METAVERSE AND INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY RIGHTS: NAVIGATING INNOVATION AND PROTECTION IN A VIRTUAL ECONOMY

Kinjal Jain, SVKM's, NMIMS

INTRODUCTION

Think of logging into a virtual universe and being able to purchase a designer handbag for your avatar (the virtual equivalent of a user, the virtual version being present in the virtual universe), go to a concert by your favourite artist, or even purchase virtual real estate that can cost as much as thousands of dollars. No longer science fiction this is the Metaverse, and slowly it is becoming our new virtual universe.

the Metaverse is transforming the way we connect to each other and conduct business on the internet. Combined with new technologies like augmented reality, virtual reality, and blockchain, it creates immersive virtual worlds where people can work out of virtual offices, socialize with their friends in virtual worlds, buy and sell digital and physical goods, and create entirely new forms of entertainment. The game platforms originally created as an entertainment medium are now an actual economic frontier where virtual assets are actual value.

But with this new frontier come a new range of pressing questions. With digital objects now having an economic value, the final question now becomes: who do they belong to? If one copies a designer fashion brand's virtual handbag, uses a trademarked emblem as a virtual asset within a game, or copies an NFT artwork, do conventional intellectual property (IP) law come into play? And if they do, how do they get enforced in an borderless, decentralized world that does not come under a single jurisdiction?

The law is behind. Traditional IP laws, like the Indian Trade Marks Act, 1999 and the Copyright Act, 1957, were conceived out of a physical marketplace.. Their current application is being utilized and stretched beyond which was intended when an item can be copied forever or when a consumer can breach rights from any country with protections, all on a decentralized system that is never really in one place.The Metaverse pushes the limits of what we know about ownership, originality, and protection.

Therein the paradox: companies and independent creators invest enormous time, resources, and intellectual capital into their creations, and rightly want to be protected. Conversely, the Metaverse thrives on openness, experimentation and testing, and freedom to create without traditional limitations. The balance must be struck. Excessive restriction risks killing innovation; insufficient protection bequeaths creators, brands, and consumers a digital "Wild West."

This study examines the manner in which existing intellectual regimes are reacting—or failing to react—to this phenomenon, specifically in regard to litigation concerning NFTs, AIgenerated works, and enforcement in virtual jurisdictions.

Ultimately, the stakes are very high. A carefully crafted balance can only unlock a virtual economy that is innovative, fair, and secure as well. If we Fail to achieve it,then we might risk in creating a future where either creativity is smothered by regulation or innovation runs unchecked without protection. This paper seeks to provide insight for policymakers, legal professionals, technology leaders, and creators into how the Metaverse can be shaped into a space that protects rights without diminishing innovation.

TRADEMARKS IN THE METAVERSE: SAFEGUARDING BRANDS IN VIRTUAL WORLDS

Trademarks are also called the fingerprints of a brand—unique symbols that enable us to recognize and rely on where a product or service originates in an instant. Consider the swoosh for Nike, or the golden arches for McDonald's. These are not logos; these are indicators of reputation, authenticity, and consumer trust. And now, as life and business move more and more into immersive virtual spaces, these same markers of identity are moving with us online.

The Digital Brand Transformation, Imagine going to a virtual shopping mall. Your digital avatar sits on a Nike shoe, or browses at a Reliance digital shop to buy exclusive virtual apparel. Perhaps you even stop at a Tanishq jewellery display in a complete-immersion, three-dimensional environment. Such scenarios are no longer the realm of science fiction—now, they're realities.

Multinationals such as McDonald's and Nike and Indian rivals such as Reliance, Maruti Suzuki, and Tanishq have already started applying for marks that clearly encompass virtual goods and virtual experiences. This is an indication that corporations have sooner rather than later understood that if consumers are ready to pay actual cash for virtual goods, brand credibility and trustworthiness must reach that space.

India's Trade Marks Act, 1999, though comprehensive in all respects, comprising shapes, colors, and even packaging was conceived in a pre-virtual era. It does not directly embrace protection of purely virtual goods or services. But the law is not set in stone. A giant step forward was the 2023 revision of the Nice Classification system, the global system for trademark classification, which formally recognised virtual goods such as NFTs and downloadable virtual jewellery or clothing.

Indian brands are innovative already

• AJIO LUXE mark was registered by Reliance under Class 9 for virtual fashion.

• Tanishq Rivaah collection was launched in the Metaverse with a cinematic jewelry launch.

• Maruti Suzuki has ventured into trademark protection for virtual reality products.

