
PERSONALITY RIGHTS AND TRADEMARK LAW: PROTECTING CELEBRITY IDENTITY IN THE DIGITAL AGE

Iram Khan, Jiwaji University

ABSTRACT

Between 2022 and 2025, the Delhi and Bombay High Courts have, one after another, passed orders restricting the unauthorised use of celebrities' voices, faces, catchphrases and even their distinctive styles of dialogue delivery. These cases involve chatbots, GIF-makers, deepfakes and AI voice-cloning platforms. What is interesting is that courts have relied on the doctrine of passing off, which was originally developed to protect businesses from unfair competition and consumer confusion, to protect something as personal as an individual's identity. In doing so, Indian courts have extended the scope of trademark law beyond what it was traditionally meant to cover. This article argues that although passing off has played an important role in protecting celebrity personality rights in India, it may not be sufficient to deal with the challenges posed by artificial intelligence, deepfakes and voice-cloning technology. Indian courts have gradually expanded the application of this doctrine to protect different aspects of a celebrity's identity. However, there are limits to how far this approach can be extended. The article argues that Indian courts have already explored most of the possibilities offered by passing off and that continuing to rely on it may not provide a long-term solution. There are several questions that still remain unanswered. For instance, how should the law deal with a celebrity's voice or image being used to train an AI model? What happens to personality rights after a celebrity's death? And how can the law distinguish between unauthorised use of someone's identity and its use for satire or creative expression? These are important questions, especially as AI technology continues to develop. While courts have been able to provide relief in individual cases, relying on separate court orders to deal with every new situation may not be enough. Therefore, this article argues that India needs a separate law specifically dealing with personality rights, rather than continuing to extend the scope of trademark law. Tennessee's ELVIS Act could provide a useful point of reference while considering such legislation. However, this is not an argument without opposing views. The flexibility of passing off is one of the main reasons why many scholars and judges continue to support its use. Although this

flexibility has helped courts respond to new forms of identity misuse, it may no longer be enough to address the problems created by AI. The law has developed through several individual cases, but many important questions remain unanswered. A separate law could provide greater clarity on these issues instead of leaving their resolution to individual courts through repeated John Doe orders.

Keywords: personality rights, right of publicity, passing off, trademark law, artificial intelligence, deepfakes, celebrity identity, India

INTRODUCTION

The right to one's own face has, somewhat improbably, become one of the more active fronts in Indian intellectual property litigation. Over roughly three years, at least eight Bollywood and Tollywood-adjacent celebrities — Amitabh Bachchan¹, Anil Kapoor², Jackie Shroff³, Arijit Singh⁴, Sadhguru Jagadish Vasudev⁵, and Hrithik Roshan⁶ among them have approached the Delhi or Bombay High Courts seeking injunctions against the unauthorised commercial use of their name, voice, image, or catchphrase. The most recent wave targets generative AI tools capable of cloning a voice from a few seconds of audio, or fabricating a video from little more than a handful of photographs. Every one of these celebrities won, usually within days, often *ex parte*. But each judgment got there through a different doctrinal door passing off, false endorsement, unfair competition, occasionally the moral-rights provisions of the Copyright Act, 1957 and none rested on a registered trademark.

This isn't a complaint about the outcomes, those seem right on the facts. It's a complaint about the method. India simply has no statute that defines a personality right: nothing fixes how long it lasts, nothing says who can exercise it after a celebrity dies, and nothing tells a satirist, a biographer, or an AI developer where homage ends and appropriation begins. Instead, personality rights have grown up as a kind of doctrinal squatter on land owned by trademark

¹ Amitabh Bachchan v. Rajat Nagi & Ors., 2022 SCC OnLine Del 4110 (order dated 25 November 2022, Chawla, J.).

