
A COMPARATIVE STUDY: AUTHORSHIP OF AI-ASSISTED AND AI-GENERATED WORKS ACROSS FOUR JURISDICTIONS

P. Hindhujaa, School of Law,
SRM Institute of Science and Technology, Kattankulathur, Chennai

ABSTRACT

The growth of technology and emergence of artificial intelligence has substantially challenged the traditional authorship under copyright laws. The Copyright Act, 1957 was enacted with the primary aim for consolidating the laws relating to copyrights in India. These rights are primarily granted to authors in respect of original work in various categories such as literary, dramatic, artistic works etc. With the development of artificial intelligence, AI systems are able to generate and produce literary, dramatic, artistic works and other forms of creative works, this thereby raises the fundamental question regarding who should be recognised as author and who holds the copyrights of AI generated works. This paper examines the relationship between artificial intelligence and human authorship, with the primary focus on the requirement of human contribution. Through doctrinal analysis of copyright legislation, judicial decisions and comparative legal developments, this paper examines the legal status of AI-assisted and AI-generated works along with the meaning of authorship and originality under copyright laws. Predominant attention is given to the Indian legal framework by examining the treatment of computer-generated works under the Copyright Act, 1957, alongside major developments in other jurisdictions such as the United States (USA), the United Kingdom (UK) and the European Union (EU). The increasing use of AI towards generation of various creative works exposes the various uncertainties in the Act, especially with regards to Authorship and the degree of human involvement required to be granted authorship rights under the Act. It further examines how the existing frameworks accommodate the varying degrees of human creativity from involvement of AI as a mere tool to substantially AI generated work. The paper concludes by establishing the need for better regulated guidelines with regards to authorship of AI generated works to protect the rights available to the authors of original works. With the advancement of AI, It is important that copyright laws must continue to evolve in a manner that protects the creative rights of the author while facilitating technological development and promoting wider societal benefits.

Keywords: Artificial Intelligence, Authorship, Originality, Copyright Act.

I. INTRODUCTION

The usage of Artificial Intelligence (hereinafter referred as AI), has seen a steady growth towards the generation and production of various creative works such as literary, images, audio-visual content and other forms of artistic expressions. “Artificial intelligence (AI) refers to the development of computer systems that can perform tasks that typically require human intelligence, such as perception, reasoning, learning, and decision making”¹. Unlike traditional technological tools that primarily assist human creators, generative AI models can produce outputs that resemble works that are traditionally associated with human creativity and authorship. “These AI technologies challenge the fundamental building blocks of existing intellectual property (IP) laws and institutions, which are misaligned with AI-driven innovation on multiple fronts”². Traditionally copyright laws require factors such as human skills and creativity to be granted copyright protections. “Mental activity is key to recognition of authorship, as shown by two main concepts of law on intellectual property: “originality” in copyright law; and “inventiveness” or “non-obviousness” in patent law”³. Further, these rights are only provided to works created by human authors. As a result, this raises the question of whether copyrights are extended towards AI generated works and to what extent is human creativity and effort required for granting copyrights to AI-assisted works. Presently, under “The Copyright Right, 1957” the provision grants rights to the human author and does not explicitly provide authorship for AI generated works. Indian copyright laws, value the creativity and originality involved in the production of the work, which are insufficient or difficult to establish with works generated with the use of AI.

Additionally, due to such ambiguity in law, the extent of protection that can be granted for such works remains uncertain, as the extent of human effort required to grant AI-assisted works copyright protection still remains underdetermined. The existing copyright framework across jurisdictions were largely developed based on traditional technological tools and human creators. However, the increasing use of generative AI results in uncertainty on the existing understanding of the concepts of authorship and originality and whether they are sufficient to

¹ Thushar V. Senan et al., AI, Creativity, and Copyright Law in India: Navigating the Boundaries of Originality and Authorship, 6 INT’L J. L. MGMT. & HUMAN. 2941 (2023).

² Deepak Somaya & Lav R. Varshney, Ownership Dilemmas in an Age of Creative Machines, 36 ISSUES SCI. & TECH. 79, 79–85 (2020).

