THE FUTURE OF INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY IN THE AGE OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE IN INDIA

Deepika Sejwal, PhD Scholar, IILM University, Gurugram

ABSTRACT

The rapid evolution of Artificial Intelligence (AI) is fundamentally reshaping the landscape of intellectual property (IP) across the globe, and India is no exception. This research explores what the integration of AI means for the future of IP laws in India, how current legal frameworks are coping with AI-generated works, and why urgent legal reform is necessary to ensure innovation is both protected and promoted in this new digital age. The article critically examines Indian IP law's current approach to authorship, ownership, and patentability in the context of AI systems capable of autonomously generating creative and inventive outputs.

Furthermore, the article investigates ethical dilemmas, enforcement challenges, and the implications for traditional creators and industries. Despite increasing discourse, there remains a significant gap in India's legal and policy landscape—namely, the absence of clear guidelines on IP rights for AI-generated works and limited judicial interpretation. This research argues that without timely and adaptive legal reform, India risks falling behind in both AI innovation and the global IP race. Ultimately, it calls for a proactive, inclusive policy framework that balances technological advancement with creator rights and public interest.

Keywords: Artificial Intelligence, Intellectual Property, India, Legal Reform, AI-Generated Works

INTRODUCTION

Artificial Intelligence (AI) is redefining the boundaries of human capability, transforming industries ranging from healthcare and agriculture to education and creative arts. In recent years, AI systems have demonstrated the ability to autonomously generate content—be it music, literature, visual art, or even patented inventions—that was once considered uniquely human. This rapid evolution challenges long-standing legal frameworks, particularly in the realm of Intellectual Property (IP), which is grounded in the assumption that creativity and innovation originate solely from human minds.

India's existing IP laws—including the Copyright Act, 1957 and the Patents Act, 1970—are fundamentally anthropocentric. They recognize only natural persons or legally incorporated entities as authors and inventors. Under current legislation, there is no provision to account for non-human agents like AI systems. As a result, works or inventions generated autonomously by AI exist in a legal grey area. This gap has serious implications, as it creates ambiguity around ownership, authorship, and enforceability, which may deter investment and innovation in the AI sector. It also risks excluding Indian developers and startups from international AI-IP regimes that are evolving more progressively.

India is at a critical juncture where AI innovation is accelerating, but legal and regulatory responses remain underdeveloped. With the Indian government pushing for digital transformation and AI integration across sectors, a lack of clarity on IP rights related to AI could stifle both domestic innovation and foreign collaboration. The issue is not only legal but economic and ethical, impacting how intellectual contributions are valued in an AI-driven future.

This research aims to critically assess the readiness of India's current intellectual property framework in responding to the growing influence of artificial intelligence in creative and inventive processes. It explores the extent to which AI challenges the foundational principles of intellectual property law in India, particularly with respect to authorship, ownership, and inventorship. By identifying the legal and policy voids that currently exist, the study highlights how these gaps hinder the effective protection and recognition of works and inventions generated by AI.

THE FUTURE OF AI AND IP IN INDIA

The integration of artificial intelligence (AI) into creative and technological processes is pushing India's intellectual property (IP) laws into uncharted territory. Traditionally, India's IP framework—like many around the world—rests on the assumption that only human beings can be inventors or authors. However, as AI systems begin to generate music, art, literature, software, and even novel inventions with minimal human intervention, this assumption is being tested. The current legal structure in India does not recognize AI as a legal person, which means that AI-generated works fall outside the scope of existing IP protection unless a human can be identified as the author or inventor. This gap in legal recognition raises important questions about ownership, accountability, and economic incentives in the age of AI.

