
AI-GENERATED WORKS: AUTHORSHIP, OWNERSHIP, AND CONSTITUTIONAL RECOGNITION: A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF THE EU, US, AND INDIA

Prachi Garg, National Law University, Delhi

CHAPTER 01- INTRODUCTION:

The way the world views creativity and invention has changed as a result of the development of artificial intelligence. Today, machines are capable of creating paintings, poetry, music, and even inventions that previously required human creativity. The conventional wisdom that authorship and ownership in intellectual property law belong exclusively to humans is being challenged by this quick change. The legal definitions of "authorship" and "originality" are becoming increasingly ambiguous as artificial intelligence starts to function as a creative collaborator or even as an independent creator.

The fundamental tenet of copyright law has always been authorship. It guarantees that artists are acknowledged and have authority over their creations. But it becomes challenging to determine the true author when a computer or algorithm creates a piece with little human input. Which party should now own the work—the programmer, the person entering the instructions, the system's owner, or the work itself not be copyrightable at all? These issues challenge the limits of creativity, responsibility, and rights in a digital society, making them not only technical but also moral and constitutional in nature.

Different jurisdictions have attempted to address these issues in their own peculiar ways. The United States emphasizes that creativity must originate from human intellect by maintaining the requirement of clear human authorship for copyright protection. With its recent Artificial Intelligence Act and copyright directives, the European Union has begun to establish more comprehensive frameworks that promote openness and human supervision in the application of AI. In India as well many questions remain unanswered in the context of autonomous AI systems despite the fact that the Copyright Act defines an author of a computer-generated work as the person who causes the work to be created. When taken as a whole, these various strategies demonstrate that there is still a need for a consistent and equitable solution to

determine the aforementioned issues.

The ownership issue is just as complicated. On the one hand, giving owners or developers of AI systems rights might promote innovation and investment. On the other hand, it could also erode human creators' rights and make it harder to distinguish between mechanical production and creative authorship. Fairness and innovation must thus be balanced carefully. The free flow of creative content and consumer rights may also be impacted by businesses' or tech platforms' overreach in controlling AI-generated content. This brings up more general issues regarding access, justice, and economic concentration in the creative industries.

This debate also has a deeper ethical and constitutional component. Fundamental principles like the right to property, freedom of expression, and appreciation of individual creativity are all connected to intellectual property in many legal systems. These principles are violated when an artificial entity is given authorship or ownership. This further highlights the core dilemma as regards to AI generated works that whether something can be considered as creative, even if it does not originate from consciousness or intellect of the human brain and whether protecting such a bot generated work actually benefits the society in any way or not?

Through a comparative analysis of the US, India, and the EU, this research paper investigates these issues. It seeks to comprehend how each legal system interprets authorship and ownership in the era of artificial intelligence, as well as how these interpretations are influenced by their respective constitutional and policy frameworks. The study also looks at whether current legal frameworks can be modified to allow for AI-generated content and its protection through intellectual property laws or if completely new legal frameworks are needed to handle this new development. The discussion takes off on an overview of the theoretical and legal bases of authorship and originality. It proceeds to comparative examination of the three jurisdictions, pointing out similarities, contrasts, and emerging trends. The subsequent sections discuss the constitutional and ethical implications of acknowledging AI-generated works and culminate with remarks on how intellectual property law can strike a balance between human creativity, technological innovation, and constitutional principles in the future.

CHAPTER 02- CONCEPTUAL AND LEGAL FRAMEWORK:

Artificial intelligence has changed and evolved the arena of creation and generation of works by providing for an altogether new medium of creation ie creation by bots or machines. These

bots and machines are efficient enough to produce and generate all kinds of creative outputs. This development calls into question the conventional view of authorship and ownership under intellectual property law, which has always been predicated on human creativity. This chapter explains the legal definitions of authorship, originality, and ownership as well as how AI-generated works are now raising doubts about these concepts.

2.1- Authorship and Originality-

According to copyright law, an author is a person who creates a work using their creativity, talent, and hard work. Being original indicates that the work was not copied or produced mechanically, but rather originated from the creator's own ideas and judgment. According to this theory, creativity entails conscious decision-making by the mind.