³ Camille Alegre, Between Device and Demiurge: AI and the Legal Status of AI Creations, in *Intelligence Artificielle, Culture et Médias* 345, 345–62 (Véronique Guèvremont & Colette Brin eds., Les Presses de l’Université Laval 2024), [<https://doi.org/10.2307/jj.15478489.19>] (last visited Sept. 27, 2026).

determine the copyright protection for AI-assisted and AI-generated works. “Applying this definition does become somewhat convoluted with the assistance of generative AI tools, specifically those using GenAI in an operation where there is a use of prompts through users, leading to vaguery on how to demarcate the act of authorship”⁴. This paper seeks to examine the concept of authorship under copyright laws, the legal status of AI - Assisted and AI - Generated works in addition examine the extent to which of requirement of human creativity and originality in India and other jurisdictions such as the UK, the EU and the US. The paper adopts a doctrinal and comparative legal research methodology by analysing statutory provisions, judicial decisions, regulatory developments and relevant international approaches. This paper examines the traditional concept of authorship and originality under copyright laws and the application of these principles to AI-assisted and AI-generated works under the Indian legal framework and other jurisdictions.

II. AUTHORSHIP UNDER COPYRIGHT ACT, 1957:

In India under Copyright Act, 1957 an author is defined as “(i) in relation to a literary or dramatic work, the author of the work; (ii) in relation to a musical work, the composer; (iii) in relation to an artistic work other than a photograph, the artist; (iv) in relation to a photograph, the person taking the photograph; 2 [(v) in relation to a cinematograph film or sound recording, the producer; and (vi) in relation to any literary, dramatic, musical or artistic work which is computer-generated, the person who causes the work to be created;]”⁵. The provision of the Act, primarily focuses on the requirement of human authorship towards the various artistic works and remains silent on AI-generated and AI-assisted works. Additionally, the section also discusses computer generated works, but remains silent on whether such definition includes AI generated works. This further raises queries of whether an AI model could be given authorship and who would be the author of works that are predominantly generated through AI.

Further, the concept of originality has been given major predominance towards the grant of copyrights in India. “Being original is one of the most important aspects of copyright protection. It is given in Section 13 of Indian Copyright Act, 1957 that copyright is only given

⁴ Tanisha Chellani, AI as Creative Collaborator: Rethinking Authorship and Copyright in the Digital Era, 5 Indian J. Integrated Rsch. L., no. 1 (2024).

⁵ Copyright Act, 1957, § 2(d), No. 14, Acts of Parliament, 1957 (India).

to original works, including especially literary, dramatic, musical, and artistic works”⁶. It can thus be understood that as per the provisions of “section 13”⁷ of the Act, the core fundamental requirement of the Act, is originality. “Consequently, 'originality' also refers not to novelty or creativity in ideas but only to the manner and material form of their presentation. What is protected is the expression of thought- the form, formulation, order, plan or arrangement of presentation- as testifying to the investment by the author of mental faculties, skills, competence, craftsmanship, knowledge, labour and capital in the production of any work”⁸. This implies that the Act, primarily protects, the author’s creativity and skill utilised towards the expression of such idea and not the idea itself. In this regard, the Hon’ble Supreme Court had further expanded on prerequisites for copyrights in the Act, in the precedent of “*Eastern Book Co. v. D.B. Modak*, 2008” The case primarily established the concept of “modicum of creativity” whereby the court had held that “The work should be independently created by the author as opposed to copied from the other works and that it possesses at least some minimal degree of creativity”⁹. This raises the fundamental question on whether, AI generated works with minimal level of human skill and creativity, satisfy the prerequisites under the Act. The concept of originality has been expanded in India through various precedents. The Court in the case of “*V. Govindan v. E.M. Gopalakrishna Kone*, 1955” the court had held that “In modern complex society, provisions have to be made for protecting everyman's copyright, whether big or small, whether involving a high degree of originality, as in a new poem or picture, or only originality at the vanishing point, as in a law report”¹⁰. The Court, had clearly established that the Act, grants protection to works with minimal level of originality involved in its production. “This usually means that an author must show that she exercised creativity in selecting which facts to include, or in arranging those facts in the collection, or both”¹¹. Thus, this warrants examination of whether, works generated by users through the prompts with the assistance of AI, where such author verifies and selects the content generated, satisfies the requirement of

⁶ Katyayani Guha, Exploring the Legal Conundrum Under Indian Law: AI-Generated Artworks and Copyright Infringement (Sept. 20, 2026), <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.7520378>.

