
COPYRIGHT IN THE CREATOR ECONOMY: REACTION VIDEOS AND TRANSFORMATIVE USE

Ritika Torgal, Lords Universal College of Law

I. ABSTRACT

Reaction videos' rise to prominence as a type of user-generated content has revolutionised digital media by allowing producers to interact with copyrighted works through entertainment, analysis, criticism, and commentary. Such content encourages audience participation and innovation, but it also poses difficult legal issues with regard to copyright infringement and transformative use. By examining the rights of copyright holders, the legality of reaction content, and the applicability of fair use under US law and fair dealing under Indian copyright law, this article investigates the copyright implications of reaction videos. Along with topics including monetisation, revenue sharing, automated copyright enforcement, and cutting edge technology like artificial intelligence, it also delves into platform governance mechanisms like YouTube's Content ID system and the Digital Millennium Copyright Act (DMCA). Significant Indian and international court rulings that have influenced how transformative works are treated legally are also examined in this study. In order to guarantee an equal balance between safeguarding copyright owners and promoting innovation, free expression, and the expansion of the creator economy, it closes by suggesting more precise legal standards, balanced platform rules, and increased recognition of transformative creativity.

Keywords: Reaction videos, Copyright, Fair Use, Fair Dealing, Transformative Use, Creator Economy, Content ID, Digital Media.

II. INTRODUCTION

The creation, consumption, and dissemination of creative content have undergone a fundamental transformation due to the swift expansion of digital platforms. Reaction videos, a popular type of user-generated content where creators react to movies, TV shows, music, video games, and other copyrighted works with commentary, criticism, humour, or analysis, are made possible by platforms like YouTube, Twitch, TikTok, and Instagram. Because they encourage audience participation, build online communities, and open up new business prospects for digital producers, these videos have become an essential component of the creative economy.

Reaction videos pose serious copyright issues despite their widespread use. They often use parts of works that are protected by copyright, violating the owners' exclusive rights to reproduction, public communication, adaptation, and distribution. The main legal dispute is whether reaction videos are transformative works covered by copyright exceptions like fair use in the US or fair dealing in India, or if they just duplicate copyrighted content without permission. The degree of originality, the intent behind the usage, the quantity of copyrighted content utilised, and the effect on the original work's market all frequently influence the response.

The increased reliance on automated copyright enforcement tools, platform governance mechanisms, and monetisation methods has further complicated this legal landscape. At the same time, emerging technologies such as artificial intelligence and short-form digital material continue to challenge existing copyright norms. Through a comparison of Indian and US copyright laws, judicial developments, platform regulations, and changing industry practices, this study investigates the legal position of reaction videos. It tries to analyse whether present copyright regimes sufficiently manage transformative digital content while maintaining an appropriate balance between the rights of copyright owners, authors, and the public interest.

III. Understanding Reaction Videos

Reaction videos are a type of user-generated content where producers document and distribute their reactions to pre-existing media, including films, TV series, music, video games, and internet videos. Parts of the original work are usually combined with commentary, criticism, analysis, humour, or emotional responses in these films. On websites like YouTube and Twitch, their popularity has increased dramatically. One of the most important legal questions is

whether reaction videos are transformative use or copyright infringement.¹

a. Entertainment Reactions

In entertainment reaction videos, artists react to social media trends, comedy routines, reality TV footage, viral online material, and celebrity interviews. Instead of the actual substance, the emphasis is typically on the reactor's character and impulsive responses. One of the most popular types of reaction content on digital platforms is these kinds of videos.

b. Music Reactions

Creators listen to and remark on songs, albums, or music videos on music reaction channels, frequently for the first time. The creator's interpretation of the lyrics, vocal performances, production methods, and emotional reactions draw in viewers. These films can pose serious copyright issues under both reproduction and public performance rights since they often include major amounts of copyrighted recordings and audiovisual works.

c. Film and Television Reactions

Commentary on movie trailers, TV shows, streaming video, and cinematic scenes are examples of film and television reaction content. Periodically, creators may interrupt the program to offer reviews, forecasts, analysis, or criticism. Because these movies frequently include criticism and commentary—purposes that are expressly permitted by US copyright law—they regularly give rise to fair use arguments.²

d. Gaming Reactions

Playthrough reactions, live-streamed games, reactions to game announcements, esports events, and game trailers are all examples of gaming reaction videos. In contrast to reactions in movies or music, the author of game content frequently participates interactively. In this case, typical copyright concerns may coexist with licensing agreements enforced by game publishers.