But this is not how AI creates. It automatically generates results, discovers patterns, and learns from vast volumes of data. Its work is devoid of any subjective intention, sentiment, or idea. The machine is not aware of or sensitive to what it is producing. As a result, it is challenging to refer to its output as "original" in the conventional legal sense.

¹Camille Alegre points out that creativity and automation are mutually exclusive. According to her, AI systems are not conscious or intentional, whereas intellectual property law has always depended on human cognition, emotion, and decision-making. This implies that although AI is capable of producing seemingly creative content, it is not subject to the creative process that is protected by the law. Thus, authorship still requires some degree of human control or creative decision-making according to contemporary legal theory. When the entire process is automated, the meaning of originality is lost as human intellect is nowhere to be found in that process.

2.2- Ownership and Attribution-

Ownership over a creation or invention is usually determined post identification of the author. Unless an agreement or employment contract transfers ownership, the author becomes the first Owner of the rights. However, it's not always possible to identify the author when using AI. In

¹ Camille Alegre, 'Between Device and Demiurge: AI and the Legal Status of AI Creations' in Véronique Guèvremont and Colette Brin (eds), *Intelligence artificielle, culture et médias* (Les Presses de l'Université Laval 2024)

an attempt to address this problem, the Indian Copyright Act of 1957 declares that the author is the one who creates computer-generated works. However, this only functions when a human clearly guides the procedure. There might not be a distinct "creator" when AI functions on its own.

²According to Yash Parashar and Nupur Dhaneriya, this legal loophole may result in injustice. They contend that even when users provide ideas or input, many businesses use restrictive licensing to claim ownership of AI-generated outputs. People who use or train AI systems lose control over the outcomes they helped create, which leads to an imbalance.

Since the person who controls or owns the AI system facilitates and supervises its creation, some legal scholars recommend granting ownership to that person. The law would become more predictable as a result. It might, however, also result in the ownership of nearly all AI generated content by big corporations, which would restrict public access and concentrate rights.

2.3 Human creativity V. Mechanical creativity-

Another profound question is whether AI creativity could be treated similarly to Human creativity? Arguments that favour human creativity suggest that protection should only be extended to human generated works as creativity is the reflection of emotion and individuality which are only possessed by human beings and not bots or algorithms. AI, hence, could merely be seen as a tool that supports human creation. The opposing view to this argument also exists, opponents argue that as technology advances, the law should also change. ³For example, Ally Kaden contends that denying protection to AI-generated works could impede innovation. She even suggests creation of a separate intellectual property office to handle AI-related applications and suggests that laws be updated to acknowledge AI's role in creation. She thinks that this would provide a clear legal framework for innovation to flourish. But there's a possibility that giving machines or software legal rights could undermine the very purpose of intellectual property law in general. Rewarding human ingenuity and promoting knowledge exchange have always been the objectives of copyright and patent law. The benefit to society could be minimal if rights are granted to non-human entities; instead of advancing cultural

² Nupur Dhaneriya and Yash Parashar, 'Artificial Intelligence and Intellectual Property: Legal Ownership in the Age of Autonomous Creation' (2025) 7(2) IJFMR 1.

³ Ally E Kaden, 'The AI Intellectual Property office of the Future: A Proposal to Grant Authorship and Inventorship Rights to AI' (2023) 52 Hofstra L Rev 175.

advancement, it might benefit corporations who own these softwares, bots and algorithms.

2.4- Moral and Constitutional considerations-

Ownership and authorship are based on values as much as the law. They relate to the rights to property, freedom of speech, and human dignity. In many nations, promoting human creativity for the benefit of the general public serves as the rationale for protecting intellectual property. For instance, in India, constitutional rights like the right to free speech and the right to own property are associated with creativity. These human-centered values would be called into question if AI were acknowledged as an author. The law would have to acknowledge that, despite their lack of moral responsibility and consciousness that machines are capable of creative thought.

This leads to a larger philosophical question that whether the law can acknowledge creativity without intention and whether doing so would benefit society as a whole? If the goal of intellectual property law is to ensure advancement in the society, then granting machines rights might not accomplish that. Rather, it could restrict access to information and consolidate power in a small number of hands.

