ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE AND INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY RIGHTS: NAVIGATING THE INTERSECTION OF INNOVATION, AUTHORSHIP, AND LEGAL PROTECTION IN THE DIGITAL ERA

Kulvinder, Research Scholar, Kurukshetra University, Kurukshetra

Dr Preety Jain, Chairperson, Department of Law, Kurukshetra University, Kurukshetra

ABSTRACT

The convergence of artificial intelligence and intellectual property rights presents unprecedented legal, ethical, and technical challenges that fundamentally question traditional paradigms of authorship, inventorship, and ownership. As artificial intelligence systems demonstrate increasingly sophisticated capabilities in generating creative works and novel inventions, existing intellectual property frameworks, designed primarily for human creators, face considerable strain. This paper examines the multifaceted intersection of AI and IPR, analyzing statutory frameworks, landmark judicial precedents, and emerging legal doctrines. Through normative legal analysis and critical examination of jurisdictional approaches particularly the Indian legal framework—this study identifies critical gaps in copyright protection, patent law provisions, and trademark regulations concerning AI-generated content. The research evaluates the RAGHAV v. Union of India case as a pivotal precedent establishing human-centric authorship requirements in India, alongside comparative analysis of American, European, and UK approaches to AI creativity. The study further examines challenges surrounding training data copyright, liability attribution, and questions of inventorship under the Patents Act, 1970. Finally, this paper proposes a framework for legislative adaptation emphasizing the distinction between AI-assisted and AI-generated works, collaborative frameworks recognizing human-AI contributions, and balanced regulatory mechanisms that foster innovation while protecting creator rights and ensuring equitable IP protection in the evolving technological landscape.

Keywords: Artificial Intelligence, Intellectual Property Rights, Copyright Protection, Patent Law, AI-Generated Works.

1. Introduction

The swift evolution of artificial intelligence has reshaped the domain of creative and inventive production, posing significant challenges to intellectual property regimes that have remained largely static for centuries. Conventional intellectual property law is grounded in the belief that human originality, imagination, and innovation deserve legal recognition. Yet, as AI systems grow increasingly autonomous and capable of producing outputs indistinguishable from those of humans, this human-centered foundation demands urgent reconsideration. The emergence of generative AI tools capable of producing art, literature, music, and technical innovations raises a profound legal dilemma: when a work is generated predominantly or entirely by AI with minimal human involvement, who is entitled to claim intellectual property rights?

This issue transcends abstract legal theory, given the rapid expansion of global AI markets across healthcare, creative industries, software development, and scientific research. India, through initiatives such as Digital India, has positioned itself as a major participant in this economy but faces pressing difficulties in reconciling intellectual property protection with technological progress. Existing statutes—most notably the Copyright Act of 1957 and the Patents Act of 1970—were drafted without anticipating autonomous machine learning systems, leaving considerable gaps in addressing AI-generated creations.

Indian courts have begun grappling with these complexities. A landmark ruling in RAGHAV Artificial Intelligence v. Union of India (Delhi High Court, 2024) marked a turning point in copyright law. The court refused to recognize an AI system (RAGHAV: Responsive AI for Generative High-Art Ventures) as the author of a digital artwork titled Celestial Harmony, reaffirming that authorship under Section 2(d) of the Copyright Act remains inherently tied to human agency. At the same time, the judgment acknowledged that works produced through substantive human-AI collaboration may qualify for copyright protection, provided human contributors exercise meaningful creative control.

This study offers a detailed legal examination of the intersection between artificial intelligence and intellectual property rights, with particular emphasis on Indian law while drawing comparative insights from the United States, European Union, and United Kingdom. Using normative and doctrinal analysis, it highlights statutory deficiencies, evaluates the adequacy of current legal principles in addressing AI-generated works, and proposes pathways for legislative and regulatory reform.