² Anil Kapoor v. Simply Life India & Ors., CS(COMM) 652/2023 (High Court of Delhi, order dated 20 September 2023, Prathiba M. Singh, J.); also reported as 2023 SCC OnLine Del 6914

³ Jaikishan Kakubhai Saraf alias Jackie Shroff v. The Peppy Store & Ors., 2024:DHC:4046 (High Court of Delhi, order dated 17 May 2024, Narula, J.).

⁴ Arijit Singh v. Codible Ventures LLP & Ors., COM IPR Suit (L) No. 23443 of 2024 (High Court of Bombay, order dated 26 July 2024, Chagla, J.); also reported as 2024 SCC OnLine Bom 2445.

⁵ Sadhguru Jagadish Vasudev & Anr. v. Igor Isakov & Ors., CS(COMM) 578/2025 (High Court of Delhi, order dated 30 May 2025, Saurabh Banerjee, J.).

⁶ Hrithik Roshan v. Ashok Kumar (John Doe) & Ors., CS(COMM) 1107/2025 (High Court of Delhi, order dated 15 October 2025, Manmeet Pritam Singh Arora, J.).

and unfair-competition law tolerated, even welcomed, but never handed formal title. That arrangement was tolerable enough back when the worst a defendant could do was sell a look-alike doll or run a misleading TV ad. It stops being tolerable once the defendant is a website that can churn out, in an afternoon, an unlimited stream of a celebrity's voice reading a financial scam script or a platform whose entire business model is voice cloning at scale. This article traces that doctrinal history, works through the recent run of AI-era litigation, and argues that the moment has come for Parliament to do what courts cannot: legislate a personality-rights framework with clear definitions, workable exceptions, and rules built for an age of synthetic media.

In the meantime, the absence of a statute has pushed celebrities and their lawyers toward a workaround registering a name, signature, or catchphrase as a trademark purely to have at least one statutory hook, the Trade Marks Act, 1999, to hang an infringement claim on, even when the real grievance has nothing to do with trademark's usual concerns of goodwill and consumer confusion. That workaround is exactly the problem this article is about. It forces a celebrity to dress a dignity claim in the language of brand assets before a court will listen to what is, underneath, a claim about the misuse of their own face and voice. Amitabh Bachchan, Shah Rukh Khan, and Priyanka Chopra are among the biggest names to have taken this route, registering their own names defensively, in anticipation of exactly the kind of litigation this article discusses. That so many stars have felt the need to do this is itself telling: the right they're actually trying to protect isn't a trademark right at all. It's a personality right, wearing a trademark's clothes, because no better-fitting garment exists yet.

PERSONALITY RIGHTS: A CONCEPTUAL DETOUR THROUGH TRADEMARK

The "right of publicity" is a type of personality rights that safeguards the right of a person's name, image, voice, signature, and other aspects of their identity from unauthorised commercial exploitation. These rights are not the same as copyright which protects creative works, or trademark which protects marks identifying the source of goods/services. Personality rights, however, safeguard the identity of a person. In India however, there is no dedicated statute to protect these rights in particular. Rather, they have used the principles of trademark and unfair competition, including deceptive similarity, likelihood of confusion, goodwill and passing off to safeguard a person's identity. This has made it somewhat challenging, as these are principles that were originally conceived for the protection of businesses and consumers,

not individuals.

Protection of personality rights by trademark principles has been largely spurred by American jurisprudence. The Second Circuit was the first court to hold that the right of publicity was distinct from the right to privacy, in *Haelan Laboratories, Inc. v. Topps Chewing Gum, Inc.*⁷ In a later case, *Zacchini v. Scripps-Howard Broadcasting Co.*, the United States Supreme Court extended the precedent in that case to say that broadcasting an entire performance of a human cannonball act without the performer's consent could be an appropriation of the economic value of the performance.⁸ These cases helped develop the legal understanding of identity, persona and unauthorised commercial use. However, such claims in the United States are still often dealt with under unfair competition law, particularly section 43(a) of the Lanham Act.⁹ Even in the United States, the right of publicity is not governed by one uniform law. Instead, it is recognised through a combination of statutory and common-law principles, with several states having introduced their own laws. India, however, has relied largely on judicial decisions without developing a similar statutory framework. This creates a difference between the two legal systems, as India has adopted some of the principles used to protect personality rights without having a separate legal structure to deal with them.

