, sometimes freely and

sometimes without permission from the original creator.

THE BASIC NEEDS OF COPYRIGHT:

1. Originality
2. Fixation
3. Work of authorship
4. Idea expression dichotomy

The requirements of the copyrights originality, fixation and utility. The originality requirement is the "independent creation of the works." The need of the originality is not an issue in the creation of audio, video contents as these are the results of the modicum of creativity. The basic nature of the 3D printing objects are through the derived versions of the 2D designs of the person created it.

The other requirement of the copyright the utility and useful article defined in the section 101 of the copyright act the works having the "intrinsic utilitarian function". The 3D printing process begins with the digitally formatted using the 3D scanner or the software which serves as the virtual model of the output. The question arise will be at what extent the CAD design files are copyrightable, generally the code on the software programs is considered as copyrightable as the software programs are ease to manipulate the designs and the shape into the 3D objects and the products. The CAD is a computer file which as the digital replication of the designs generated.

The mechanism of the tangible product are the designs are sent through the printer, it reads the file layer by layer as each contains the patterns and the 3D items is created as this takes the limitless time make it work in to the objects. The only real limits on the designs are the printer's technical abilities like what materials it can use and how big it can print, the materials are plastics, edible, metals or glass.

The 3D printer gives a predominant challenges for the IP realm, the stages of the CAD file to the printing output creates a problem in the requirements of the intellectual property. The finality produced as the artistic elements, they may be covered by the copyright. The impact of

the 3D printing technology in intellectual property still there is no provisions for the problem. As the 3D printing has combine of the many separate areas of the laws at same time which creates challenge to understand the same.

As the CAD are the online in nature which transmits the designs rapidly which leading to the many infringements, as they can duplicate, alter, or make it for their own use without the authority. When a 3D printer is used to copy an existing object, it's essentially making a duplicate. So, if that original object is protected by copyright, printing a copy without permission is considered copyright infringement. As 3D printing becomes easier and more popular, more people can now make copies of copyrighted items often without realizing they're breaking the law. Since digital 3D files can be quickly shared online, they can spread across countries in seconds. That means copyright issues are no longer just local they can become international problems.

3D printing includes several different methods, each with its own way of creating objects. Some of the most common types are Fused Deposition Modeling (FDM), Fused Filament Fabrication (FFF), Stereolithography (SLA), and Selective Laser Sintering (SLS). These techniques use different processes to turn digital designs into physical 3D objects. Each method has its own strengths and weaknesses, depending on what the printed object will be used for.

2) To what extend the patent law balance the protecting innovation of the accessibility and reparability of the 3D printing?

FINDINGS:

The patent law struggles to balance the protection of innovation with accessibility and reparability of 3D printing products, particularly Patents pays more attention to the growing of the innovation in the through their development concerning the spare parts of the products. Since a patent is an intellectual property right that is granted to a patent holder for 20 years to exercise exclusive rights for their invention. When an inventor gets a patent, they're given exclusive rights to their invention. This means they can stop others from making, using, selling, or sharing it without permission. In return for these rights, the inventor has to publicly share how their invention works. This helps build a shared pool of knowledge, allowing others to learn from it and inspiring even more new ideas and innovations.

The 3D printing challenges lies in the authentication of the patented technologies with the 3D printers. As the 3D printing have various different types to get the final result of the product which involves the more complex process of software algorithms. As the patents only all the broader categories, including the layer adhesion and print quality efficient techniques. However these complex patent compress the significant challenge for the industries producing new 3D printing hardware, because they must ensure their innovation does not infringe upon the existing IP LAWS.

PATENT INFRINGEMENT:

The way machines made from the 2D designs does not amount to the infringement, eventually the 3D printing in the industries are profound to be infringed on the other works, resulting in the heavier legal disputes and potential market loss with the stoppage of the creativity requirements from the authors. The concept of patent exhaustion and cross-licensing are the grater difficult to the content of the 3D printers, where the patent exhaustion means the product is sold, and limits the ability of the holder of patent to impose restriction on the future sales of the product.

In 3D printing in the domain of patent rise a principle question to the industrial holders that the hardware component how long they may reused and resold in the market. The answer the problem from the patenting rights of the 3D printing the cross licensing agreements came with the negotiating of the terms and conditions of the patents with the stakeholders and the collaborations. Additionally the new grow up problem of the patent of 3D printing is that individuals produces the product privately which create uncertain situation to the holder of the patent. With the legal implications of this shift introduce the other rise of direct and indirect infringement.