2.6- The Way forward-

Countries all over the world are still trying to find the ideal balance. Some, such as the UK, give the person who organized the creation of computer-generated works the title of author. Others have started to acknowledge AI as an inventor under patent law, including South Africa and Australia. Human authorship is insisted upon and preferred by the US, EU, and India. As of yet, there is no universal and straight-jacket solution. Promoting technological innovation and upholding the moral and cultural significance of creativity are two objectives that the law must be balanced. Both must be supported by an equitable and forward-thinking intellectual property system that keeps human creativity at its core but also does not impede innovation by completely rejecting mechanical creativity.

CHAPTER 03- COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF LEGAL APPROACHES IN THE EU, UNITED STATES, AND INDIA

Regarding authorship and ownership of works produced by artificial intelligence (AI), various nations have taken distinct stances. All three jurisdictions—the US, India, and the EU—

acknowledge copyright and patent protection as means of encouraging innovation and rewarding creativity, but they differ on one important issue: whether or not works produced by artificial intelligence (AI) should be treated legally on par with those produced by humans.

This chapter contrasts the ways in which these three legal systems interpret ownership, originality, and authorship in the era of artificial intelligence. Additionally, it highlights the key parallels, divergences, and new developments.

3.1- The European Union Approach-

The European Union places a lot of emphasis on the notion that human thought is the source of creativity. The foundation of EU copyright law is the idea that a work must represent the "author's own intellectual creation." This expression originates from Court of Justice of the European Union (CJEU) case laws such as the ruling in *Infopaq International A/S v. Danske Dagblades Forening*. It implies that the piece must demonstrate the free will and inventiveness of a human being.

Since AI-generated works lack human personality and creative decision-making, they are unlikely to be eligible for copyright protection under this standard. Nonetheless, a human can still be regarded as the author in cases where they control the output and use AI as a tool.

EU has also taken preliminary measures such as advent of legislations like the EU Artificial Intelligence Act (2024) to regulate AI more widely and prominently. This Act seeks to guarantee that AI systems are open, secure, and used responsibly even though it does not grant AI copyright rights. This illustrates the cautious stance taken by the EU, which prioritizes human accountability while promoting innovation.

However, legal experts like Rita Matulionyte and Jyh-An Lee observe that European thought is gradually shifting away from rigid ideology and toward workable solutions.⁴ They contend that by tying legal rights to human accountability, transferring ownership to the Humanistic and individualistic running or managing of the AI system may increase certainty. In subsequent reforms, this might end up being the EU's middle ground.

⁴ Rita Matulionyte and Jyh-An Lee, 'Copyright in AI-generated Works: Lessons from Recent Developments in Patent Law' (2022) 19(1) *SCRIPTed* 5

3.2- The United States of America Approach

Regarding AI authorship, the US adopts the strictest stance. Only human authors are eligible for copyright protection, according to numerous declarations made by the US Copyright office and courts. The argument goes that "the fruits of intellectual labor" that are "founded in the creative powers of the mind" are protected by copyright.

The court affirmed in the *Thaler v. Perlmutter* (2023) case that an artwork created solely by artificial intelligence could not be protected by copyright since there was no human creator.⁵ Similarly, even in well-known cases like the DABUS applications, the US Patent and Trademark office denied patent applications that named AI as the inventor.

According to Ally Kaden, this human-only perspective is outdated and could stifle creativity.⁶ She suggests two changes to the Copyright and Patent Acts: first, adding AI systems to the list of "authors" and "inventors"; and second, establishing a new AI Intellectual Property office with a focus on AI-related applications. According to Kaden, such changes would help the US keep up its technological leadership and prevent AI investment from moving to other areas with more lenient legal systems.

Critics counter that acknowledging AI as an author might violate the Progress Clause of the US Constitution, which links copyright to the advancement of human knowledge and creativity. It might not fulfill that constitutional goal if machine-generated works are granted protection. Thus, the US continues to insist on human authorship, leaving AI outputs unprotected unless a human can be identified as having made a meaningful creative contribution.