For India, a country with a thriving tech sector and a growing creative economy, this legal ambiguity poses both a challenge and an opportunity. On one hand, the lack of clear protection for AI-generated works could discourage investment in AI-driven innovation. On the other, it opens the door for legal and policy reforms that could position India as a global leader in modern IP governance. As AI becomes more integrated into everyday work—from generative design and automated content creation to AI-assisted research and innovation—India will need to consider introducing new legal categories, such as shared authorship models, data-driven rights attribution, or licensing systems that fairly compensate both human creators and AI developers. One of the key challenges in the age of AI is determining the ownership and inventorship of AI-generated inventions. As AI systems become more sophisticated and capable of producing novel and non-obvious outputs, the traditional concepts of authorship and inventorship are being questioned.[1]

Ultimately, the integration of AI into India's innovation ecosystem will demand a future-facing IP regime that balances the rights of human creators with the realities of machine-assisted creativity. Whether through amendments to existing laws, the introduction of new legislation, or the development of AI-specific IP guidelines, India has the chance to shape a framework that is not only legally sound but also ethically grounded and innovation-friendly.

THE INDIAN LEGAL FRAMEWORK AND THE CHALLENGES POSED BY AI TO IP LAWS

India's intellectual property (IP) laws were established in a time when creativity and invention

were understood to be the exclusive domain of human beings. The principal statute Copyright Act of 1957 and the Patents Act of 1970 reflect this human-centric foundation, offering protection only to works or inventions created by natural persons. However, the advent of Artificial Intelligence (AI), which now plays a significant role in generating content and solving complex problems, has exposed critical limitations in this traditional legal framework. Despite the benefits, the technological shift introduces challenges related to AI-generated IP, ownership rights, and ethical concerns about AI as an inventor, which remain unresolved in India's legal framework.[2]

Under the Copyright Act, protection is extended to "original literary, dramatic, musical and artistic works" among others, with authorship assigned to natural persons depending on the category of the work (Section 2(d))[3]. There is no provision for works autonomously created by non-human entities such as AI systems. This raises the fundamental question of who holds the copyright in content generated by AI without direct human input. Similarly, the Patents Act defines an inventor as the person who has contributed to the inventive step in a patentable product or process. AI-generated inventions, especially those created through machine learning algorithms and neural networks, challenge this definition. The Act requires disclosure of the true and first inventor but offers no guidance for cases where no human can reasonably claim authorship.

The Trademark and Designs Acts, while less frequently challenged by AI-related issues, may also face questions in the future around AI-generated branding or automated product design.

At the core of these issues is the fact that Indian IP laws are fundamentally anthropocentric structured around the assumption that only humans can be creators or inventors. This creates a legal void for AI-generated works and inventions, leaving them without clear protection or attribution. Such uncertainty can hinder innovation, discourage investment, and make it difficult for Indian creators and businesses to engage in the global AI economy, where other countries are already exploring adaptive legal reforms.

CHALLENGES -

1. **Authorship and Ownership Ambiguity**

Current Indian IP laws recognize only human creators. When AI generates content

autonomously, there is no legal clarity on who—if anyone—can claim ownership. This creates a major gap in protection for AI-generated works.

2. **Enforcement Difficulties**

   Without a legally recognized author, enforcing rights over AI-generated works becomes problematic. If such content is copied or misused, there's often no clear party who can file a claim or seek legal remedy.

3. **Blurring the Line Between Inspiration and Infringement**

   AI systems trained on large datasets can replicate styles, patterns, or even entire works without clear attribution. This raises concerns about potential infringement, especially when the output mimics existing copyrighted content.

4. **Data Usage and Copyrighted Training Material**

   AI models often rely on massive datasets that include copyrighted works. Using such data without permission raises ethical and legal issues about consent, compensation, and data provenance.

5. **Impact on Traditional Creators and Industries**

   The widespread use of AI-generated content poses a threat to human creators, who may struggle to compete with machine-made outputs that are faster and cheaper to produce. This could lead to a devaluation of original human-created works.

Ultimately, while India's IP laws have served well in traditional contexts, they are not equipped to meet the complex realities introduced by AI. There is a growing need for forward-looking legal reforms that can accommodate machine-generated creativity and innovation while preserving the balance between protection, economic growth, and public interest.