2. Literature Review and Theoretical Framework

2.1 Evolution of Intellectual Property Law and the Authorship Paradigm

Intellectual property law rests upon the philosophical foundation that individual creativity and inventiveness merit legal recognition and protection. The Berne Convention for the Protection of Literary and Artistic Works, established in 1886, embedded this human-centric authorship requirement into international copyright frameworks. Section 2(d) of the Indian Copyright Act, 1957, defines an "author" as "in relation to a literary or dramatic work, the person who has authored the work." This definitional structure presupposes natural personhood, creating an implicit barrier to non-human authorship recognition.

The concept of "originality" in copyright jurisprudence further reinforces human authorship requirements. In Eastern Book Company v. D.B. Modak (2008), the Supreme Court of India established that originality necessitates "a minimum level of creativity and intellectual effort necessarily associated with human authorship." This precedent proved instrumental in subsequent AI-related decisions, establishing that mechanical reproduction or algorithmic generation lacking human creative input does not satisfy originality criteria.

2.2 Artificial Intelligence Capabilities and Creative Production

Contemporary generative artificial intelligence systems operate through sophisticated neural network architectures trained on vast datasets. These systems employ machine learning algorithms to identify patterns, relationships, and structures within training data, subsequently producing outputs that demonstrate substantial sophistication. Generative pre-trained transformers (GPTs) and similar models have demonstrated capabilities in:

- Creating visual artwork through text-to-image generation models
- Producing literary and poetic compositions
- Generating musical compositions and arrangements
- Designing technical solutions and software algorithms
- Creating chemical structures and pharmaceutical compounds

The sophistication of AI outputs has precipitated what scholars term the "authorship paradox": AI systems produce works displaying apparent creativity and originality while simultaneously operating through deterministic algorithms executing instructions derived from human-developed training datasets and programming architectures. The question emerges whether such outputs constitute "original" authorship or merely sophisticated reproduction of patterns encoded in training data.

2.3 Global Approaches to AI-Generated Works

United States Framework:

The U.S. Copyright Office has adopted a restrictive position regarding AI authorship. In its March 2025 guidance, the Copyright Office reaffirmed that copyright protection attaches only to works demonstrating "human authorship." The Office specifically noted that output produced entirely by generative AI systems lacks eligibility for copyright registration. However, the Office recognized that works incorporating both AI-generated and human-authored elements may qualify for protection if human authorship is "sufficiently perceptible" in the final work. This approach permits copyright registration for human-curated or substantially modified AI outputs but denies protection for autonomous AI creation.

European Union Framework:

The European Union adopted a more interventionist regulatory stance through the AI Act (2024). Rather than addressing AI authorship per se, the EU framework imposes mandatory disclosure requirements regarding training data composition. The Act requires AI developers to maintain transparency concerning the copyrighted works incorporated into training datasets, with an "opt-out" mechanism permitting copyright owners to exclude their works from AI training. This approach emphasizes transparency and creator consent rather than definitively resolving authorship questions.

United Kingdom Framework:

The UK's Copyright, Designs and Patents Act, 1988 (Section 9(3)) provides statutory protection for computer-generated works absent identifiable human authors. Instead, the Act designates "the person by whom the arrangements necessary for the creation of the work were undertaken" as the author. This framework explicitly accommodates non-human creative

agents, departing from the strict human-authorship requirement adopted by the United States and currently maintained in India.

2.4 Indian Judicial Precedents and the RAGHAV Decision

The RAGHAV Artificial Intelligence v. Union of India (Delhi High Court, 2024) decision represents Indian jurisprudence's most authoritative pronouncement on AI authorship. Ankit Sahani, proprietor of Raghav Technologies Pvt. Ltd., sought copyright registration for "Celestial Harmony," a digital artwork created through the RAGHAV AI system. The copyright office rejected the application, contending that Section 2(d) of the Copyright Act requires human authorship. Upon judicial review, the Delhi High Court upheld the copyright office's decision, reasoning:

1. Authorship under Indian copyright law presupposes human intent, consciousness, and creative agency

2. AI systems, despite operational sophistication, lack subjective experience and intentionality requisite for authorship determination

3. The absence of human creative control does not establish copyright eligibility

4. The statutory and judicial framework consistently emphasizes human originality as copyright's foundational element

Significantly, the court acknowledged that works produced through human-AI collaboration might qualify for copyright protection if human contributors exercised meaningful creative control over final outputs. This distinction between "AI-generated" works (lacking copyright eligibility) and "AI-assisted" works (potentially eligible) has emerged as a critical jurisprudential development.