3.3- The Indian Approach-

India's strategy is less clear-cut than the EU's but more adaptable than the US. The Indian Copyright Act, 1957 recognises a special category for computer-generated works. The author is defined as "the person who causes the work to be created" in Section 2(d) (vi). This implies that a human can claim authorship if they instruct a computer program or artificial intelligence

⁵ *Thaler v Vidal* 43 F 4th 1207 (Fed Cir 2022) (United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit) ⁶ Ally E Kaden, 'The AI Intellectual Property office of the Future: A Proposal to Grant Authorship and Inventorship Rights to AI' (2023) 52 Hofstra L Rev 175.

system to produce something.

⁶But when AI behaves on its own, as Yash Parashar and Nupur Dhaneriya note, this rule becomes ambiguous. It is challenging to apply this definition in the absence of discernible human input or guidance. They also point out that, even in cases where users contribute substantial creative input, businesses frequently assume ownership through licensing agreements that grant them authority over AI-generated outputs. This creates practical and ethical concerns about fairness and ownership.

Indian courts have not yet made any clear ruling as regards AI authorship although previous cases exist on originality such as the *Eastern Book Company v. D.B. Modak* (2008) which highlighted human creativity and skill as pertinent components of originality and subsequent rights to authorship. This implies that authorship is still seen as a human activity in India. Nonetheless, the incorporation of computer-generated works in India demonstrates that the legal system is at least flexible.

Indian authorities have also taken a cautious approach to patent law. Similar to the US and EU, the Indian Patent office has denied applications that list AI as an inventor. However, policy debates indicate a growing understanding of the necessity of precise regulations to handle innovations brought about by AI.

3.4- Determining Similarities and differences –

All three jurisdictions have a number of obvious similarities:

- As of right now, none acknowledges AI as a legitimate author or inventor.
- They all insist on a human connection, whether it be causation element (India) or direct creativity (EU, US).
- Every system is finding it difficult to strike a balance between creativity, justice, and accountability.

The primary distinctions are found in their degree of flexibility:

⁶ Nupur Dhaneriya and Yash Parashar, 'Artificial Intelligence and Intellectual Property: Legal Ownership in the Age of Autonomous Creation' (2025) 7(2) IJFMR 1

- The EU maintains a strong moral and personal connection between the author and their work while permitting a limited amount of human-AI collaboration.
- The US upholds a rigorous human requirement, considering authorship to be connected to a purpose.
- Although it is unclear for completely autonomous systems, India takes a middle ground by permitting the "person who causes" the work to be created to claim authorship.

These differences are a reflection of larger constitutional and cultural values. India blends pragmatic adaptability with human-centered ideals, the US places a higher priority on economic incentives and constitutional purpose, and the EU places a greater emphasis on moral rights and human dignity.

3.5- Emerging Comparative Trends-

One pattern is evident in all three regions: the legal system is finding it difficult to keep up with technological advancements. Lawmakers and courts are attempting to apply outdated definitions of originality and authorship to new forms of creativity that don't fit within those parameters.

Hybrid approaches, in which AI is acknowledged as a tool but not as a separate right-holder, are gaining traction. The emphasis is now on determining which person or entity is most accountable for the creation, be it the owner of the AI system, the user, or the programmer.

⁷S. Alex Yang and Angela Zhang point out that by discouraging human involvement, excessive protection for AI outputs may actually undermine creativity and competition. Future reforms must therefore seek to promote innovation while maintaining the importance of human creativity and accountability.

Ultimately, all three jurisdictions are working toward the same objective: striking a balance between human values and technological advancement. The issue is not whether AI is capable of creating, but rather how the law can be changed to guarantee that this kind of creation

⁷ S Alex Yang and Angela Huyue Zhang, 'Generative AI and Copyright: A Dynamic Perspective' (2024) London Business School working paper

advances society rather than threatens it.