INDIAN IP LAWS CURRENT APPROACH TO AI: AUTHORSHIP, OWNERSHIP AND PATENTABILITY

1. **Authorship Under Copyright Law**

Indian copyright law, as outlined in the Copyright Act, 1957, attributes authorship only to natural persons. This means that AI systems, no matter how sophisticated, cannot be considered authors. For copyright protection to apply, there must be significant human involvement in the creation of the work. Thus, purely AI-generated content is not eligible for copyright protection under current Indian law unless a human can demonstrate creative input.[4]

2. **Ownership Rights**

Ownership of a work typically vests in the author or creator. In AI-assisted creations, the individual who contributes substantial human creativity—such as through prompt engineering, editing, or directing the AI—is considered the author and thus holds the rights. However, in cases of fully autonomous AI output, there is a legal vacuum. Since the AI cannot own rights and no human is considered the creator, such works may be unprotectable, leaving them vulnerable to free use and exploitation.

3. **Patentability**

Indian patent law, under the Patents Act, 1970, requires that an "inventor" be a natural person. As such, inventions generated autonomously by AI systems are currently not patentable. For an invention involving AI to qualify for a patent, a human inventor must be identifiable as having contributed the inventive step. This limits the protection of novel solutions or products developed by AI systems without direct human involvement.

Indian courts and IP offices have so far followed a conservative interpretation, aligned with the letter of the law. In recent cases and filings, authorities have emphasized that authorship and inventorship must be attributed to natural persons, rejecting applications that list AI as the creator or inventor.

ETHICAL DILEMMA IN AI AND IPR

1. **Attribution and Moral Rights**

A key ethical issue arises around the question of who deserves credit for AI-

generated works. If an AI composes a song or designs a product, should the credit go to the developer of the AI, the user, or should no one claim moral rights? The lack of recognition for actual human effort (such as curating data or guiding the AI) can raise concerns over fairness and accountability.

2. **Creator Displacement**

As AI-generated content becomes more common, traditional creators—artists, writers, musicians, inventors—face the threat of being overshadowed by machines. Ethically, this raises concerns about the value of human creativity and labor in a system increasingly dominated by automation.

3. **Training Data Ethics**

Many AI models are trained on large datasets scraped from the internet, which may include copyrighted materials used without consent. This not only infringes on the rights of original creators but also raises broader ethical concerns about data privacy, consent, and intellectual theft.

4. **Bias and Misuse**

AI systems can inherit biases from their training data and produce discriminatory or misleading outputs. When such outputs are published, especially under IP protection, it becomes ethically problematic if there's no clear accountability or way to trace the origin.

ENFORCEMENT CHALLENGES IN AI AND IPR

1. **Lack of Legal Personality for AI**

AI cannot be treated as a legal person under current laws, which means it cannot hold rights or responsibilities. This makes it difficult to assign liability or ownership when AI generates infringing or original works.

2. **Difficulty in Proving Infringement**

AI-generated content can closely mimic styles or replicate aspects of existing

works, making it hard to distinguish between originality and infringement. Proving that a particular AI output violates someone's IP rights is legally complex, especially without transparency in how the AI functions or where its data came from.

3. **Cross-Border Complications**

   AI tools are often developed, trained, and deployed across multiple jurisdictions. If an AI-generated work is created in one country and infringes on IP in another, its unclear which country's laws apply, complicating enforcement.

4. **Lack of Precedents and Guidelines**

   Since AI and IPR is a relatively new field, courts and IP offices often lack clear guidelines or precedents. This results in inconsistent decisions and legal uncertainty for creators, innovators, and companies working with AI.

INDIA'S LEGAL POSITION AND ONGOING EFFORTS ON AI AND IPR

India's current intellectual property laws primarily governed by the Copyright Act, 1957 and the Patents Act, 1970 are not equipped to address the challenges posed by artificial intelligence (AI). These laws are rooted in the notion that creativity and innovation stem from human effort. As such, they fail to recognize AI as a legal entity capable of authorship or inventorship. Consequently, works generated entirely by AI, without meaningful human intervention, are excluded from copyright and patent protection. In these cases, the IP system struggles to provide clarity, leaving AI-generated works in legal limbo.