These actions demonstrate that companies are not waiting for legislation to catch up; they are taking action to safeguard their identities as electronic commerce accelerates.

There is a dilemma of Enforcement, though. Having a trademark on paper is one thing.

Enforcing it in the Metaverse is a very different thing.

Try to chase an infringer in some virtual world where people conceal their identities behind avatars and conduct their behavior on millions of sites at once. It's not so much preventing a person from reproducing your store front on a public sidewalk, but more akin to controlling a masquerade ball filled with numerous countries, where each person is anonymous and the rules are different on which room you go into.

The law of the land has not yet sorted out the mechanics. Questions are still outstanding: Is the use of another's trademark on a virtual good equivalent to infringement in the physical world? Whose laws do you use when the infringement takes place in a virtual world that exists on servers across the globe? How do you even identify and prosecute an anonymous user?

The Metaverse trademark dispute is just one echo of a larger truth: our legal infrastructure was designed for the physical world, but commerce is moving to the virtual world. For commerce, the task is to start establishing a digital trademark policy today. For policymakers and attorneys, the task is to craft enforcement mechanisms that will be able to operate effectively in decentralized, borderless worlds.

The Metaverse is not only changing the way we play or buy things—it's changing basic concepts of ownership, identity, and commercial trust. Trademark law might be only a part of this revolution, but it is a critical one. Without it, the look of authenticity that forms the basis of consumer trust is unlikely to survive the move to these virtual spaces.

COPYRIGHTS IN THE METAVERSE: WHEN CREATIVE WORLDS COLLID

Imagine strolling through a virtual art gallery in which each painting, sculpture, and even the structure itself is the creation of a single artist. Imagine this: any person can copy, alter, or sell these works with the click of a button. Welcome to the metaverse copyright crisis—a world of lots of art but which is much harder to protect.

The Creative DNA of Virtual Worlds, Everything you see in virtual worlds while your avatar's hair physics are intricate to the point of almost being photorealistic, and the sounds of a virtual forest surround you—puts thousands of hours of human creativity into play. Digital artists build 3D models, composers compose soundtracks, coders code, and designers build experiences. All of this creative work must be safeguarded, just as a work of art in a physical museum or a song on Spotify.

India's Copyright Act of 1957 does provide some protection in this regard. The Act automatically grants protection to original works the instant they're created and "fixed" in some way—whether a saved file of a 3D model or recorded sound. Even computer programs and databases are covered under the law, so the underlying code that makes virtual worlds go is protected too.

But that's where the picture gets blurry: what about the avatar you spent hours getting just right, or the digital sculpture that you built from ground up with the platform's tools? Current copyright law wasn't written thinking about shared, digital creation.

Bollywood is also trying to embrace the future growth of virtual platform, let's understand through an example in real life, Take the example of Pooja Entertainment's "Poojaverse" venture. They conceptualized a virtual world with which to sell their movie Bade Miyan Chote Miyan, essentially building a branded virtual world. Although the venture has not been fully rolled out yet, it shows how Indian entertainment companies are feeling their way around virtual space to reach out to the audience in a new manner.

This creates interesting questions: If the fans create their own content from the movie in this virtual space, do they own that creative work legally? If someone recreates the scenes from the movie in their virtual space, then what? The distinctions between fan creation, promotion, and possible infringement are elegantly blurred.

Now let's dive in, where the metaverse gets really interesting and complicated at the same time. Unlike the old-fashioned creative endeavors where you write a book or make a painting, virtual worlds are typically collaborative works of art.

Put yourself in this scenario: Where You are in a virtual world where User A from Mumbai creates a beautiful garden, User B from Delhi adds butterflies which can fly, User C from Bangalore adds background music, and User D from Chennai builds a virtual pavilion in the center. All of them used tools provided by the platform, and the platform did contribute textures, physics engines, and hosting as well. Whose is this collaborative work then?

This is not a theoretical problem. Platforms such as Meta's Horizon Worlds (take India as an example, though not available there) face this on a daily basis. When users build virtual worlds using the platform's tools, it is an actual legal problem: Is it more akin to writing a book using Microsoft Word (where, by definition, you own the book), or more akin to using another's art materials and studio space?

And then introduce AI into the mix, and it gets even more confusing. Some metaverse platforms now employ AI to assist in creating content—landscape, texture, even structures. But Indian copyright law, and most legal systems around the world, only recognize human authors. So if AI is employed to create a beautiful virtual landscape, in a legal sense nobody owns the copyright on it.

This leaves a void in the law that's both exhilarating and frightening to creatives. On the positive side, there is content created by AI present in the world. On the negative side, it leaves creatives with no way to safeguard AI-facilitated work using conventional copyright deals.