The main problem with relying on trademark law is that its purpose is different from that of personality rights. Trademark law mainly protects consumers from confusion about the source of goods or services. Its remedies and exceptions are also based on this purpose. Personality rights, on the other hand, are concerned with a person's identity, dignity and control over its commercial use. For example, when a fan buys a T-shirt carrying the image of a film star, the fan is usually aware of whose image is being used and who manufactured the T-shirt. The issue is not necessarily whether the consumer is confused, but whether the celebrity's image has been used for commercial purposes without their consent. Therefore, applying the principles of confusion and goodwill to such situations can create difficulties. Courts have had to use trademark principles to address a type of harm that trademark law was not originally designed to deal with.

⁷ *Haelan Laboratories, Inc. v. Topps Chewing Gum, Inc.*, 202 F.2d 866 (2d Cir. 1953).

⁸ *Zacchini v. Scripps-Howard Broadcasting Co.*, 433 U.S. 562 (1977).

⁹ Lanham Act § 43(a), 15 U.S.C. § 1125(a) (2018).

THE INDIAN DOCTRINAL JOURNEY

Personality rights entered Indian law, fittingly, through a dispute about cricket merchandise. The Delhi High Court refused to grant an interim injunction against an electronics dealer indulging in a promotional scheme referring to the 2003 Cricket World Cup, but in the process, the court observed that the right of publicity is a personality right and not one of an event or an organisation and, therefore, could not be created by means of mere registration.¹⁰ This aside, which left the impression that publicity rights are vested in natural persons, rather than the trademark they may own, is what the case is remembered for, not the verdict.

The next landmark case was *D.M. Entertainment Pvt. Ltd. v. Baby Gift House*, which involved dolls imported from China which resembled singer Daler Mehndi and could sing snippets of his songs. The Delhi High Court issued a permanent injunction, finding that the unauthorised commercial use of a celebrity's personality may be barred on a theory of 'false endorsement' under the torts, and that even if a celebrity's name is not registered, his right to control such use of his persona exists.¹¹ In another case, the same High Court had banned a jewellery store from publishing an ad with Amitabh Bachchan and his wife Jaya Bachchan for a competitor, *Titan Industries Ltd. v. Ramkumar Jewellers*. The court concluded that the absence of more than these two elements—identifiability and unauthorised use—was enough to establish liability, and that consent would be the line between a lawful endorsement and an actionable misappropriation.¹² This argument would be repeated almost word-for-word 10 years later in the same court, when Bachchan obtained an omnibus ex-parte injunction against an entire ecosystem of websites engaged in the KBC-lottery scam using his name, voice and image, relying on *Titan* as precedent for the free-standing publicity right of a celebrity.¹³

The doctrine was the best expressed by the Madras High Court in its decision of *Shivaji Rao Gaikwad v. Varsha Productions*, where the doctrine was expressed outside Delhi. Actor Rajinikanth wanted to halt the release of a Hindi movie, provisionally titled 'Main Hoon Rajinikanth', with a character of his screen avatar, dialogue style and mannerisms that was a caricature of him. Justice Subbiah gave an interim injunction and said that a celebrity is entitled

¹⁰ *ICC Development (International) Ltd v. Arvee Enterprises & Anr.*, 2003 (26) PTC 245 (Del).

¹¹ *D.M. Entertainment Pvt. Ltd. v. Baby Gift House & Ors.*, MANU/DE/2043/2010 (High Court of Delhi, 2010).

¹² *Titan Industries Ltd. v. Ramkumar Jewellers*, 2012 (50) PTC 486 (Del); also reported as 2012 SCC OnLine Del 2382.