However, this traditional legal framework is increasingly inadequate in a world where AI plays a growing role in fields such as content creation, music composition, product design, and even scientific discovery. India has yet to pass any comprehensive amendments to adapt IP law to the era of AI. This gap in legislation is compounded by the rapid pace of AI development, which has outstripped the pace at which laws and regulations can adapt. Recognizing the need for reform, India's NITI Aayog (National Institution for Transforming India) has been at the forefront of advocating for the responsible development of AI. In 2018, NITI Aayog published a National Strategy on Artificial Intelligence, which includes recommendations for addressing AI's implications on various sectors, including IPR. The document emphasized the importance

of updating India's IP framework to reflect the changing landscape, but it did not propose specific changes to copyright or patent laws. Instead, it called for further research and multi-stakeholder consultations to develop a framework that balances innovation with the protection of human creators' rights.

In terms of policy development, India has seen increasing attention to AI governance from several committees and working groups. The Ministry of Electronics and Information Technology (MeitY) has initiated dialogues on AI policy and data protection, which touch on intellectual property issues related to AI-driven innovation. Similarly, the Department for Promotion of Industry and Internal Trade (DPIIT) has launched consultations around intellectual property and AI, exploring how AI can influence patent filings and rights management.

The Indian judiciary has also encountered several cases involving AI in recent years, but there have been no landmark decisions directly addressing AI-generated works. Courts have consistently emphasized the need for human involvement in creative and inventive processes. In practice, the Indian Copyright Office and Indian Patent Office reject applications that list AI as the creator or inventor, in line with current law. This approach, while conservative, highlights the judiciary's cautious stance on AI, with the understanding that the existing legal framework is not yet prepared to fully account for AI-driven creation.

Despite these developments, India's approach to AI and IP remains fragmented and somewhat reactive. A specialized committee on AI and IPR, perhaps akin to the UK's Intellectual Property Office (IPO) efforts or WIPO's (World Intellectual Property Organization) ongoing international discussions, could play a significant role in shaping a coherent strategy that addresses the complexities of AI. However, such a committee has not yet been fully established or empowered to propose binding reforms.

Looking ahead, India's efforts to modernize its IP laws will likely revolve around defining the relationship between AI and human authorship/inventorship. India must balance the protection of human creators and innovators with the recognition of AI's role in advancing new technologies. Reforms could include shared authorship models, where both the AI tool and the human creator are credited, or the introduction of new classifications for works generated by AI. Licensing schemes that recognize AI as a tool of creation, with human oversight, might be

another avenue to explore, ensuring that creators, developers, and users benefit from AI's outputs.

POSSIBLE SOLUTIONS FOR AI AND IPR IN INDIA

1. **Amendment of Existing IP Laws**

   One of the most pressing needs is the amendment of India's copyright and patent laws to accommodate AI-generated works. Specifically, the Copyright Act, 1957, and the Patents Act, 1970 need revisions that acknowledge the role of AI in the creation and innovation process.

   a. **Copyright Amendments**: A potential solution could be to introduce provisions that allow for shared authorship between humans and AI. For instance, the AI could be considered as an assistive tool to the creator, and the rights could be attributed to both parties. This approach could help human creators retain their rights while recognizing the importance of AI in the creative process.

   b. **Patent Amendments**: In the case of inventions created by AI, patents could be granted if a human inventor or overseer is involved in the process. New categories or subclasses of inventions could be introduced to address AI-assisted innovations, where human creators still provide oversight, guidance, or critical input.

2. **Creating a New Legal Category for AI-Created Works**

   One possible solution is to introduce a new category of IP protection specifically for works generated by AI. This would recognize AI as a tool used by human creators to produce new types of works, while still protecting the intellectual property in ways that benefit both the creators and developers of the AI systems.

   a. This legal category could ensure that creators who use AI tools to generate content, designs, or inventions are rewarded, while the ownership rights could be divided between the AI developer (for creating the tool) and the user (for guiding and using the tool).

b. **Example**: Similar to how a photographer has rights over photographs they capture but not necessarily over the camera that captures it, this framework could allocate ownership to both the AI creator and the human who directs or supervises the AI's actions.