Metaverse copyright infringement detection is like being a detective in a world where evidence disappears, witnesses go into hiding, and crime scenes are in several dimensions.

While the open internet is open to Google to crawl and index, virtual worlds tend to be closed. If your stolen virtual art design is utilized in a closed virtual world, you will never find out.

The infringement may be:

- Conducted in enclosed virtual rooms
- Incorporated in blockchain platforms' smart contracts
- Spanning several virtual worlds
- Embedded in the greater collective works

This is opening up a new profession: virtual copyright investigators. They use avatars to move around virtual worlds, apply AI software to look for similarities, and operate across platforms to capture infringements.

The courts are slowly catching up in actual court cases:

The NBA 2K Tattoo Case: Tattoo artists sued a video game company for placing their tattoo designs on virtual basketball players. The tattoo artists complained that their art was being used illegally. The court, however, decided in favor of the game makers on the basis of two significant legal principles:

- Fair Use: The tattoos were a mere fraction of a larger work of imagination (the game)
- De Minimis Doctrine: It is a doctrine of law which states that trivial or incidental copying does not constitute infringement. The court held that the tattoos were a minor aspect of the overall game experience and their reproduction did not constitute material copyright infringement

Hermès v. Rothschild: A creator made unauthorized NFT photographs of luxury Hermès handbags and sold them on the web. Hermès brought the suit, claiming this was sheer trademark and copyright infringement. The case demonstrated the way virtual products can compete on equal terms with physical high-end markets.

Indian Context: India has not yet experienced big metaverse copyright cases before its courts so we are still in fairly new legal territory. This is opportunity and threat:

- For Creators: There is doubt about protection because there are no clear precedents, but freedom regarding how copyright principles can be used.
- For Platforms: In Indian virtual world platforms, there is no set rules explicitly stated on their functionality for user-generated content.
- For Users: Content creators in virtual worlds might not know that they are potentially infringing on copyrights—or that their own works are not secure from copying.

What makes this whole area so compelling is that it's fundamentally about human creativity finding new expressions. Whether someone is designing a virtual fashion collection, composing music for a virtual concert, or building architectural marvels in digital space, they're exercising the same creative impulses that have driven art throughout history.

The copyright test is finding the balance between this creativity and facilitating collaborative, remix culture that adds flavor to virtual spaces. It's a question of finding the balance between rights of creators and the open, innovative character of digital spaces.

The metaverse is teaching us that imagination never loses value because it's expressed in pixels instead of paint—but it makes us question some of our basic assumptions regarding ownership, authorship, and creativity in our networked digital world.

WALKING THE TIGHTROPE: CREATIVITY VERSUS CONTROL IN VIRTUAL WORLDS

The Great Virtual Balancing Act, The basic challenge of the metaverse is to balance the rights of intellectual property owners who wish to guard their brands and works of authorship, with the needs of developers and consumers who must be able to enjoy freedom to innovate and to cooperate in virtual worlds.

Suppose you were present at this huge cooperative art festival with thousands of artists converging together in the moment. There are already well-known artists who have dedicated three decades to cultivating their persona and would rather not share their trademarked styles. There are also emerging artists who want to play around and combine old concepts into something new. Now suppose this festival never ends, covers the entire globe, and whatever is created there can be instantly reproduced with exact precision. Welcome to the intellectual property conundrum of the metaverse.

This battle isn't abstract, it's playing out today as virtual worlds become mainstream. On one side, you have companies like Disney or Nike who've invested billions building their brand presence. Of course, they'd want to control how their logos, characters, and designs appear in virtual worlds. On the other side, you have the metaverse itself—built on principles of open creativity, user collaboration, and innovation-busting experimentation.

When Code Becomes the Peacekeeper, Here's where technology comes to some interesting rescue. Imagine smart contracts as never-doze digital referees. These blockchain-based systems can monitor automatically whenever someone makes use of copyrighted content and solve the business aspect instantly.

Let's take an example. You're developing an online music club and wish to add a top Bollywood track. Rather than negotiating complex licensing deals, a smart contract can do the following for you:

• Ensure you are allowed to play the song

•\Calculate the proper payment of royalty

• Pay the money to the rights owner in real-time

•Track the number of listeners of the song within your virtual club

It is like having a microscopic lawyer and accountant embedded in all creative content, negotiating permissions and remuneration on autopilot. It might finally solve the age-old issue of creators needing to stand on the shoulders of existing content without making original creators get appropriately compensated.