CHAPTER 04 - CONSTITUTIONAL AND ETHICAL DIMENSIONS TO CONSIDERATION OF AI AS THE 'AUTHOR' OR THE 'INVENTOR'

The question that whether AI could be determined as an 'Author' or 'inventor' in the domain of intellectual property laws is no longer merely a legal one but also has constitutional and ethical implications. The principles of fairness, human ingenuity, and public benefit form the foundation of intellectual property law. Both international agreements and national constitutions uphold these ideals. The very basis of these principles is called into question when rights are granted to machines that lack a mind, intention, or moral sensibility.

This chapter looks at the ethical discussions surrounding personhood, accountability, and justice as well as how constitutional notions of creativity and advancement relate to AI-generated works.

4.1- The Constitutional Purpose of Intellectual Property –

The goal of copyright and patent protection in the majority of legal systems is to benefit the general public as well as to compensate creators. Its goal is to promote creativity, education, and cultural development.

This concept originates in the United States from the Constitution's Progress Clause, which grants Congress the authority "to promote the progress of science and useful arts." The language makes it apparent that author and inventor protection serves as a tool for achieving a goal that is not personal benefit but rather public advancement. Giving authorship to AI systems that don't have human intent, therefore, might not align with this constitutional objective. Machines are not motivated by rewards or recognition, nor do they require incentives to generate works.

However, legal experts like Ally Kaden contend that a complete exclusion of AI could hinder innovation and hinder technological advancement.⁸ According to Kaden, amending the legislation to recognize AI as a possible author or inventor would be consistent with the Constitution's objective of fostering advancement. Others counter that this would turn a human-

⁸ Ally E Kaden, 'The AI Intellectual Property office of the Future: A proposal to grant Inventorship and authorship rights to AII' (2023) 52 Hofstra L Rev 175

centered right into a technical entitlement by interpreting the term "author" in a way that goes beyond what the framers intended.

Copyright law in the European Union is also based on moral and constitutional principles. Human dignity and personality are linked to the protection of creative works in the EU Charter of Fundamental Rights. In addition to being a financial tool, copyright acknowledges the author's personal connection to their work. Therefore, granting non-human entities rights would go against this moral tenet.

4.2- The Indian Constitutional Perspective-

Both statutory law and constitutional principles influence intellectual property rights in India. Although intellectual property is not specifically mentioned in the Constitution, two important clauses are reflective of jurisprudence regarding it.

First, the freedom of speech and expression, which encompasses the freedom to generate and disseminate ideas, is safeguarded by Article 19(1) (a). Only when people are in charge of their artistic creations does this freedom have any real meaning. Second, the right to property, including intellectual property, is protected by Article 300A.

The fact that creativity is a social and personal activity is reflected in these rights. It is social because it advances public knowledge and personal because it involves human expression. This equilibrium would be upset if AI were acknowledged as an author. It would grant property rights to beings devoid of morality, consciousness, or the capacity for human thought.

As Yash Parashar and Nupur Dhaneriya point out, the matter is not just about ownership but also about equity.⁹ AI could limit opportunities for human creators and consolidate power in a small number of hands if businesses use it to produce and manage enormous volumes of creative content. Such a system might be in opposition to the public's right to knowledge and the equality aimed for by the constitution.

Therefore, from an Indian standpoint, any acknowledgement of AI authorship must guarantee that the public interest and human ingenuity continue to be at the forefront of the legislation.

⁹ Nupur Dhaneriya and Yash Parashar, 'Artificial Intelligence and Intellectual Property: Legal Ownership in the Age of autonomous creation' (2025) 7(2) IJFMR 1

4.3- Ethical dimensions: Individuality and Accountability

Two main questions are at the centre of the ethical discussion surrounding AI-generated authorship:

- (1) Can law view status of a machine/Bot/Algorithm that to a 'Person'?
- (2) Who is accountable for the output of the machine/Bot/Algorithm?

Artificial intelligence is devoid of emotion, intention, and consciousness. It is unable to accept accountability for their actions or comprehend the moral ramifications of their actions. Thus, acknowledging it as 'author' would establish a class of rights devoid of obligations.¹⁰ According to Camille Alegre, moral judgment and awareness are prerequisites for creativity in its purest form, which AI systems lack. They mimic patterns but lack comprehension of meaning or intent.