¹³ *Amitabh Bachchan v. Rajat Nagi & Ors.*, 2022 SCC OnLine Del 4110 (order dated 25 November 2022, Chawla, J.).

to protection against unauthorised use of his name, image, caricature or manner of delivery where the persona has a commercial value of its own and where there is any proof of confusion or falsity upon proof of identifiability.¹⁴ What is remarkable about this series of cases, and often overlooked in the secondary literature, is that none of these cases are considered to be registered trademark cases. The Madras High Court didn't ask whether Rajinikanth had registered his image as a trademark and the Titan court did not require Bachchan to register his name as a trademark. In substance, the courts were creating a personality right, rather than merely using the language and precedent of the Trade Marks Act, 1999, which does allow a name to be registered as a trade mark in accordance with whose section 2(1)(m) defines a registrable 'mark' inclusively to cover a device, brand, heading, label, ticket, name, signature, word, letter, numeral, shape of goods, packaging, or combination of colours, and whose section 11(1) bars the registration of a mark deceptively similar to an earlier one.¹⁵ The statute is a convenient platform, but what the courts are really protecting is the right to life and personal liberty under Article 21 of the Constitution¹⁶—right to dignity and autonomy of one's identity. In Justice K.S. Puttaswamy (Retd.) v. Union of India, the Supreme Court has given this constitutional reading real teeth, having recognised privacy as a fundamental right, which also includes the right to control the dissemination of personal information, including one's own image.¹⁷

THE DIGITAL AGE RUPTURE

The legal framework that Indian courts have developed to protect personality rights has faced new challenges with the rise of artificial intelligence. The principles of passing off and trademark law were not originally developed to deal with technologies such as AI-generated images, deepfakes and voice cloning. However, courts have increasingly relied on these principles to deal with cases involving the unauthorised use of celebrities' identities. This has led to several important judgments in a relatively short period. In *Anil Kapoor v. Simply Life India & Ors.*¹⁸, the actor approached the Delhi High Court seeking protection against the unauthorised use of his name, image, voice and famous catchphrase, 'Jhakaas'. His identity

¹⁴ Shivaji Rao Gaikwad v. Varsha Productions, O.A. No. 735 of 2014 in C.S. No. 598 of 2014 (High Court of Judicature at Madras, order dated 3 February 2015, Subbiah, J.).

¹⁵ The Trade Marks Act, 1999, s. 2(1)(m) (India).

¹⁶ Constitution of India, art. 21.

¹⁷ Justice K.S. Puttaswamy (Retd.) v. Union of India, (2017) 10 SCC 1.

¹⁸ *Anil Kapoor v. Simply Life India & Ors.*, CS(COMM) 652/2023 (High Court of Delhi, order dated 20 September 2023, Prathiba M. Singh, J.); also reported as 2023 SCC OnLine Del 6914.

was being used in AI-generated videos, GIFs and morphed merchandise circulated through various websites and online platforms. Justice Prathiba M. Singh granted a broad ex-parte injunction and recognised that a celebrity's personality rights also extend to misuse through AI tools, deepfakes and face-morphing technology. The court also observed that such misuse could cause serious and irreparable harm, even where the celebrity did not have a registered trademark.

A few months later, the Delhi High Court dealt with a similar issue in *Jaikishan Kakubhai Saraf alias Jackie Shroff v. The Peppy Store & Ors.*¹⁹ The actor sought protection against the unauthorised use of his name, nicknames such as 'Jaggu Dada' and 'Bhidu', and his voice. The case involved online sellers, AI chatbots and even a restaurant using his nickname. The court protected these aspects of his identity. However, it did not restrain a YouTube parody video, recognising that such content could fall within the protection given to artistic expression. This part of the judgment is important because it shows that protecting personality rights does not necessarily mean restricting every use of a celebrity's identity. The Bombay High Court also dealt with similar issues in *Karan Johar v. Indian Pride Advisory & Ors.*²⁰, where it recognised the filmmaker's personality and publicity rights. The decision was later referred to by the same court in another case. These judgments show that the issue was not limited to one celebrity or one particular form of misuse. Courts in different cases were being asked to protect celebrities against the unauthorised use of their identities through digital platforms and emerging technologies.