The Platform Responsibility Challenge: Virtual world sites are put into a no-win situation. They would like to promote creativity and user-generated content (that's the commodity that their sites offer), but they don't wish to be sued by large brands for trademark infringement.

It's like having a worldwide flea market where millions of sellers open up shop on a daily basis. You can't go through every single thing sold yourself, but you're on the hook when someone begins selling fake branded items like Rolex watches. Sites are building or can build advanced systems to handle this:

• AI-based content scanning that is able to identify possible trademark infringement

• Community reporting features whereby users can report suspicious content

• Bot-driven take-down procedures that facilitate faster removal of the infringing content

•Author authentication tools to authenticate rightful ownership

Fair Use in a Time of No Borders, Fair use is copyright's most vital and least understood provision. It permits individuals to utilize copyrighted work for criticism, teaching, parody, or news reporting without asking permission. But fair use in virtual worlds generates headspinning conundrums.

Examples are:

As Educational Use, A web-based history museum with copyrighted materials for educational purposes, or

As Parody, an avatar dressed in a satirical version of a luxury brand's clothing, or as a Commentary, A mock news program with excerpts of copyrighted entertainment The issue is that virtual worlds render these distinctions hard to tell apart. Is a virtual replica of a parodic fashion show of actual brands educational commentary or commercial competition? The answer will likely be context-dependent, which is hard to discern in virtual worlds.

The Wild West of Virtual IP Enforcement, For IP owners who would like to enforce their rights in the metaverse, the challenges are certainly daunting. Here is what they have to deal with:

The Invisibility Problem, Unlike physical counterfeiting, where the fake products appear in open markets, virtual infringement is able to occur in concealed digital environments. You might be selling counterfeit branded virtual goods in a concealed virtual room you invite your visitors to enter. It is like attempting to police trademark infringement occurring in a million concealed homes simultaneously.

The Identity Puzzle, Virtual worlds are based on pseudonymous activity in which users are concealed behind fictitious avatars and nicknames, making it virtually impossible to determine actual individuals behind IP abuse. In contrast to traditional commerce based on verifiable identity and addresses, the metaverse permits users to have access to multiple accounts, switching digital personas at will, that conceal their actual affiliation.

This anonymity is then supplemented by global servers, VPNs, and technological capabilities that conceal users' locations across various countries. Even if the IP owners are making choices regarding blatant infringement, they do not have any way to attribute the activity to a real person who can be served with papers within the law or held responsible.

This generates a broad incompatibility between physical world legal systems and virtual space anonymity, with owners of IP having few options even when IP infringement is established and standard intellectual property protection mechanisms fail.

The Jurisdiction Maze, the boundary-less character of virtual worlds makes enforcement of IP in law uncertain. Metaverse transactions typically involve users, platforms, and servers in various countries, so it is not certain which country's laws are applicable or whose court has jurisdiction in the event of a dispute.

Such jurisdictional confusion erodes effective IP protection and requires firms to have to battle costly suits in multiple nations at once, doubling cost and complexity. Without universal standards of metaverse litigation in place, brands are confronted with a patchwork legal environment where traditional enforcement mechanisms are helpless to keep up with the virtual nature of international commerce.

The Speed Problem, Virtual goods are copied and resold at light speed. It is too long before a brand becomes aware of infringement and acts to stop it, with thousands of copies already in existence on most sites.

False Advertising in Virtual Wonderlands**,** Virtual worlds possess an interactive aspect that brings new room for fraudulence. If you see a Nike shop in the real world, you are going to think Nike owns it. But in virtual worlds, it is possible for anyone to make a very realisticlooking Nike shop, with branded virtual products and Nike's trademark marketing strategy.

It puts them psychologically vulnerable. When someone is totally immersed in a virtual world, their defenses can be down. They might believe that professional-looking virtual branded content somehow has the stamp of approval of the officials. The result is that fake endorsements and counterfeit branding in virtual worlds can be more convincing than ever on the internet.

AI makes this worse by personalizing experiences. If the program knows you like Nike merchandise, it could give you fake Nike material that looks completely real, and this makes cheating more sophisticated and efficient.

The Indian Legal Vacuum, India is in a very interesting place. India boasts a strong IT sector and a developing virtual world interest, but its courts have not yet ruled in significant metaverse IP cases which is opportunity and uncertainty:

The Opportunity: Indian judicial precedents for virtual IP can have a global standard-setting role, especially since India's influence is so massive globally in terms of technology.

The Uncertainty: Indian businesses do not know how the courts would interpret the current laws to virtual goods and services.