3. **AI-Specific Licensing Systems**

Another solution could be the development of AI-specific licensing models that recognize the contributions of both the human and the AI in the creation process. This could include:

a. **AI Developer Licensing**: AI developers could receive a percentage of licensing fees or royalties for the commercial use of content generated by AI systems they have created.

b. **User Licensing**: Individuals or companies using AI to generate creative or technological works could have to pay fees to both the AI tool developers and, if applicable, any human collaborators involved in the creative process.

c. These models would need to be carefully designed to ensure fairness, transparency, and adequate compensation for all parties involved, including the developers of the datasets that train AI.

4. **Enhanced Transparency and Accountability in AI Creation**

One of the biggest enforcement challenges is tracing the origin of AI-generated content, especially when it resembles existing copyrighted works. To address this, transparency mechanisms could be implemented, ensuring that AI creators (whether human or machine) provide detailed records about:

a. The data source**s** used to train AI models, ensuring proper licensing and data usage rights are respected.

b. Audit trails of AI-generated works, so that the ownership and origination of the work can be traced back and confirmed.

Such transparency could help enforce copyright laws and ensure that AI systems are used ethically and legally, mitigating potential infringement issues related to unauthorized replication of existing works.

5. **Public Awareness and Ethical Standards**

   In addition to legal solutions, promoting public awareness of ethical issues surrounding AI and IP is vital. This could involve:

   a. **Industry Guidelines**: Encouraging AI developers and IP organizations to collaborate and create ethical standards that govern how AI tools are used to generate creative works. For example, guidelines could stipulate that AI developers disclose the datasets they use and provide credits for human authors where applicable.

   b. **Ethical AI Usage**: Both AI developers and users need to follow a code of ethics ensuring AI is used in a way that benefits society, respects human creativity, and fosters inclusivity in industries like entertainment, education, and research.

6. **International Cooperation and Alignment**

   AI and IP are global issues, and international alignment is critical for creating an effective framework. India can look to international best practices from countries like the US, UK, and European Union, which are beginning to address AI's impact on IP through consultations, policy papers, and even pilot projects.

   a. India could align its IP regulations with international norms while crafting solutions specific to its domestic needs. For example, it could explore treaties or cooperative agreements with WIPO (World Intellectual Property Organization) that allow for smoother enforcement of AI-related IP issues across borders.

   b. Global agreements on AI-specific data protection and ownership could also provide a clearer legal path for Indian innovators and businesses working in international markets.

7. **Establishing Specialized AI and IP Committees**

   To address these challenges systematically, India could set up a dedicated AI-IP policy and regulatory body that works with experts from the fields of AI, IP law, ethics, and technology.

   a. **Policy Recommendations**: This body could provide recommendations for reforming Indian IP laws to accommodate AI, assess the effectiveness of new laws, and create frameworks that help both AI developers and traditional creators navigate the evolving landscape.

   b. **Dispute Resolution**: In the long term, India could establish a specialized dispute resolution body focused on AI-related IP disputes, providing a clearer, more efficient mechanism for resolving issues related to AI-generated works.

CONCLUSION

As artificial intelligence continues to reshape the landscape of creativity and innovation, India finds itself at a critical juncture in redefining its intellectual property framework. The current IP laws, rooted in human-centric notions of authorship and inventorship, fall short of addressing the complexities introduced by AI-generated content. From ethical dilemmas around authorship and data usage to enforcement challenges and the potential displacement of traditional creators, the rise of AI demands urgent legal and policy attention.

While the Indian legal system has taken cautious steps through committee discussions and judicial interpretations, comprehensive reforms are yet to materialize. Moving forward, India must adopt a balanced approach—one that protects human creativity, promotes innovation, and ensures accountability in AI-driven creation. Solutions may include amending existing IP laws, introducing AI-specific legal categories, enhancing transparency, and fostering international cooperation. Specialized committees, licensing models, and ethical frameworks will be key to navigating this transition.

By proactively updating its IP regime, India can not only protect its creators and innovators but also establish itself as a global leader in ethical and inclusive AI governance. The future of

intellectual property in India will depend on how well the legal system evolves to meet the demands of a rapidly changing technological era.