¹ 17 U.S.C. § 107 (2024), <https://www.law.cornell.edu/uscode/text/17/107>

² *Campbell v. Acuff-Rose Music, Inc.*, 510 U.S. 569, 579 (1994), <https://supreme.justia.com/cases/federal/us/510/569/>

e. Educational and Commentary Reactions

The goal of educational reaction videos is to provide an explanation, critique, or analysis of material from scholarly, scientific, historical, legal, or cultural viewpoints. Lawyers responding to courtroom scenes, historians responding to historical documentaries, and musicians evaluating musical compositions are a few examples. Because the original work acts as a medium for analysis and instruction rather than just enjoyment, such content is typically more likely to be deemed transformative.

Economic Significance of Reaction Content

Reaction videos are becoming a major component of the creator economy, making money from platform monetisation, sponsorships, advertising, and subscriptions. They can spark debates over the unapproved use of copyrighted content while simultaneously boosting audience participation and promoting unique creations.³

IV. COPYRIGHT PROTECTION OF ORIGINAL WORKS

Authors of original literary, artistic, musical, dramatic, cinematographic, and other creative works are protected by copyright. It promotes creativity while balancing public access to knowledge and culture by granting writers exclusive rights over the use and profit of their works. The Copyright Act of 1957 governs copyright protection in India.⁴

Reproduction Rights

Copyright holders can either permit or forbid the copying of their work in any tangible form thanks to the right of reproduction. When parts of copyrighted content are copied without authorisation, reaction videos may violate this right.⁵

Public Communication

Owners of copyrights have the sole authority to distribute their creations to the general public

³ Oxford Economics, *The Economic Impact of YouTube in the United States 2024*, <https://www.oxfordeconomics.com/resource/the-economic-impact-of-youtube-in-the-united-states-2024/>

⁴ Copyright Act, No. 14 of 1957, §§ 13–16, India Code (1957), <https://copyright.gov.in/documents/copyrightrules1957.pdf>

⁵ Copyright Act, No. 14 of 1957, § 14, India Code (1957), <https://copyright.gov.in/documents/copyrightrules1957.pdf>

via streaming, broadcasting, and other digital channels. Posting copyrighted material online could be considered public communication.

Adaptation Rights

Copyright holders can grant permission for a work to be transformed into an other format, such as turning a book into a movie or altering an already-existing work, thanks to adaptation rights. Reaction videos pose the dilemma of whether they replicate the original or produce a new, transformational work.

Distribution Rights

The commercial dissemination and distribution of copies of their works are under the control of copyright holders. These exclusive rights may be violated by unapproved dissemination of copyrighted content.

Copyright Protection for Films, Music, Broadcasts, and Online Content

Cinematograph films, sound recordings, musical compositions, broadcasts, and digital content are only a few of the many creative works that are protected by copyright law. With the growth of internet platforms, content shared via social media, streaming services, and video-sharing websites is now protected by copyright. Reaction videos regularly become the focus of copyright disputes pertaining to ownership, licensing, and fair use or fair dealing exceptions since they often include parts from these protected works.⁶

V. THE LEGAL NATURE OF REACTION VIDEOS

Reaction videos occupy a complex position within copyright law because they combine original expression with pre-existing copyrighted content. In order to offer commentary, criticism, analysis, or entertainment, reaction producers frequently use segments of movies, TV shows, music videos, live broadcasts, video games, and other digital media. A hybrid audiovisual work is produced when the original content is frequently shown alongside the creator's responses. Excerpts of copyrighted content, such as sound recordings, photos, music, and video clips, are used in the majority of reaction videos. The amount of use varies from

⁶ Copyright Act, No. 14 of 1957, §§ 2(f), 2(xx), 13, India Code (1957), <https://copyright.gov.in/documents/copyrightrules1957.pdf>

short snippets to significant chunks of the original work. The copyright owner's exclusive rights to reproduction and public communication may be violated by such use.⁷

Whether reaction videos are derivative or transformative works or just copies of copyrighted material is a key legal question. Reaction films, according to supporters, convert the original content into a new creative work by adding context, criticism, personal expression, and fresh meaning. However, detractors claim that a lot of reaction videos violate copyright owners' rights because their value is mostly derived from the copyrighted item itself. In evaluating these claims, courts typically take into account elements such the nature and intent of the use, the quantity of copyrighted content utilised, and the impact of the usage on the original work's market. As a result, the legality of reaction videos is still very fact-specific and continues to push the limits of digital era freedom of expression and copyright protection.⁸