This leads to arising of another ethical and practical concern of 'accountability'. Who is at fault if an AI system produces offensive or illegal content—the AI itself, the user, or the programmer? Every creative act is assumed to have a responsible human agent under current laws. This chain of accountability breaks if AI is given authorship.

However, it might also be unfair to entirely disregard AI's contributions. In creative processes, modern machines can support or even surpass humans. Therefore, a balanced strategy is required, one that acknowledges human control, upholds accountability, and fosters innovation without giving machines legal personhood.

4.4- Public Interest and Cultural Balance

Benefiting society is the deeper goal of intellectual property law. The purpose of the law is to encourage artists to share their creations with others, not to protect them for their own sake thinking they'd get no economic benefit out of sharing. Giving AI-generated outputs the same legal protection as human-made works could result in an overabundance of copyright-protected automated works, which would leave less room for human creativity.

¹⁰ Camille Alegre, 'Between Device and Demiurge: AI and the Legal Status of AI Creations' in Véronique Guèvremont and Colette Brin (eds), *Intelligence artificielle, culture et médias* (Les Presses de l'Université Laval 2024)

¹¹Angela Zhang and S. Alex Yang caution that excessive protection for AI outputs may be detrimental to social welfare. They contend that it could restrict access to creative content, deter human artists, and consolidate rights in large corporations. Therefore, from an ethical perspective, the law should treat AI outputs as public resources that can spur additional innovation while simultaneously protecting human effort and originality.

The public interest test serves as an ethical compass in this sense. Encouraging technological advancement while maintaining open, diverse, and human-driven cultural development should be the aim to achieve a fair balance.

4.5- The Path Ahead:

AI should continue to be a tool, not a proprietor of rights, according to both ethical and constitutional reasoning. Instead of focusing on the AI itself, legal protection should target the people who created the system, whether they be developers, users, or organizations that direct its use.

But as technology develops, it will become increasingly difficult to distinguish between human and machine creativity. New types of recognition, like joint authorship, sui generis rights, or licensing frameworks that recognize AI involvement without bestowing full legal personhood, might be necessary in the future.

Whichever model is selected, it must uphold the original intent of intellectual property law, which was to ensure justice in the era of intelligent machines, reward human ingenuity, and advancement of the common good.

CHAPTER 05- CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Intellectual property (IP) law has undergone a sea of change as a result of artificial intelligence (AI). Beyond legal interpretation, the issue of whether AI qualifies as an author or inventor further raises issues of human dignity, creativity, and social justice. The United States, India, and the European Union are all having difficulty striking the correct balance between promoting innovation and protecting human creativity, as was evident in previous chapters.

¹¹ S Alex Yang and Angela Huyue Zhang, 'Generative AI and Copyright: A Dynamic Perspective' (2024) London Business School working Paper

None of these jurisdictions currently acknowledge AI as an author or inventor. Whether through control, causation, or intellectual effort, they all insist that authorship must have a human component. However, due to the speed at which technology is developing, current legal definitions are becoming less and less equipped to handle the intricate reality of machine generated creativity.

Key Findings:

From the comparative analysis, three main conclusions can be drawn:

First, the concept of authorship is still very much a part of awareness of the human mind. It is believed that creativity is the result of intention, feeling, and thought.¹² According to Camille Alegre, intellectual property law is based on this connection between creativity and mental activity. AI's outputs cannot meet this requirement in the conventional sense because it lacks consciousness and moral judgment.

Second, there are new issues with ownership of AI-generated content. The author of computer generated works is defined by the Indian Copyright Act as the "person who causes the work to be created," but this definition falters when AI acts on its own. In contrast, direct human authorship is still required in the US and the EU.¹³ According to the "AI-owner" model put forth by academics such as Rita Matulionyte and Jyh-An Lee, the controller or operator of the AI system may be regarded as the owner of the rights. This strategy increases clarity, but it also runs the risk of concentrating ownership in big businesses, which would limit access and fairness.

Third, the debate's ethical and constitutional aspects demonstrate how giving non-human entities rights may go against the fundamental intent of intellectual property. IP law is based on public welfare in both the United States and India; it exists to safeguard creative freedom and advance human progress. The moral and social basis of the law may be undermined if machines start to have rights.