Another important development came in *Arijit Singh v. Codible Ventures LLP & Ors.*²¹ The case was different because the singer was not only seeking protection for his name and image but also for his voice, singing style and vocal technique. An AI platform was offering voice-cloning services that could imitate his voice. Justice R.I. Chagla of the Bombay High Court held that a celebrity's personality rights could extend to different aspects of their identity, including their voice, even when no existing song or performance was being used. The court also recognised the risk of such technology being misused for unauthorised commercial purposes. This judgment is particularly relevant because it deals with the use of AI to imitate

¹⁹ *Jaikishan Kakubhai Saraf alias Jackie Shroff v. The Peppy Store & Ors.*, 2024:DHC:4046 (High Court of Delhi, order dated 17 May 2024, Narula, J.).

²⁰ *Karan Johar v. Indian Pride Advisory & Ors.*, Commercial IPR Suit (L) No. 17863 of 2024 (High Court of Bombay, 2024), referred to in *Arijit Singh v. Codible Ventures LLP*, 2024 SCC OnLine Bom 2445, para 16.

²¹ *Arijit Singh v. Codible Ventures LLP & Ors.*, COM IPR Suit (L) No. 23443 of 2024 (High Court of Bombay, order dated 26 July 2024, Chagla, J.); also reported as 2024 SCC OnLine Bom 2445.

a person's voice rather than simply copying an existing recording.

By 2025, courts had begun to deal with these cases through increasingly broad forms of relief. In *Sadhguru Jagadish Vasudev & Anr. v. Igor Isakov & Ors.*²², the Delhi High Court granted what is known as a 'dynamic-plus' injunction. This allowed the plaintiffs to inform online platforms directly about newly discovered infringing content, without having to approach the court every time. The case involved websites using AI-modified videos of Sadhguru to carry out financial scams. The order was intended to address the problem of new infringing content appearing even after legal action had been taken. A similar approach can be seen in *Hrithik Roshan v. Ashok Kumar (John Doe) & Ors.*²³, where the Delhi High Court restrained thirty-three named and unnamed defendants, including major technology platforms, from using AI, deepfakes, machine learning and face-morphing technology to create merchandise, obscene content or false brand associations using the actor's identity. The court also relied on its earlier decisions in the cases involving Anil Kapoor, Karan Johar and Jackie Shroff. This shows how the earlier judgments have gradually become the basis for dealing with newer forms of misuse of celebrity identities.

Taken together, these cases show how Indian courts have tried to protect celebrities from the misuse of their identities in the digital age. However, most of these decisions are interim or ex-parte orders. They provide relief in particular cases, but they do not settle some of the larger legal questions raised by AI technology. For example, it is still unclear how the law should deal with an AI model that has been trained using a celebrity's voice but does not produce any recognisable imitation of it. There are also questions about whether personality rights continue after a person's death and, if so, for how long. Another important issue is how the law should distinguish between an AI-generated parody, which may be protected as freedom of expression, and an AI-generated impersonation that unlawfully uses a person's identity. These questions cannot be answered simply by granting injunctions in individual cases. While courts have been able to respond to different forms of misuse, the legal position on several important issues remains uncertain. A separate law could provide clearer rules on these matters and help establish a balance between protecting personality rights and safeguarding freedom of expression. The growing number of cases therefore raises an important question: whether

²² *Sadhguru Jagadish Vasudev & Anr. v. Igor Isakov & Ors.*, CS(COMM) 578/2025 (High Court of Delhi, order dated 30 May 2025).