3. Methodology

3.1 Research Approach

This research employs a normative juridical (doctrinal) approach, emphasizing analysis of statutory provisions, judicial precedents, legal principles, and theoretical frameworks governing intellectual property protection. The normative approach proves particularly suitable

for examining intellectual property law, as it permits systematic examination of existing legal norms, identification of statutory gaps, and development of recommendations for legislative adaptation.

3.2 Data Sources

Research data derives from multiple authoritative sources:

Primary Sources:

- Indian statutory instruments: Copyright Act, 1957; Patents Act, 1970; Designs Act, 2000; Trademarks Act, 1999
- Indian judicial decisions: RAGHAV Artificial Intelligence v. Union of India (2024), Eastern Book Company v. D.B. Modak (2008), R.G. Anand v. Delux Films (1978)
- International legal instruments: Berne Convention, TRIPS Agreement, EU AI Act (2024)
- U.S. Copyright Office guidance and regulatory documents

Secondary Sources:

- Peer-reviewed legal journals and academic publications indexed in Scopus and Web of Science databases
- Legal scholarship examining AI and intellectual property intersection
- Government reports and policy documents from intellectual property offices
- Case law from multiple jurisdictions addressing AI-generated content

3.3 Analytical Framework

Analysis proceeds through systematic examination of: (1) statutory frameworks and their application to AI-generated works; (2) judicial precedents establishing authorship and originality standards; (3) comparative jurisdictional approaches; (4) identification of statutory gaps and implementation challenges; (5) development of recommendations for legislative and

regulatory adaptation.

4. Copyright Protection and AI-Generated Works: The Challenge to Authorship Doctrine

4.1 Statutory Framework and the Originality Requirement

The Copyright Act, 1957 establishes two foundational requirements for copyright protection: authorship and originality. Section 2(d) defines "author" exclusively in human terms, while Section 13(1) establishes categories of protectable works without explicit reference to AI-generated content. Originality, while not statutorily defined, has been judicially developed through precedent to require "independent effort and the exercise of creative faculties."

The application of these requirements to AI-generated works presents substantial difficulties. If an AI system produces a work through autonomous operation of algorithms, several questions emerge:

Can an AI system constitute an "author"? Current statutory and judicial interpretation uniformly answers in the negative. The Indian Copyright Act defines authorship exclusively in terms of natural persons and specified entities (corporations in specific contexts). An AI system, lacking legal personhood, cannot satisfy statutory authorship requirements.

Does AI-generated output demonstrate "originality"? While AI-generated works may display apparent novelty and creativity, courts have questioned whether such output genuinely originates from the AI system or merely represents sophisticated reproduction of patterns encoded in training data. The distinction between "original creation" and "pattern-matching reproduction" remains legally contested.

4.2 The RAGHAV Decision: Implications and Legal Principles

The RAGHAV decision establishes several critical propositions:

Proposition 1: Authorship Requires Human Consciousness and Intent

The court emphasized that copyright authorship inherently involves human consciousness and intentional creative expression. An AI system, despite operational sophistication, cannot embody the subjective human experience requisite for authorship. This reasoning draws

support from constitutional principles protecting individual human expression and creativity as manifestations of human dignity and autonomy.

Proposition 2: Statutory Interpretation Excludes AI Authorship

Examining Section 2(d) of the Copyright Act through principles of statutory interpretation, the court concluded that the provision's language and historical context presume human authorship. Legislative amendments would be necessary to explicitly extend copyright protection to AI-authored works or to designate alternative authorship frameworks for machine-generated content.