The traditional patent law protect the distributors as the primary target, by this 3D printing the individual might become a producers by creating the physical items from the digital files which are patent protected. The current law patent does not address the issue of sales of the digital file whether a direct or indirect infringement. Other complication is the matter of a prosumer society, means the consumer act as both producers and users of the goods by the 3D printing leading to the unpredictable patent infringement, as they navigating from the decentralized network of potential infringers.

Patents play a key role in helping 3D printing technologies grow and evolve. They give inventors the exclusive rights to their creations, which not only protects their hard work and investment but also gives them a competitive edge. However, because 3D printing is so digital in nature, it also brings new challenges like how to prevent unauthorized copying, how to enforce rights, and how to make sure innovation remains accessible to others.

As 3D printing continues to change industries around the world, finding the right balance in patent protection is more important than ever. We need strong protections that encourage innovation, but also flexible systems that don't block creativity or access. Getting this balance right will help secure the future of 3D printing and build an ecosystem where new ideas can thrive, benefiting both inventors and society as a whole.

3) What are the ethical and legal implications of bio printing and 3D printing of organs in the IP protections?

The bio printing make an appearance of integrative technology by the biological sciences manufacturing, which has the forefront position in transforming the innovations in the sectors of healthcare and biomedical research. The process how the bio printing are entails by the layer by layer deposition of bio inks comprising of living cells, bio materials and biologically revelant substances which produce the three dimensional tissue structures of the morphology and functional element of the original biological tissues.

The 3D bio printing have been modernized and they formulated the way better complex models into the tissue engineering used to create a medical devices in prosthodontics. Even though the bio printing is seen as a successful advancement in technology, it has faced a critical problem in incorporating live cells into the fabricated system.

ESSENTIAL COMPONENTS OF BIOPRINTING:

Significantly the 3D bio printing contains three essential components they are: biomaterials, cells and growth factors. The living cells in the human body are transformed with the help of biomaterials and printed into a desired complex form with the help of variety of printers. These transforming mechanisms has the functional element which enhance the cellular activity of the real human body in the several bio medical applications. Certain tools are help in identifying the initial image to construct a designated 3D bio printed structure such as MRI, X-ray and CT. In 3D printing prior formula or the elements optimizing are not affected as it deals with the

software that smoothens the processing and give the product desired beforehand. However, this requires a costly, timely and more efforts needed for the needed biomaterial output. Among the 2D printing in biomaterials, the advantages of flexible design, easing prototyping, on demand printing are making the 3D printing more viable than the 2D designs. The 3D printing has been used to construct the specific issues and design the organs which are more complex in functions such as the kidney by the different methods example biomimicry, autonomous self-assembly and mini tissue building block.

In the regime of the 3D bio printing, the first method is bio mimicry, which act as a powerful tool were the goal of the bio mimicry is to recreate living tissues and organs as this function as the real organs to the human body. The creation of the bi mimicry are evidently more complex and the surgeons or the creators should take care of the shapes, layers of tissues and their internal environment as such their type of cells involve, because they are arranged in order to send the micro biological signals to the human mind to keep everything working. The recent 3D printing accordingly handle the bio materials, living cells and every biological factors with the help of microscale in the individual cells and their surroundings.

The second method autonomous self-assembly, where the cells are spontaneously organize themselves with the naturally embryos development. This give the signals to the cells to make the tissue to be specially align with their own tissues and the organs that are guided by signals and pattern in their environment. The method the researchers use is the spheroids where the group of cells collide and build the tissue structure on their own, the method mimic the way hoe our body respond to naturally building tissues and formulating for more organic growth and functionality.

The third method is the mini tissues, these are the small, functional units which act as the building blocks for the big and complex organs which involves a precision assemble of the units to make it as a full sized tissues. These method are regularly used in the organ on a chip technology were a tiny device that simulate real organ function and also to test the drugs and vaccines safely and effectively.

4) Who holds the authorship and ownership rights on the designing, modelling and printing of 3D objects?