VI. FAIR USE AND FAIR DEALING DOCTRINES

A. UNITED STATES PERSPECTIVE

The fair use concept is a significant restriction on the exclusive rights of copyright holders under U.S. copyright law. Fair use, which is codified in § 107 of the U.S. Copyright Act, allows some unapproved uses of copyrighted works for things like research, teaching, criticism, commentary, and news reporting. Courts use a four-factor test to determine whether a use is fair:

- (1) the nature of the copyrighted work;
- (2) the purpose and character of the use, including whether it is transformative;
- (3) the quantity and substantiality of the portion used; and
- (4) the impact of the use on the potential market for the original work.⁹

The transformative use concept, which considers whether the new work adds a distinct purpose, meaning, or message to the original, is a particularly important development in fair use

⁷ Copyright Act, No. 14 of 1957, § 14, India Code (1957), <https://copyright.gov.in/documents/copyrightrules1957.pdf>

⁸ *Campbell v. Acuff-Rose Music, Inc.*, 510 U.S. 569, 579–81 (1994), <https://supreme.justia.com/cases/federal/us/510/569/>

⁹ 17 U.S.C. § 107 (2024), <https://www.law.cornell.edu/uscode/text/17/107>

jurisprudence. The U.S. Supreme Court highlighted in *Campbell v. Acuff-Rose Music, Inc.* that transformative works are more likely to be eligible for fair use since they offer fresh expression rather than just replacing the original.¹⁰ This idea is now crucial for determining whether reaction videos—which frequently incorporate copyrighted material with commentary, criticism, or analysis—are lawful.

B. INDIAN PERSPECTIVE

Indian copyright law acknowledges particular fair dealing exceptions under Section 52 of the Copyright Act, 1957, in contrast to the United States' wide fair use theory. Limited uses of copyrighted works, including private study, research, criticism, review, reporting on current affairs, and legal processes, are allowed under fair dealing.¹¹ The most pertinent exceptions for reaction videos include criticism, reviews, and commentary, especially when the producer supplements the original content with their own insights or analysis.

When interpreting fair dealing regulations, Indian courts have typically used a purposive approach. The Kerala High Court ruled in *Civic Chandran v. Ammini Amma* that the degree of copying, the purpose of the use, and the possibility of market substitute all play a role in determining fair dealing. Indian courts have recently placed a strong emphasis on striking a balance between the public interest in free speech and criticism and the rights of copyright holders.¹² Therefore, under the fair dealing framework, reaction videos that actually offer criticism, review, or commentary may be protected, but those that only replicate copyrighted information without significantly altering it are less likely to be eligible for the exemption.

C. COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS

Although they both aim to strike a balance between the rights of copyright holders and the public interest in creativity and free speech, the theories of fair use in the US and fair dealing in India have quite different applications and scopes. A flexible four-factor test is used by courts to assess unauthorised uses under the open-ended doctrine of fair use under U.S. law. On the other hand, fair dealing under Indian law is more stringent, allowing usage only for certain

¹⁰ *Campbell v. Acuff-Rose Music, Inc.*, 510 U.S. 569, 579–80 (1994), <https://supreme.justia.com/cases/federal/us/510/569/>

¹¹ Copyright Act, No. 14 of 1957, § 52(1)(a), India Code (1957), <https://copyright.gov.in/documents/copyrightrules1957.pdf>

¹² *Civic Chandran v. Ammini Amma*, 1996 PTC 329 (Ker.) <https://www.casemine.com/judgement/in/56e66b08607dba6b534374a3>

reasons that are specifically acknowledged under Section 52 of the Copyright Act, 1957¹³, including reporting on current events, criticism, review, and study.¹⁴

For producers of reactive content, these variations have significant ramifications. The more expansive and flexible notion of transformative use may be advantageous for reaction videos in the US, especially when producers provide the original work significant commentary, critique, or new meaning.¹⁵ Reaction videos have less legal protection in India since artists must show that their usage is covered by a recognised fair dealing exception. Because of this, creators working in the Indian digital ecosystem may face more legal uncertainty because reaction content that could be considered fair use in the US might not be protected similarly under Indian copyright law.