Proposition 3: Human-AI Collaboration Permits Copyright Protection

The court acknowledged that works produced through meaningful collaboration between human creators and AI systems could potentially satisfy copyright requirements if human contributors exercise sufficient creative control. This distinction between "AI-assisted" and "AI-generated" works provides a framework for protecting collaborative creative processes while maintaining authorship requirements.

4.3 Training Data Copyright and Infringement Challenges

A distinct copyright concern involves the use of copyrighted material in AI training datasets. Generative AI systems require training on vast quantities of data to develop sophisticated output-generation capabilities. Training datasets frequently incorporate copyrighted literary works, artwork, photography, and musical compositions without explicit copyright owner authorization. This practice raises substantial copyright infringement concerns.

The Unauthorized Reproduction Problem:

Copyright law grants exclusive reproduction rights to copyright owners. The incorporation of copyrighted works into AI training datasets—where the material is copied, stored, and processed by algorithmic systems—arguably constitutes unauthorized reproduction absent fair use or licensed exceptions. Multiple jurisdictions currently litigate questions of whether AI training constitutes permissible fair use or violates copyright owner exclusive rights.

The Output Infringement Risk:

If AI systems trained on copyrighted material produce outputs substantially similar to training data sources, copyright infringement liability potentially attaches. The similarity between AI output and copyrighted source material could evidence unauthorized copying and derivative work creation.

Jurisdictional Variations in Treatment:

The European Union AI Act (2024) addresses training data transparency through mandatory disclosure requirements and creator opt-out mechanisms. Conversely, current U.S. law remains unclear regarding fair use applicability to AI training, with ongoing litigation exploring this question. India lacks explicit statutory guidance on AI training data copyright implications, representing a significant legislative gap.

4.4 Proposed Framework: AI-Assisted Works and Human Contributions

To address copyright protection gaps while maintaining statutory authorship requirements, a framework distinguishing "AI-assisted" from "AI-generated" works merits consideration:

AI-Generated Works: Works produced entirely or substantially through autonomous AI operation without meaningful human creative contribution would remain ineligible for copyright protection under this framework, consistent with current Indian law. Such works would exist in the public domain, unprotected by copyright.

AI-Assisted Works: Works produced through human-AI collaboration where human creators exercise meaningful creative control—selecting training data, designing algorithmic parameters, curating outputs, making creative modifications, or providing substantial human-authored components—would qualify for copyright protection. Authorship would be attributed to the human contributor(s) whose creative choices shaped the final work.

This framework maintains statutory authorship requirements while accommodating collaborative creative processes increasingly prevalent in digital production.

5. Patent Law, Inventorship, and AI-Generated Inventions

5.1 The Inventorship Requirement Under the Patents Act, 1970

The Patents Act, 1970 requires that patent applications be submitted by "the true and first

inventor" or the inventor's assignee. Section 6 implicitly presupposes that inventors are natural persons capable of executing legal instruments and bearing legal responsibility. This human-centric inventorship requirement, analogous to copyright authorship provisions, creates substantial obstacles for patent protection of AI-generated inventions.

The question becomes increasingly acute as AI systems demonstrate capability for:

- Novel pharmaceutical compound generation and optimization
- Chemical structure design for specific functional properties
- Software algorithm development and technical solutions
- Mechanical design improvements through iterative optimization
- Biotechnology innovations through computational protein folding

5.2 Global Patent Law Responses to AI Inventorship

United States Approach:

The Thaler v. Vidal (2022) case established authoritative U.S. precedent rejecting AI inventorship. Stephen Thaler applied for patents designating DABUS (Device for the Autonomous Bootstrapping of Unified Sentiment) as the inventor. The U.S. Patent Office rejected the application, reasoning that patent law requires inventors to be natural persons capable of executing formal documents and bearing inventorship obligations. U.S. courts upheld this position, concluding that statutory inventorship provisions presume natural personhood.

European Patent Office Position:

The EPO has adopted a more flexible approach, permitting patent applications identifying human persons as inventors for AI-assisted inventions where human inventors made meaningful contributions to the inventive concept. However, the EPO has not explicitly recognized AI systems as inventors. Patents for AI-implemented technical solutions remain available when proper human inventorship can be established.