The 3D printing has changed the ideology of the rights and authorship in the intellectual

property laws domain. They are certain challenges faced by the IP legislation on the 3D printing mainly with the means of production which area decentralized (means the manufacturer are the final user who can create the object typically in their own way). Generally, the ownership are lies with the author who created the original work of the 3D model and it is copyrighted.

The copyright act 1957, says that copyright will protect the underlying software and the graphic design within the digital model which are the elements of literary or artistic work. With the emerging technology of 3D printing, people can are likely scan and the work and reproduce by the 3D printer. If the work are without the authority from the original owner it can be an infringement.

According to the copyright act, 1957 section 14(c)(1) a copyright grants an exclusive right to the holder to reproduce the work in any material form, including storing it in an electronic medium. With this an evident the CAD file are being protected as the original, artistic work. Now the challenge has been arisen that is to control the unauthorized transmission if CAD files among the internet. The ways that can be protected is through granting the license and yet to permitted by the consent from the explicitly from the author.

As the IP laws domain the patent plays an important role in protecting the works of the authors by their legislations. The laws states and protect the holder exclusive right from the third party who selling, importing or making use of it. Whereas the 3D printing easily facilitates the infringer to print at multiple locations with the limited visibility to the patent holder, in order protect the CAD files they have to get the patented product or websites that sell or share the CAD files. As basically the patent law protects both the 3D printing machines, processes and the output of the printers, with the hardware and software.

Under the trademarks act 1999, a trademarks is infringed where the mark has been identical to the original user. In the case of CAD file the digital version of trademark and the illegal use will be occurring the course of a trade. Where the 3D shape area also the trademarks and they can be a replica of the shape mark to constitute an infringement.

5) What are the legal liability arises on the defective and unsafe product by the 3D printing over the 2D designs?

The 3D printing process are almost the same in all the cases, were the physical object is being created through the method called the additive manufacturing. The printer prints the solid objects one layer at a time being through a computer aided device to produce a finished product. Often the 3D printing differs from the age old manufacturing method the "subtractive" process, a process where the solid materials are going through a normal cutting, grinding, crushing or other process.

LIABILITY OF THE 3D PRINTING:

Generally the states have adopted the concept of strict liability for the cases involving defective product suits. The categories were the product can be held to a strictly liable are when the products alleged defective in design, defective in manufacture, and defective in instructions. Conferring to the defence of strict liability claims in 3D printed products, the question arise will be the output from the printers i.e,.the product are within the proper definition of product and through whom the product is being made.

While a professional uses the 3D printer and leads to a defective product, the liability for the manufacture may arise to the extent of the 3D printer's software developer, and the manufacture of raw materials, are binding within their limit of use in the physical object. In some other states the cases rise will be that a component part are not defective, then the manufacturer will not be held liable for the defective product unless the such component part are not fall under the final product. Similarly, if the 3D printer or the software, the manufacturer of the 3D device are relatively protected from the product liability, until the 3D printing device or such software are not having the defects in itself then the liability will shift to the manufacturer, as he was more proximity to the issues of 3D printing. In certain case the contractual obligation might also happen to the potential defendants to each other.

The product liability are evidently seen in many industries and the sectors, the standard of professional negligence claim will be that what a same trained professional will give in consistent with the situation. That can be evaluated through by the background of their training and experience not only the care of the physical product but also the on the creation of the product through the 3D printing. The additive manufacturer technology have gained the many possible theories of liability and that will leading to penalizing the professional act.

6) How the international legal frameworks might be necessary for the cross-border IP

infringement due to the 3D printing?

The intersection of the 3D printing and the IP gives a diverse challenge as the 3D printing technologies are ongoing advance, in its field with the issue of the digital fabrication and the duplication. Presently, the legal framework for the 3D printing and the IP are mainly governed by the traditional laws, where the copyright protects the creative ideas in the digital models, allowing the creators to for reproduction, distribution. The patent law concern to the inventive industrial designs of the 3D printing of patented products and its spare parts, the trademark law governs over the logos, brands in the commercials of the trade. However these law are to the centralized and to the physical goods and centralized manufacturing units.