Foreign precedents like Hermès v. Rothschild, Nike v. StockX etc are creating precedents that can impact Indian courts:

- Nike v. StockX: Set the precedent that Unauthorized production of NFTs of physical goods may be trademark infringement
- Hermès v. Rothschild: Proved that virtual replicas of luxury goods can compete with real ones head-to-head

Building Bridges, Not Walls

The answer is not to close down innovation or disregard IP rights. It's to design systems that honor both. It's like city planning: you've got speed limits and traffic lights to make cars safe, but you've got to have roads where traffic can move freely.

Already, smart platforms are trying out hybrid models:

- Revenue-sharing arrangements in which original creators automatically receive a share when their content is being utilized
- Collaboration tools for creators to share easily permission and profit-sharing
- User-moderated sites where users themselves identify and report infringement
- Open attribution systems with explicit statements of who did what

The Human Factor, At its core, this isn't a technical or legal issue—it's human imagination and how we handle it. The metaverse is providing an unprecedented level of collaborative creation, where a person in Mumbai can collaborate with a person in São Paulo to produce something that each could not have conceived of individually.

The question is how to maintain this co-creative attitude and make it possible for individuals who invest time, money, and creativity creating content and brands to be able to safeguard their creations. It is about building virtual worlds in which innovation is encouraged but creativity is valued.

As virtual economies grow up and more individuals are spending real-world money on virtual objects and experiences, it is important that this right be in place. The choices we make today regarding how to treat IP in virtual worlds will determine how creative work is protected and shared for the next few decades.

The metaverse isn't transforming entertainment or commerce alone—it's compelling us to reexamine basic questions of ownership, authorship, and equity in a networked digital world where the rules we know don't even apply, but new ones have yet to be codified.

CONCLUSION

As we head for a virtual revolution, the metaverse is actually transforming the shape of business, creativity, and ownership. From virtual Nikes to Bollywood's ventures into virtual entertainment spaces, the union of the physical and virtual is no longer a theoretical prospect, it's already a reality, with real money changing hands and real business value being generated in virtual space.

The journey through trademark protection, copyright conflicts, and the fine line between innovation and over-control is a highly complex terrain in which centuries-old legal boundaries are being stretched to the breaking point. Indian companies like Reliance, Tanishq, and Maruti Suzuki are already making their mark in virtual worlds, understanding brand protection in cyber space is not a choice but a requirement for success in the future. In the meantime, the 2023 revisions to world-wide classification systems indicate that the world of law is finally waking up to technological reality.

And the problems remain daunting. Virtual infringement's invisibility, anonymity of digital players, and jurisdictional puzzles' maze make enforcement nightmares unthinkable in strictly physical commerce. When one transaction crosses one, multiple countries, sites, and legal systems, the basis of how we enforce intellectual property rights is called into question.

Most deeply, however, the metaverse presents to us some extremely fundamental questions about the very essence of creativity. When computers are generating content, when global consumers are collaborating to create virtual works of art, and when the line between original content and collaborative mashup is blurred, our existing concepts of ownership and authorship must be rewritten on some extremely fundamental levels.

The future is not protection or innovation, but a vision of laws and technologies that allow both. Smart contracts already promise automated solutions to licensing and royalty distribution. Platform responsibility models are adapting to balance freedom of creativity with brand safety.

Global legal precedents are gradually developing norms for virtual goods and services.

For India, it is a massive opportunity and a moment of destiny. With its robust system of law and international leadership in technology, Indian legislatures and courts can set international standards for metaverse intellectual property. Decisions today—whether in boardrooms, courtrooms, or legislatures—will determine whether the metaverse expands as an open, innovative space that honors creative rights or as hobbled by the same constraints that at times have suppressed innovation in physical markets.

The metaverse is not a new location in which to sell products or gaze upon things—it's a human experiment for society to work out ownership, creativity, and justice in a virtual world. Those models of intellectual property we construct today won't simply define how virtual worlds unfold, but how future generations will approach creative expression, collaborative innovation, and the worth of human imagination in a world where anything can be replicated, remixed, or passed around in the blink of an eye.

As virtual economies develop and increasing real resources are invested in virtual life, getting it right becomes not just a matter of law but morality. The objective is to make virtual worlds that foster innovation, reward creativity, make collaboration easier, and allow creators, from individual players to large brands, to own and profit from their contribution to our collective digital future. The new law hasn't been drafted, and the old ones don't fit. But in this time of transition, we can do better: intellectual property regimes that incentivize creators while also supporting the kind of boundary-breaking collaboration that makes virtual worlds enchanting.

The decisions we make today will resonate in virtual worlds for generations to come.