Indian Legal Framework:

India's Patents Act contains no explicit provisions addressing AI inventorship. The statute presumes that inventors are natural persons capable of executing applications and bearing inventorship responsibilities. Current practice follows traditional human inventorship requirements, leaving substantial uncertainty regarding patent eligibility for autonomous AI-generated inventions.

5.3 Challenges in Attributing Inventorship

Several fundamental challenges complicate AI inventorship determination:

Agency and Intentionality:

Patent law presumes that inventors possess intentional creative agency—deliberate efforts to solve technical problems and create novel solutions. AI systems operate through algorithmic processes lacking human-like intentionality. The distinction between "deliberate inventive effort" and "automated algorithmic operation" proves legally and philosophically contentious.

Liability and Responsibility:

Patent law contemplates inventors bearing legal and financial responsibility for inventorship claims and patent validity. An AI system cannot assume such responsibilities, raising questions about liability attribution when patent disputes arise.

Originality in Technical Context:

Patent law requires that inventions demonstrate novelty and non-obviousness. Whether AI-generated technical solutions satisfy these requirements depends partly on whether the solutions represent genuine innovations or sophisticated reproductions of patterns in training data sources.

5.4 The Human-AI Collaboration Framework for Patents

Similar to copyright, a distinction between "AI-generated" and "AI-assisted" inventions provides a workable framework:

AI-Generated Inventions: Inventions produced through autonomous AI operation without meaningful human inventive contribution would remain unpatentable under current Indian law absent statutory amendments. Such inventions could not be assigned inventor status without violating statutory requirements presupposing natural person inventors.

AI-Assisted Inventions: Inventions developed through human-AI collaboration where human inventors make substantive contributions to the inventive concept conceiving technical problems, designing solution parameters, selecting optimization criteria, evaluating outputs, or making inventive modifications—would qualify for patent protection under conventional frameworks. Inventorship would be attributed to human contributors making material inventive contributions.

6. Additional IP Domains: Trademarks, Trade Secrets, and Design Protection

6.1 Trademark Law and AI Considerations

Trademark law presents somewhat different issues than copyright and patents, as trademarks protect source identification rather than creative content or technical innovation. AI systems demonstrate utility in trademark administration through:

- Automated trademark application processing and examination
- Conflict detection between proposed and existing marks
- Online infringement monitoring and enforcement
- Trademark suggestion and optimization

However, AI creation of trademark designs raises questions regarding distinctiveness and consumer confusion requirements. If an AI system autonomously generates trademark designs, questions emerge regarding whether such designs qualify as "distinctive" or instead represent generic algorithmic outputs lacking trademark's requisite distinctiveness element.

6.2 Trade Secret Protection and Data Ownership

Trade secret law protects information providing competitive advantage through non-disclosure. AI systems require training on vast datasets, creating tension between trade secret protection

and data access requirements. Questions arise regarding:

- Whether training datasets themselves qualify for trade secret protection
- Whether disclosure requirements in jurisdictions like the EU AI Act undermine trade secret protection for training data
- Whether developers must disclose proprietary algorithmic architectures to satisfy transparency requirements

6.3 Design Protection Under the Designs Act, 2000

Design protection covers visual and functional design aspects of products. AI-assisted design optimization raises questions regarding authorship and inventorship applicable to design protection regimes.

7. Liability, Accountability, and Risk Attribution in AI Systems

7.1 The Liability Attribution Challenge

IP liability traditionally attaches to identifiable parties bearing responsibility for infringement or validity challenges. AI systems, lacking legal personhood, cannot themselves bear liability. This creates difficulties in accountability frameworks:

Copyright Infringement Liability: If an AI system produces output infringing third-party copyright, who bears liability? The output's user? The AI system's developer? The training data compiler? Current law allocates liability ambiguously.

Patent Infringement Risk: If an AI system generates a solution infringing existing patents, liability again remains legally ambiguous absent explicit statutory provisions assigning responsibility.