VII. Platform Governance and Automated Copyright Enforcement

Digital platforms are crucial in ensuring that user-generated content, such as reaction videos, complies with copyright laws. Platforms use a variety of enforcement techniques, such as notice-and-takedown systems and automated detection technologies, to deal with widespread copyright infringement. These procedures aim to safeguard copyright holders' rights while preserving the availability of legitimate uses like fair use and fair dealing.¹⁶

YouTube's Content ID system, which automatically compares submitted videos to a database of copyrighted works supplied by rights holders, is one of the most well-known enforcement tools. Copyright owners may decide to monetise the content, prohibit it, or monitor its viewership when a match is found.¹⁷ The Digital Millennium Copyright Act (DMCA), which mandates that online service providers delete allegedly infringing content upon receiving a valid copyright complaint, is another option available to copyright owners in addition to automated methods.¹⁸

Automated copyright detection systems have serious drawbacks notwithstanding their efficacy

¹³ Copyright Act, No. 14 of 1957, § 52, India Code (1957), <https://copyright.gov.in/documents/copyrightrules1957.pdf>

¹⁴ 17 U.S.C. § 107 (2024), <https://www.law.cornell.edu/uscode/text/17/107>

¹⁵ *Campbell v. Acuff-Rose Music, Inc.*, 510 U.S. 569, 579–80 (1994), <https://supreme.justia.com/cases/federal/us/510/569/>

¹⁶ 17 U.S.C. § 512 (2024), <https://www.law.cornell.edu/uscode/text/17/512>

¹⁷ YouTube, *How Content ID Works*, <https://support.google.com/youtube/answer/2797370>

¹⁸ Digital Millennium Copyright Act, Pub. L. No. 105-304, 112 Stat. 2860 (1998); 17 U.S.C. § 512 (2024), <https://www.law.cornell.edu/uscode/text/17/512>

in preventing infringement. When reaction videos include commentary, criticism, parody, or instructional analysis, algorithms frequently find it difficult to discern between legitimate uses covered by fair use or fair dealing and infringement uses. Therefore, even when their use is allowed, artists may face account penalties, demonetisation, or content deletions.

These issues have led to complaints about fraudulent copyright claims and excessive enforcement. Automated methods might encourage owners of rights to make wide claims, which would stifle free speech and innovative reuse. As a result, academics and judges have stressed how crucial it is to strike a balance between copyright enforcement and users' rights to free speech, criticism, and innovative innovation in the digital sphere.¹⁹

VIII. Monetization and Revenue-Sharing Disputes

In the digital creative economy, reaction videos have grown to be a substantial source of revenue. Advertising income, channel memberships, sponsorships, subscriptions, contributions, and platform partnership programs are some of the ways creators make money off of their work. Reaction content's commercial success has heightened discussions over who owns and can profit from copyrighted material included in these kinds of films.

The conflicting rights of original creators and reaction creators are a major problem. Reaction videos, according to copyright owners, derive value from their protected works and may make money without permission. However, reaction makers argue that their own expression, analysis, critique, and commentary offer independent value that warrants a portion of the content's financial gains. This strain is especially noticeable when reaction videos become very popular and profitable.

A few of sites have implemented revenue-sharing schemes to allay these worries. For instance, rather than completely eliminating their copyrighted content, YouTube's Content ID system enables copyright holders to claim advertising revenue from videos that use their content. These agreements lessen the need for litigation while allowing both parties to profit financially.

Collaborative techniques between content creators and rights holders are becoming more and more popular in emerging industry practices. These consist of platform-based dispute

¹⁹ Id.; *Campbell v. Acuff-Rose Music, Inc.*, 510 U.S. 569, 579 (1994), <https://supreme.justia.com/cases/federal/us/510/569/>

resolution procedures, creator collaboration programs, revenue-sharing plans, and licensing agreements. Such models might offer a more equitable framework for safeguarding copyright rights while promoting transformative and user-generated creativity in the digital ecosystem as reaction content continues to gain popularity.^{20 21}

IX. Emerging Trends and Future Developments

The legal environment around reaction content is still changing due to the quick development of digital media. Future developments in copyright law, audience tastes, and technology will probably have an impact on the production, distribution, and regulation of reaction videos.

The emergence of AI-generated reactions in which AI systems produce commentary, voiceovers, facial expressions, or analytical answers to copyrighted works is one new problem. Authorship, ownership, originality, and culpability for possible copyright infringement are all new issues brought up by these advancements. Courts and legislators may need to clarify the extent to which current copyright regimes apply to AI-generated content as it gets more sophisticated.

The increasing popularity of short-form material on websites like TikTok, YouTube Shorts, and Instagram Reels is another noteworthy development. Reaction clips sometimes blend quick commentary or amusement-focused reactions with brief passages of copyrighted compositions. Legal evaluations are quite fact-specific since shorter uses do not always qualify for copyright exceptions, even though they may support transformative use arguments.