⁷ (1) Subject to the provisions of this section and the other provisions of this Act, copyright shall subsist throughout India in the following classes of works, that is to say, (a) original literary, dramatic, musical and artistic works; (b) cinematograph films; and (c) sound recording. Copyright Act, 1957, § 13, No. 14, Acts of Parliament, 1957 (India).

⁸ Baxi, Upendra. “COPYRIGHT LAW AND JUSTICE IN INDIA.” *Journal of the Indian Law Institute*, vol. 28, no. 4, 1986, pp. 497–540. JSTOR, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/43951048>. Accessed 3 Oct. 2026.

⁹ *Eastern Book Co. v. D.B. Modak*, (2008) 1 SCC 1 (India).

¹⁰ *V. Govindan v. E.M. Gopalakrishna Kone*, AIR 1955 Mad. 391 (India).

¹¹ R. Anthony Reese, What Should Copyright Protect?, in *What If We Could Reimagine Copyright?* 111, 111–46 (Rebecca Giblin & Kimberlee Weatherall eds., ANU Press 2017), <http://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt1q1crjg.7> (last visited Oct. 3, 2026).

originality and could claim copyright protection.

In India copyright laws still places principle focus on the works created through the use of traditional methods and remains silent on the grant of such protection to AI generated or AI assisted works. Further, it can be seen that one of the key requirements for granting copyrights in India, is the human creativity, skill and effort exercised towards the creation of such works. However, the Act continues to remain silent on whether AI- assisted works could be registered and protected under the Act. This implies that there is a need for establishing clarity regarding the position of AI assisted works, where there is proof of sufficient skill and judgement by the human author, so that such work could be guaranteed the protection and benefits available to authors under the Act.

III. WHO IS THE AUTHOR OF AI ASSISTED AND AI GENERATED WORKS? :

The continued evolution of generative AI necessitates a legal framework that primarily addresses the concept authorship and ownership of AI generated works but also provides safeguards against the unauthorised exploitation of copyrighted works for training AI models. The use of AI in generation of creative works such as images, books etc. has significantly increased, this results in ambiguity in two-folds namely. Firstly, an author can generate work with the complete dependence of AI, which leads to the question of who qualifies to be the “author” of such work and whether such work can be registered and granted protection under the Act. Secondly, an Author can create works with AI as a research tool and utilising human skill, creativity, effort and time towards the creation of such work, this aspect leads to the question of whether such work satisfies the fundamental prerequisites of originality and creativity, which qualifies the work to be eligible for copyright protection. “This is where AI-assisted works ought to be distinguished from AI-generated works AI Works. These are not terms of art but merely serve as a categorical guide to reflect the degree of human input that is subsequently traceable to the expression of the generated output”¹².

In Indian Scenario, “Ankit Sahni had through the assistance of RAGHAV AI (Robust Artificially Intelligent Graphics and Art Visualizer)”¹³, generated art work and approached the

¹² Cheng Lim Saw & Duncan Lim, The Case for AI Authorship in Copyright Law (Oct. 30, 2024), <https://ssrn.com/abstract=5108423> , <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.5108423> .

¹³ Ankit Sahni’s AI Co-Authored Artwork Denied Registration by US, Continues to Be Registered in India, SpicyIP (Dec. 2023), <https://spicyip.com/2023/12/ankit-sahnis-ai-co-authored-artwork-denied-registration-byus-continues-to-be-registered-in-india.html> .

Indian Copyrights Office in 2020 and was subsequently granted such copyright protection, making it the first case in India, where AI assisted work was granted copyrights along with the AI as co-author. However, this was later withdrawn by the Indian Copyrights Office, due to the primary requisite of human authorship and originality under Act. Similar stance was held by the U.S Copyright Office, which held that there was insufficient proof that, such work was an output of human authorship. Thus, it is apparent that, the copyright protection extends to AI-assisted works, provided they show sufficient proof of human authorship and skills. Additionally, both jurisdictions, have also refrained to grant co-authorship to AI models, for the works generated with AI assistance and collaboration.