Moral and Personality Rights: Copyright law recognizes creators' moral and personality rights beyond economic interests—rights to attribution, integrity, and reputation protection. AI systems cannot claim such rights, but human developers and users also face uncertainty regarding their moral rights in AI-assisted works.

7.2 Developer Responsibility and Due Diligence

As AI systems become increasingly autonomous, developer responsibility intensifies. Developers have increasing obligations regarding:

- Training data source verification and licensing
- Algorithmic bias identification and mitigation
- Output quality assurance and compliance verification
- User guidance regarding proper AI system usage
- Monitoring for intellectual property infringement risks

8. Ethical Dimensions and Constitutional Considerations

8.1 Human Creativity and Constitutional Values

Beyond statutory interpretation, fundamental constitutional principles inform AI authorship questions. India's Constitution protects human dignity, freedom of expression, and equality rights. Copyright protection arguably serves as an instrument protecting creative expression as a dimension of human dignity and autonomy. Extending copyright to AI systems raises questions regarding whether such extension meaningfully protects human interests or whether it instead commodifies human creative expression in ways that diminish human autonomy.

8.2 Access to Knowledge and Public Domain Concerns

Copyright and patent protection create limited monopolies restricting public access to protected works and inventions. Extending such protection to AI-generated content could reduce public domain materials and knowledge commons available for free access and subsequent creation. This concern assumes heightened importance in developing countries where access to knowledge directly impacts educational and research capabilities.

8.3 Innovation Incentives and IP Policy

IP protection aims to incentivize innovation through economic reward mechanisms. For AI-generated works, traditional incentive structures may prove less relevant—AI systems do not

require copyright or patent incentives to function. Instead, IP policy must grapple with questions regarding who appropriately receives economic returns from AI-generated innovation: users, developers, society broadly, or rights-holders in training data?

9. Recommendations for Legislative and Regulatory Reform

9.1 Statutory Amendment Recommendations

Copyright Act Amendments:

1. Introduce explicit statutory definitions distinguishing "AI-generated works" (ineligible for copyright absent human authorship) from "AI-assisted works" (eligible for copyright where human creators exercise meaningful control)

2. Establish authorship attribution standards for AI-assisted works, specifying minimum human creative contributions required for copyright eligibility

3. Create statutory licensing frameworks governing copyright owner consent for AI training data incorporation

4. Establish mandatory disclosure requirements for training data composition, similar to EU AI Act provisions

Patents Act Amendments:

1. Clarify that patent eligibility requires human inventorship; AI-generated inventions without human inventor participation remain unpatentable

2. Establish frameworks for joint inventorship acknowledging human-AI collaborative contributions

3. Address liability attribution for AI-implemented inventions and patent infringement risks

4. Create provisional patent frameworks for inventions at early development stages, encouraging subsequent human refinement and contribution

9.2 Regulatory and Policy Recommendations

1. **IP Office Guidance:** The Indian Patent Office and Copyright Board should issue guidance clarifying current statutory interpretation regarding AI-generated works, providing developers and creators with transparent expectations.

2. **Transparency Requirements:** Establish disclosure requirements for AI training data composition, permitting copyright owners to assess infringement risks and exercise protective measures.

3. **Fair Compensation Mechanisms:** Develop statutory licensing regimes providing fair compensation to copyright owners whose works are incorporated into AI training datasets, balancing innovation incentives with creator compensation.

4. **Liability Frameworks:** Establish clear liability attribution rules addressing accountability for IP infringement by AI systems, clarifying responsibility distribution among developers, deployers, and users.

5. **Interdisciplinary Collaboration:** Encourage ongoing dialogue among legal scholars, technologists, ethicists, and policymakers to address emerging challenges in AI-IP intersection.

10. Discussion and Synthesis

10.1 Tensions in Current Legal Frameworks

Current intellectual property frameworks contain internal tensions when applied to AI-generated content:

Innovation and Protection Tension: IP law aims to encourage innovation through protection and economic incentives. Yet extending such protection to AI systems may underinvest in human creator incentives and instead reward technology developers or training data compilers without corresponding creative contributions.