¹² Camille Alegre, 'Between Device and Demiurge: AI and the Legal Status of AI Creations' in Véronique Guèvremont and Colette Brin (eds), *Intelligence artificielle, culture et médias* (Les Presses de l'Université Laval 2024).

¹³ Rita Matulionyte and Jyh-An Lee, 'Copyright in AI-generated Works: Lessons from Recent Developments in Patent Law' (2022) 19(1) *SCRIPTed* 5

Recommendations:

The following suggestions are put forth in light of the discussion in each chapter:

1. **Preserve the human basis of authorship:** Laws ought to keep considering creativity as a human endeavour requiring aptitude, discernment, and purpose. AI shouldn't take the place of human authorship, but it might help.
2. **Adopt a "human control" principle:** When AI is used to create a piece of art, the author should be regarded as the one who has meaningful control or makes original decisions. This keeps people accountable and stops abuse.
3. **Provide limited or sui generis protection for works created by AI:** Rather than granting complete copyright, nations could establish a unique type of protection that recognizes AI's contributions without granting exclusive ownership. This would maintain public access to works while promoting innovation.
4. **Assure fairness and transparency in AI ownership:** Businesses utilizing AI should not unjustly limit user rights and should explicitly reveal the degree of human involvement. AI assisted outputs should be somewhat controlled by the creators and consumers.
5. **Encourage international cooperation:** Since AI transcends national boundaries, international organizations like WIPO ought to take the lead in talks to standardize AI authorship guidelines so that they are uniform and equitable across jurisdictions.

Concluding Remarks:

The definition of creativity is changing due to AI, hence the law also needs to change gradually now. By acknowledging AI as a tool rather than a creator, we can make sure that technology advances humanity rather than the other way around. Encouraging innovation while advancing the general welfare has always been the aim of intellectual property law.

Future legal frameworks will need to find a way to balance in promoting new technologies while defending the moral principles and constitutional principles that make creativity a distinctively human form of expression. Intellectual property law can only fulfil its actual function of promoting knowledge, culture, and justice in a changing world by maintaining human intention, responsibility, and fairness at its core.

BIBLIOGRAPHY:

Primary Sources:

Legislation

1. Copyright Act 1957 (India).
2. European Union Artificial Intelligence Act 2024.
3. United States Constitution, art I, s 8, cl 8 ('Progress Clause').

Case Law

1. Eastern Book Company v D B Modak (2008) 1 SCC 1 (Supreme Court of India).
2. Infopaq International A/S v Danske Dagblades Forening (Case C-5/08) [2009] ECR I6569 (Court of Justice of the European Union).
3. R G Anand v Deluxe Films (1978) 4 SCC 118 (Supreme Court of India).
4. Thaler v Perl matter 2023 WL 5333236 (DDC 2023) (United States District Court for the District of Columbia).
5. Thaler v Vidal 43 F 4th 1207 (Fed Cir 2022) (United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit).

Secondary Sources

Books and Chapters in Edited Volumes

1. Camille Alegre, 'Between Device and Demiurge: AI and the Legal Status of AI Creations' in Véronique Guèvremont and Colette Brin (eds), *Intelligence artificielle, culture et médias* (Les Presses de l'Université Laval 2024).

Journal Articles and Working Papers

1. Ally E Kaden, 'The AI Intellectual Property office of the Future: A Proposal to

Grant Authorship and Inventorship Rights to AI' (2023) 52 Hofstra Law Review 175.

2. Nupur Dhaneriya and Yash Parashar, 'Artificial Intelligence and Intellectual Property: Legal ownership in the Age of Autonomous Creation' (2025) 7(2) International Journal for Multidisciplinary Research (IJFMR) 1.

3. Rita Matulionyte and Jyh-An Lee, 'Copyright in AI-generated Works: Lessons from Recent Developments in Patent Law' (2022) 19(1) SCRIPTed 5.

4. S Alex Yang and Angela Huyue Zhang, 'Generative AI and Copyright: A Dynamic Perspective' (2024) London Business School Working Paper.