In the case of “Thaler v Perlmutter”, the U.S Copyrights Office had held that “human authorship is a bedrock requirement of copyright”¹⁴. Both India and U.S firmly affirm that the term “Authorship” refers to “human authorship” and AI generated works, do not pass the requisites under copyright laws, to be granted the same protection and benefits guaranteed to works created through human authorship. Similarly in the case of “Zarya of the Dawn” the U.S copyrights Office had held that “Nor does the Office agree that Ms. Kashtanova’s use of textual prompts permits copyright protection of resulting images because the images are the visual representation of “creative, human-authored prompts”¹⁵. Thereby, further restricting the availability of copyright protection for AI-generated works where the author’s involvement is limited to prompts.

A different stance was held in the case of “Li v Liu” the Beijing Internet Court had held that “However, the plaintiff used prompt words to work on the picture elements such as the character and how to present it, and set parameters to work on the picture layout and composition, which reflects the plaintiff’s choice and arrangement”¹⁶. The court had subsequently granted protection for such AI generated work, recognising the human author’s skill and effort towards the prompts provided and selection and modification of such output, in desirable manner. Thus it can be understood that, primarily copyrights to AI generated works and AI models as co-author is denied, on the ground of human authorship and creativity. However, copyright protection extends to AI-assisted works, provided there is sufficient proof

¹⁴ Thaler v. Perlmutter, 2023 WL 5333236 (D.D.C. Aug. 18, 2023).

¹⁵ U.S. Copyright Office, Re: Zarya of the Dawn, Registration No. VAu001480196, at 9–10 (Feb. 21, 2023).

¹⁶ Li v. Liu, (2023) Jing 0491 Min Chu No. 11279 (Beijing Internet Ct. 2023), <https://english.bjinternetcourt.gov.cn/pdf/BeijingInternetCourtCivilJudgment112792023.pdf>.

of human authorship and involvement in the work.

IV. CONCEPT OF FAIR DEALING AND AI TRAINING:

The concept of fair dealing has been discussed in detail in India as “(1) The following acts shall not constitute an infringement of copyright, namely, [(a) a fair dealing with any work, not being a computer programme, for the purposes of (i) private or personal use, including research (ii) criticism or review, whether of that work or of any other work; (iii) the reporting of current events and current affairs, including the reporting of a lecture delivered in public”¹⁷. With the increasing use of AI, serious questions have been raised on whether authors of original works could be granted protection against the storage and reproduction of such work by Large Language Models (LLMs). These issues have been considered by the U.S District court in the case of “Andrea Bartz v. Anthropic” “This order grants summary judgment for Anthropic that the training use was a fair use. And, it grants that the print-to-digital format change was a fair use for a different reason. But it denies summary judgment for Anthropic that the pirated library copies must be treated as training copies”¹⁸. The court had held that the use of copyrighted materials towards training purposes is valid under the concept of fair-use due to the transformative nature of the work. However, the court, had held use of pirated copies as an infringement of the rights guaranteed under the concept of fair use. Similarly in the case of “Kadrey v. Meta Platforms”, the U.S District court had held the “There is no serious question that Meta’s use of the plaintiffs’ books had a “further purpose” and “different character” than the books that it was highly transformative”¹⁹. Thus, had upheld the use of copyrighted material towards the training of AI models permitted under fair-use. These judgments provided important insights into the recent Delhi High Court decision in the case of “ANI Media Pvt Ltd. Vs Open AI OPCO LLC”²⁰. The case raised important questions concerning storage, reproduction and the applicability of fair dealing under the Act. LLMs utilise various publicly available and licensed materials for the purpose of training and to subsequently generate responses based on user prompts. The High Court had devised two-step test for determining whether the protection can be invoked under the Act, namely purpose test and fairness test. Regarding the purpose test, the court had held that in spite of the commercial nature of the

¹⁷ Copyright Act, 1957, § 52, No. 14, Acts of Parliament, 1957 (India).

¹⁸ Bartz v. Anthropic PBC, No. 3:24-cv-05417 (N.D. Cal.).

¹⁹ Richard Kadrey v. Meta Platforms, Inc., No. 3:23-cv-03417 (N.D. Cal.).