²³ *Hrithik Roshan v. Ashok Kumar (John Doe) & Ors.*, CS(COMM) 1107/2025 (High Court of Delhi, order dated 15 October 2025, Manmeet Pritam Singh Arora, J.).

relying on court orders in individual disputes is enough to deal with the challenges created by AI, or whether India now needs a separate legal framework for personality rights.

COUNTERARGUMENTS AND THE COMPARATIVE PICTURE

These decisions are doctrinally defensible but institutionally fragile. All are interim injunctions in response to the specific circumstances of each celebrity's case, issued on a passing-off or 'trademark like' basis which was never intended to provide general solutions. Each new AI platform brings a new celebrity to court to litigate the same legal issue that the previous celebrity had won. It is certainly not a stable method of controlling a rapidly evolving technology and it's an expensive method, too, because it assumes that only the more popular and litigious public figures can afford to police themselves; the lesser-known performers, radio jockeys, regional actors and ordinary private citizens whose faces and voices are stolen for scams have no similar protection.

It is this gap that Tennessee's Ensuring Likeness Voice and Image Security Act of 2024 was built to close. The ELVIS Act essentially expanded the definition of an individual's voice to include voices created by AI or simulated by voice synthesis, and did so in a manner that was more explicit and overt in the statute than in previous case-by-case judicial interpretations of the right of publicity.²⁴ The California longstanding right-of-publicity statute (Civil Code section 3344) also provides a similar statute claim for the unauthorized use of a person's name, voice, signature, photograph, or likeness without any requirement for registration of a trademark or for consumer confusion.²⁵ A similar approach is found in the EU AI Act, which entered into force in 2023, under Article 50 of which providers of AI systems that produce synthetic audio, image or video must label their output as machine-generated or manipulated, and deployers must explicitly state that a published deepfake is synthetic or manipulated.²⁶ None of these three options have been taken up in India. Its closest analogue, the Digital Personal Data Protection Act, 2023, along with the Bill introduced in the Rajya Sabha in December 2025 that amended it, regulates the processing of personal data but it was never intended to and does not grant a right against the unauthorised commercial exploitation of a

²⁴ Ensuring Likeness Voice and Image Security Act of 2024 (ELVIS Act), amending the Tennessee Personal Rights Protection Act of 1984, Tenn. Code Ann. § 47-25-1101 et seq. (effective 1 July 2024).

²⁵ Cal. Civ. Code § 3344.

²⁶ Regulation (EU) 2024/1689 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 13 June 2024 Laying Down Harmonised Rules on Artificial Intelligence (Artificial Intelligence Act), art. 50, in force from 2 August 2026.

person's voice or likeness; it protects data flows, not personas.²⁷ What India has is a judiciary which is engaged in a more or less ad hoc task, and which is resourceful. There is also a simpler access to justice issue under the doctrinal issue. Each plaintiff in the cases discussed above is either a wealthy, well-represented national celebrity who can instruct senior counsel, can pick out dozens of infringing websites, and can get an ex-parte hearing within days, or a celebrity who is a national celebrity. A regional television anchor, a lesser known playback singer or a plain old citizen whose photo has been taken and pasted into a bogus investment brochure has no parallel ability to bring a "passing-off" suit to life. A statute, by contrast, could set out a registration-free, self-executing cause of action available to any identifiable individual, together with a standardised takedown procedure that does not depend on a sympathetic judge improvising a remedy from first principles each time.