LEGAL FRAMWORKS:

In spite of these existing legal frameworks, there are still a huge gap between the 3D printing technologies in the traditional IP laws. One among them is the lack of clarity in the application terms for the copyright, patent and the trademark protection of digital files. The domain lack the infringing of derivative works that are legally ambiguous, and the patented items are not fully produced through their demand in needs which sometimes being infringed due to the mass production. The other gap among the 3D printing and the IP are the lack of consistency among the nations as the different countries opt for the different laws this will be sound challenges to the IP enforcers to do their 3D printing physical products do the cross-border distribution, which will affect the enforcing rights of the holder and creator.

The international variations of the 3D printing and the IP laws are quite complex issue, with the mass production and distribution of the digital files which are being done in the global level varies through the enforcement mechanism and the protection available there. To address these kind of problems the international treaties and the agreements are relatively needed to be harmonized to improve the cross border mechanisms. As the discussions are going to make the IP laws available to present problem the World Intellectual Property Organization has made strides in promoting the IP matters. One of the promising way to protect the digital files are the blockchain and the Digital Rights Management (DRM) which will protect the copyrights effectively in the digital 3D printing space, by the strong security and the transparency the holders in contact.

The realistic difficulties of international cooperation for cross-border IP enforcement have been

widely acknowledged: Differences in legal system and conflicts of interest between countries. To solve this problem, one can establish an independent cross-border independent organization dedicated to IP arbitration which could be potentially designated as the neutral party in resolving

3D Printing disputes. This organ would be authorized to offer one-way binding arbitration with the advice of international institutions, like WIPO. It is suggested that such a body could facilitate the enforcement of IP rights across jurisdictions and help reduce conflicts by offering standardized dispute resolution mechanisms

RECOMMENDATIONS:

- The future outlook of the 3D printing technology should be seen to a split approach from copyright for the physical objects.
- As equivalent patent domain are to make decentralized production and distribution more adhere to his newer licensing models and system by compulsory license to the critical innovations.
- The IP communicates a complex legal frontiers to the technology advancement specially in the sector relating to human dignity, the creation of 3D bio printing needs a specialized regulatory laws to address the domains criticism such will be done through sui generis.
- Resolving the cross border dispute is not an easy task as it needs more laws to be harmonized with it, therefore the international treaties and the agreements are need to be strengthened
- The 3D printing had made a special revolution in the product liabilities as it makes both the creator and the service provider are liable the physical objects are meant to go through more phase in the lawsuits.

CONCLUSION:

On concluding the 3D printing in the intellectual property law is going to be evidently value to the technology of today's world. The ongoing process of 3D printing has transformed certain possibilities among various sectors and industries, yet they forms a new complex problems to

the attention of the intellectual property legal frameworks. This study have go through the various questions how the IP are being useful to the world and at the same extent they are protecting the interest of the digital right holders.

Furthermore, the 3D printing have introduced the new environment to the intellectual property which may or may not complicate the enforcement of the physical product to reproduce, that is the foster of prosumer culture. Such a potential commercialization adds on to the layered ambiguity to the frequently modifying digital files, and creation of the derivative works which woke up the question of ownership and the copyright status.

As the legal society and the industrial shareholder are wants to bypass this challenges the new future are coming into force through the technological advancements that are the blockchain and the digital rights managements. The other innovation which are going to be focused in the future will be the healthcare industry, the 3D bio printing had made the life easier to by the digital fabrication to the nonstop work of the human nature. Adding to this the critical area of the research are basically lies in the decentralized nature of 3D printing and the careful approach of the legislative reforms certainly to develop the risk free contractual agreements to the IP environment.

REFERENCE:

1. https://www.fbm.com/content/uploads/2019/01/3d-printing-copyright-challenges-and-thedmca.pdf - copyright of 3D printing and it's challenges

2. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC11761581/ - 3D bio printing

3. https://www.iam-media.com/article/unravelling-the-concept-of-3d-printing-knowing-yourrights-in-india - knowing the concept of 3D printing rights in India .

4. https://www.iadclaw.org/defensecounseljournal/3d-printing-product-liability-professionalliability-and-other-tort-aspects-of-the-burgeoning-industry/ - product liabilities of 3D printing

5. https://iciset.in/Paper2601.pdf - 3D printing technology implications.

6. https://www.globalpatentfiling.com/blog/Role-of-Patents-in-3D-Printing-Protecting Innovation-in-3D-Printing-Industry- patent in 3D printing

7. https://www.mdpi.com/2076-3417/14/23/11448- legal framework of 3D printing.