Access and Monopoly Tension: IP protection creates temporary monopolies reducing public knowledge access. Expanding IP eligibility to AI-generated works could restrict public domain materials and knowledge commons essential for subsequent innovation.

Statutory Clarity and Technological Neutrality Tension: Statutory provisions drafted without AI consideration lack explicit guidance for emerging technologies. Yet overly specific legislation may rapidly become obsolete as AI capabilities evolve.

10.2 Comparative Legal Evolution

Examining global responses reveals divergent regulatory philosophies:

- **United States:** Strict human-authorship requirement maintaining traditional IP frameworks
- **European Union:** Regulatory intervention through AI Act imposing transparency obligations rather than redefining authorship
- **United Kingdom:** Statutory accommodation of non-human creators through designated authorship alternatives
- **India:** Judicial affirmation of human-centric authorship through RAGHAV decision, awaiting legislative response

India's approach, emphasizing judicial wisdom and careful statutory interpretation, demonstrates appropriate caution regarding wholesale legal reform. However, judicial restraint should not preclude legislative action addressing clear statutory gaps.

10.3 The Role of Human Contribution in Determining IP Eligibility

Across copyright, patents, and design protection, a consistent principle emerges: meaningful human creative or inventive contribution proves essential for IP protection. This principle reflects foundational values regarding:

- Recognition of human creativity and innovation as deserving legal protection
- Attribution of responsibility to identifiable human agents
- Maintenance of incentive structures rewarding human effort
- Protection of human dignity and autonomy through creative expression recognition

The human contribution standard provides a workable framework distinguishing protectable from unprotectable AI outputs without requiring fundamental statutory redefinition.

11. Conclusion

The intersection of artificial intelligence and intellectual property rights presents the most significant challenge to IP frameworks since their modern codification in the nineteenth century. As autonomous AI systems demonstrate increasing capability in creative and inventive production, statutory and judicial frameworks designed exclusively for human creators face acute strain.

Current Indian law, as authoritatively interpreted through the RAGHAV decision, maintains that IP protection requires meaningful human authorship or inventorship. This position reflects both statutory language and foundational principles regarding human creativity's legal significance. However, the decision simultaneously acknowledges that human-AI collaborative works may qualify for protection if human contributors exercise sufficient creative control.

Statutory amendments clarifying the legal status of AI-assisted versus AI-generated works would provide necessary guidance to developers, creators, and IP offices. Such amendments should maintain the human contribution requirement while accommodating collaborative creative processes increasingly prevalent in digital production. Additionally, regulatory frameworks addressing training data transparency, fair compensation mechanisms, and liability attribution would address pressing practical concerns without fundamentally reconceiving IP's human-centric foundations.

The challenge facing Indian policymakers involves balancing multiple competing interests: encouraging AI innovation and investment, protecting human creators and IP rights holders, ensuring equitable access to knowledge and technology, and maintaining constitutional values protecting human dignity and freedom of expression. No single legal regime perfectly optimizes all these interests. However, a framework maintaining human authorship and inventorship requirements while explicitly accommodating human-AI collaboration appears most consistent with India's legal traditions and constitutional values while remaining responsive to technological evolution.

The evolution of IP law regarding AI represents not merely technical legal adjustment but rather

fundamental reconsideration of how legal systems recognize, protect, and incentivize human creativity in technological contexts. India's judicial and legislative responses to these questions will shape not only domestic IP frameworks but also contribute to emerging global norms addressing technology and human creativity's complex relationship.

REFERENCES

- Asian Journal of International Law. (2025). "Copyright Protection for AI-Generated Works: Exploring Originality and Ownership in a Digital Landscape," Volume 15, Issue 1.

- Buick, A. (2025). "Copyright and AI training data—transparency to the rescue?"*Journal of Intellectual Property Law & Practice*, 20(3), 182-197.

- C&D IP. (2025). "AI-Generated Inventions and Patentability: Navigating Legal Implications." Retrieved from legal databases on AI and patent law.