Discussions about possible legislative reforms have also been sparked by these events. The effectiveness of current copyright rules in addressing contemporary types of user-generated and platform-based material is being investigated by policymakers in a number of nations. More clarification on fair use, fair dealing, platform liability, and the handling of transformative digital works may be the goal of future legislation.

Reaction content's future will probably rest on striking a compromise between defending copyright holders' rights and promoting freedom of expression, creativity, and innovation. Transformative material is anticipated to continue to be a significant and developing part of the

²⁰ OECD, *Creators, Copyright and Digital Platforms* (2022), <https://www.oecd.org/digital/>

²¹ Copyright Act, No. 14 of 1957, § 52, India Code (1957), <https://copyright.gov.in/documents/copyrightrules1957.pdf>

internet ecosystem as digital culture depends more and more on remixing, commenting, and participatory media.²²²³

X. Challenges in the Creator Economy

The difficulty of striking a balance between copyright protection and creative freedom has increased due to the expansion of the creator economy. This conflict is best illustrated by reaction videos, which frequently use copyrighted content while also offering fresh perspectives, comments, and audience interaction. Although copyright law aims to compensate original artists for their work, excessively stringent enforcement may deter innovative and transformative content, which has emerged as a key component of digital culture.

The discussion has important ramifications for the right to free speech as well. Reaction films are often used for public conversation, education, parody, review, and criticism. Overzealous copyright enforcement may stifle free speech and restrict producers' access to cultural works and current affairs, especially when it comes to automated detection systems and widespread takedown procedures.

At the same time, copyright holders have justifiable worries about their original works being exploited. There are concerns about whether artists are unfairly profiting from the work, investment, and inventiveness of rights holders without getting permission or paying anything because many reaction films derive significant value from protected content.

The legal ambiguity that content makers must deal with is another obstacle. Results are unpredictable since the line between acceptable transformative use and copyright infringement frequently depends on case-specific judge evaluations. This ambiguity may deter artists from creating reaction content or put them at risk for copyright violations, censorship, and legal action. One of the biggest issues in contemporary copyright law is striking a fair balance between promoting creative expression and safeguarding original works as digital media develops.^{24 25}

²² World Intellectual Property Organization, *WIPO Conversation on Intellectual Property and Artificial Intelligence*, <https://www.wipo.int>

²³ *Thaler v. Perlmutter*, 687 F. Supp. 3d 140 (D.D.C. 2023).

²⁴ *Civic Chandran v. Ammini Amma*, 1996 PTC 329 (Ker.); 17 U.S.C. § 107 (2024), <https://www.law.cornell.edu/uscode/text/17/107>

²⁵ *Lenz v. Universal Music Corp.*, 815 F.3d 1145, 1153–55 (9th Cir. 2016).

XI. Judicial Approaches and Landmark Cases

India TV Independent News Service Pvt. Ltd. v. Yashraj Films Pvt. Ltd. (2012)

In its analysis of the unapproved use of movie clips in a television show, the Delhi High Court stressed that the existence of the fair dealing argument is contingent upon the intent, scope, and mode of use. For media and commentary-based content that uses parts of copyrighted audiovisual works, the ruling is nonetheless important.²⁶

Super Cassettes Industries Ltd. v. Hamar Television Network Pvt. Ltd. (2012)

The Delhi High Court made it clear that fair dealing for criticism and review might include criticism of more general social, political, or cultural issues in addition to criticism of the copyrighted work itself. The Court emphasised that free expression and commentary shouldn't be unduly restricted by copyright laws.²⁷

The Chancellor, Masters & Scholars of the University of Oxford v. Rameshwari Photocopy Services (India) (2016)

The Delhi High Court investigated whether creating course packets by reproducing passages from copyrighted books constituted copyright infringement in the DU Photocopy Case. The Court held that educational usage that falls within legislative limitations may not constitute infringement and stressed that copyright law must strike a balance between the rights of copyright owners and the greater public interest. The ruling is noteworthy for its intentional interpretation of fair dealing and its focus on striking a balance between information access and exclusive rights.²⁸

Google LLC v. Oracle America, Inc. (United States) (2021)

Since Google's use of parts of Oracle's copyrighted software code was innovative and transformative, the U.S. Supreme Court ruled that it qualified as fair use. Despite the fact that the decision dealt with computer software, its logic regarding transformative use, purpose, and public benefit has grown to be a significant precedent in contemporary copyright law and is

²⁶ *India TV Indep. News Serv. Pvt. Ltd. v. Yashraj Films Pvt. Ltd.*, 2012 SCC OnLine Del 3961

²⁷ *Super Cassettes Indus. Ltd. v. Hamar Television Network Pvt. Ltd.*, 2012 SCC OnLine Del 3782.