TOWARDS A SUI GENERIS FRAMEWORK FOR INDIA

A viable Indian law would have to do five things that passing off cannot. First, it would have to clearly specify the protected attributes (name, voice, signature, image, likeness, and any other indicators of identity) instead of courts having to figure them out anew in each case. Second, it would require a licensing and consent regime which recognizes a personality right as a property right that can be assigned and exclusively licensed, without having to rediscover the first principles that were debated in the Titan and Bachchan cases. Third, it would have to resolve a term of posthumous protection, that the California model doesn't have, but the current case law never had to resolve: whether a deceased celebrity's estate can sue a deepfake maker decades later. Fourth and most urgently, it would need AI-specific provisions that would determine what constitutes 'unauthorised use' when a model's voice or image is used in an AI model without it ever appearing in a recognisable output, a question that was not asked to be determined by any of the 2023–2025 orders because each of those orders involved an output that was clearly recognisable. Fifth, it would have to fix the dynamic-plus injunction which the Delhi High Court improvised in the Sadhguru case, thus effectively creating a statutory take down obligation for intermediaries in the case of copyright infringement, similar to the notice-and-blocking mechanism already available in India's courts.

None of this is exotic. In essence, it is an Indian ELVIS Act, tailored to the constitutional

²⁷ The Digital Personal Data Protection (Amendment) Bill, 2024 (Bill No. 182 of 2024), introduced in the Lok Sabha on 5 December 2025.

framework of India with a focus on the dignity guarantee in Article 21 instead of a bare property right, and explicitly exempting from Article 19(1)(a)'s free speech guarantee.

CONCLUSION

None of the foregoing is infallible and none of the foregoing should be interpreted to suggest the opposite. Scholars have long expressed concerns about the right of publicity, which might be expanded to such an extreme as to become a danger to the freedom of legitimate biography, satire and news commentary. This is a serious objection, not a rhetorical one. Any law which would permit a public figure to prohibit all unflattering AI-generated caricatures would directly conflict with Article 19(1)(a) of the constitution²⁸, which guarantees freedom of speech, just as a broadly worded right of publicity in the US would clash with the First Amendment. The Restatement (Third) of Unfair Competition explicitly tackles it, by acknowledging that the right of publicity extends to section 46, but limiting it to section 47, which protects only works of news reporting, commentary, and works of fiction or nonfiction.²⁹ Any Indian statute that mirrors the ELVIS Act must include similar exceptions: for news reporting, satire and truly transformative work. And, as the Shroff court's refusal to adjudicate a parody video demonstrates, Indian judges seem to know, intuitively, where this line should fall.³⁰

This restriction, more than anything else, bolsters and reinforces the case for legislation, not lessen it. Case-by-case litigation is an ineffective way to make the sharp distinction between parody and misappropriation; it is better to make that distinction once, deliberately, in a statute with clear exceptions, than to let it be made in a piecemeal fashion across different High Courts by a passing-off analysis that no one would have conceived when writing the statute for parody, posthumous rights or AI training data. The slow, incremental development of a personality-rights doctrine in India is the kind of ambiguity that free-speech advocates, AI creators and celebrities would all prefer to see the Parliament deal with instead of a series of John Doe orders.

²⁸ Constitution of India, art. 19(1)(a).

²⁹ Restatement (Third) of Unfair Competition §§ 46–47 (Am. Law Inst. 1995).

³⁰ Jaikishan Kakubhai Saraf alias Jackie Shroff v. The Peppy Store & Ors., 2024:DHC:4046 (High Court of Delhi, order dated 17 May 2024, Narula, J.).

REFERENCES

1. AZB & Partners, 'Bombay High Court Safeguards Celebrity Personality Rights in AI Era: Arijit Singh Case' (30 October 2024).
2. Bar and Bench, 'Delhi High Court Protects Hrithik Roshan's Personality Rights' (23 October 2025).
3. Bananaip, 'D.M. Entertainment Pvt. Ltd. v. Baby Gift House and Ors.', Media and Entertainment Law (14 September 2011).
4. India Law LLP, 'The Delhi High Court Steps In to Protect Sadhguru Jagadish Vasudev's Personality Rights' (25 June 2025).
5. SS Rana & Co., 'Delhi High Court Restrains Unauthorized Use of Personality Attributes of Amitabh Bachchan' (2 December 2022).
6. World Trademark Review, 'Bollywood Singer Prevails in First AI Voice-Cloning Infringement Decision in India' (2024).