- Copyright Alliance. (2023). "Who Owns the Copyright to AI-Generated Works?" Frequently Asked Questions.

- Delhi High Court. (2024). RAGHAV Artificial Intelligence v. Union of India, Patent and Copyright Case Decision 2024.

- Drishti IAS. (2025). "Generative AI and Copyright Issues." Daily updates analysis.

- EU Commission. (2024). "EU Artificial Intelligence Act: Comprehensive Regulatory Framework."

- Granthaalaya Publication. (2024). "Artificial Intelligence and Protection of AI-Generated Works Under Intellectual Property Rights,"*ShodhKosh: Journal of Visual and Performing Arts*, 5, 1319-1327.

- Israhadi, E.I. (2023). "The Impact of Developments in Artificial Intelligence on Copyright and other Intellectual Property Laws."*Journal of Law and Social Sciences*, 11(11), 1965.

- K&S Advocates. (2024). "AI, IPR, and The Evolving Legal Landscape in India." Legal analysis and commentary.

- Maheshwari & Co. (2025). "AI Copyright Law India: Ownership Explained." Retrieved from legal databases on AI and copyright.

- Mondaq. (2025). "Training AI Models: Intersection Between AI And Copyright." Legal analysis regarding training data and copyright infringement.
- Mondaq. (2024). "AI, Machine Learning & Big Data Laws And Regulations 2024." Comparative legal analysis across jurisdictions.
- Oxford Academic Press. (2025). "Copyright and AI training data—transparency to the rescue?"*Journal of Intellectual Property Law & Practice*, 20(3).
- Parliament of India. (1957). The Copyright Act, 1957. Statutory Instrument.
- Parliament of India. (1970). The Patents Act, 1970. Statutory Instrument.
- Sahni, A. (2025). "Legal Protection of AI-Generated Creative Works in the Digital Age." Legal research and policy analysis.
- Scholar9. (2025). "How can I write a plagiarism-free research paper without using AI?" Academic writing guidance and research ethics.
- Soni, T. (2024). "Impact of AI on IPR Framework."*SSRN Electronic Journal*, 4831898. DOI: 10.2139/ssrn.4831898
- Supreme Court of India. (2008). Eastern Book Company v. D.B. Modak, 3 SCC 53.
- Supreme Court of India. (1978). R.G. Anand v. Delux Films, AIR 1978 SC 1613.
- Thakur, A. (2025). "Legal Implications of AI-Generated Works in Copyright Law: An Analysis of RAGHAV Artificial Intelligence v. Union of India."*Symbiosis Law School Research Journal*.
- UNESCO. (1886/2025). The Berne Convention for the Protection of Literary and Artistic Works. International legal instrument.
- United Nations. (1994). TRIPS Agreement (Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights). International legal framework.
- University of Nebraska Digital Commons. (2018). "Intellectual Property Rights and

Copyright Laws in the Digital Age." Academic legal research and analysis.

- U.S. Copyright Office. (2025). "Copyright Office Releases Part 2 of Artificial Intelligence Report." NewsNet Issue 1060. Official guidance on AI and copyright protection.

- U.S. Patent and Trademark Office. (2022). Thaler v. Vidal Patent Inventorship Case. Federal court decision establishing AI inventorship framework.

Appendix A: Key Terminology

Authorship: Legal recognition of human persons as creators of literary, dramatic, musical, and artistic works qualifying for copyright protection.

Generative AI: Artificial intelligence systems capable of producing new content (images, text, music, code) based on learned patterns from training data.

Inventorship: Legal recognition of natural persons as developers of technical solutions and innovations qualifying for patent protection.

Machine Learning: Subset of artificial intelligence where systems improve performance through experience and data analysis rather than explicit programming.

Neural Networks: Computational structures mimicking biological brain organization, enabling sophisticated pattern recognition and generation.

Originality: Legal requirement that protectable works demonstrate independent creation and minimum level of creative effort.

Training Data: Dataset used to train artificial intelligence systems, upon which the system's output generation depends.