²⁸ *The Chancellor, Masters & Scholars of the Univ. of Oxford v. Rameshwari Photocopy Servs.*, CS(OS) No. 2439 of 2012 (Delhi H.C. Dec. 9, 2016).

regularly brought up in conversations about digital material and online creators.²⁹

Andy Warhol Foundation for the Visual Arts, Inc. v. Goldsmith (United States) (2023)

The U.S. Supreme Court made it clear that adding a new style or aesthetic does not inevitably make a work transformative. Courts have to decide if the secondary use is truly distinct from the original in terms of both purpose and character. Reaction videos and other creator-generated content that incorporates copyrighted works will be significantly impacted by the ruling, which restricts the scope of transformative usage.³⁰

XII. Recommendations

Reaction content producers should use strategies that prioritise uniqueness, commentary, and transformative value in order to reduce the possibility of copyright conflicts. Instead of posting copyrighted works in its entirety, creators should only use the parts that are logically required for review, analysis, criticism, or instructional debate. Arguments that the content qualifies as fair use or fair dealing rather than simple reproduction might be strengthened by adding insightful criticism, critique, or commentary

Creators should think about getting licenses or permits from copyright owners when using significant amounts of copyrighted content. In addition to reducing the possibility of takedown notices and offering legal clarity, licensing agreements may encourage cooperative relationships between content creators and rights holders. This is especially crucial for content like music, movies, and television shows, since copyright holders often use formal legal processes and automated detection techniques to enforce their rights.

To guarantee a just balance between copyright protection and artistic expression, platform-level changes are also required. Digital platforms should make automated enforcement processes more transparent, offer more efficient dispute resolution procedures, and guarantee that fair use and fair dealing issues are sufficiently evaluated prior to the removal or demonetisation of content.

Lastly, there is a growing demand for more precise legal guidelines pertaining to transformative digital output, such as reaction videos. In order to reduce ambiguity for artists, rights holders,

²⁹ *Google LLC v. Oracle Am., Inc.*, 593 U.S. 1 (2021).

³⁰ *Andy Warhol Found. for the Visual Arts, Inc. v. Goldsmith*, 598 U.S. 508 (2023).

and platforms, legislatures and courts should offer more clarity on the applicability of copyright exceptions to contemporary online media. In the digital age, more precise guidelines would aid in safeguarding both intellectual property rights and the freedom to produce, discuss, and interact with cultural works.³¹

XIII. CONCLUSION

Reaction films have become one of the most important types of digital expression, making it harder to distinguish between using pre-existing copyrighted works and creating unique content. While they contribute considerably to the creator economy by stimulating innovation, public discourse, education, and audience engagement, they also face complicated copyright difficulties relating to replication, communication, adaptation, monetisation, and platform enforcement.

This study shows that the degree to which reaction films alter the original work by incorporating insightful comments, critique, analysis, or fresh expression determines their legality. According to the comparative research, India's fair dealing framework is still more constrained and purpose-specific, while the United States offers more protection through the flexible doctrine of fair use. As a result, while relying on copyright exceptions, creators working in India suffer relatively more legal ambiguity.

The study also shows that while automated copyright enforcement systems are good at preventing infringement, they often have trouble differentiating between genuine transformative applications and illegal copying. Both authors and copyright owners are impacted by this, which frequently leads to over-enforcement, incorrect takedowns, and financial conflicts. AI-generated content and short-form reaction videos are examples of emerging advancements that are expected to exacerbate these legal issues and necessitate legislative and judicial adaptation.

In the end, a fair copyright system should support transformative creativity, innovation, and freedom of speech while simultaneously defending the legal rights of copyright holders. To ensure that copyright law continues to fulfill its primary goal of fostering creativity in an increasingly digital and participatory media environment, it will be crucial to establish clearer

³¹ *Campbell v. Acuff-Rose Music, Inc.*, 510 U.S. 569, 579–80 (1994); 17 U.S.C. § 107 (2024), <https://www.law.cornell.edu/uscode/text/17/107>

legal standards, transparent platform governance, enhanced dispute resolution procedures, and increased recognition of transformative uses.