²⁰ ANI Media Pvt. Ltd. v. OpenAI OpCo LLC, 2026:DHC:5900, CS(COMM) 1028/2024 (Delhi H.C. July 24, 2026).

activities of the Defendant, such entities could also avail themselves of the exceptions under the Act. Additionally, the court had held that since the primary data utilised is for research and was not made available to the public, such processing and storage of data, amounts to fair use under the Act. Further, under the fairness test it was stated that, since the functions of the Defendant have no negative impact, towards its economic interests and these activities also support economic development, the use of such available data towards training of LLMs amount to fair use. Thus, it can be reasonably understood that the training of AI models with copyrighted materials comes under the concept of fair dealing/ fair use, due to the highly transformative nature of the work. Therefore, with the advancement of AI, there is a need to strike balance between the objective of the Act to protect authors and original creators while simultaneously encouraging the growth of technology. It is important that copyright laws must continue to evolve in a manner that protects the creative rights of the author while facilitating technological development and promoting wider societal benefits.

V. COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF AUTHORSHIP RIGHTS IN INDIA, THE UNITED STATES, THE UNITED KINGDOM AND THE EUROPEAN UNION.

The legal treatment of authorship of AI generated and AI assisted works varies across these jurisdiction. Although, these jurisdictions primarily recognise originality as a fundamental requirement of copyright protection the difference lies on how they address works generated through artificial intelligence, when the level of human creativity is limited or absent.

The United Kingdom defines an author through “the Copyright Designs and Patents Act 1988, (CDPA)” as “In this Part “author”, in relation to a work, means the person who creates it”²¹. And further, similar to ‘the Copyright Act 1957’ the author of computer generated works is defined as “In the case of a literary, dramatic, musical or artistic work which is computergenerated, the author shall be taken to be the person by whom the arrangements necessary for the creation of the work are undertaken”²². It is understood that, the right of authorship towards compute generated works is granted to the person who has made all the necessary arrangements required for the generation of such works. Additionally, such works are further expanded as “computer-generated”, in relation to a work, means that the work is generated by computer in circumstances such that there is no human author of the work;”²³.

²¹ Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988, § 9(1) (UK).

²² Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988, § 9(3) (UK).

²³ Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988, § 178 (UK).

“Under such a framework, if human curation constitutes at least 20% of the final output, partial or joint authorship could be recognized”²⁴. Thus, this framework potentially allows authorship to be attributed to a person who is responsible for arranging the creation of a work even when such person had not significantly contributed towards such work. However, “The UK Report on copyright and artificial intelligence had proposed to reconsider the protection granted for wholly computer generated works, while continuing the protection for created with AI assistance”²⁵. Therefore, the existence of a statutory rule in the UK and India does not automatically result in guaranteed copyright protection for every AI-generated output; the applicability of the requirement of originality still remain relevant in both the jurisdictions.

In contrast “The United States follows a stringent human authorship policy: copyright protection shall be available only if the work demonstrates independent human thinking”²⁶. “The Copyright Act 1976”, defines the subject matter of copyrights as “Copyright protection subsists, in accordance with this title, in original works of authorship fixed in any tangible medium of expression, now known or later developed, from which they can be perceived, reproduced, or otherwise communicated, either directly or with the aid of a machine or device”²⁷. Thus, it is implied that the fundamental requirement of originality, is mandatory to be fulfilled so that the author can be granted copyright protection under the Act. The US copyrights office in this regard had stated that “This can include situations where a human authored work is perceptible in an AI output, or a human makes creative arrangements or modifications of the output, but not the mere provision of prompts. The Office confirms that the use of AI to assist in the process of creation or the inclusion of AI-generated material in a larger human-generated work does not bar copyrightability”²⁸. It can thus be inferred that, AI-assisted works, with predominance of human authorship is still eligible for copyrights protection, provided the requirement of originality is satisfied and that such human effort should not be limited merely to providing prompts.

Similarly the European Union places greater emphasises on human intellectual creativity

²⁴ Tanishka Yadav, Authorship and Ownership of AI-Generated Works: A Comparative Analysis of Copyright Law in India and the United Kingdom, IJLLR, ISSN: 2582-8878, PIF: 7.142

²⁵ UK Intell. Prop. Off., Report on Copyright and Artificial Intelligence (2026), <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/report-and-impact-assessment-on-copyright-and-artificialintelligence/report-on-copyright-and-artificial-intelligence> .

²⁶ Pratham Ahuja, AI-Generated Works and the Crisis of Authorship Under Copyright Law: An Indian Perspective (Jan. 31, 2026), <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.6266719> .

²⁷ Copyright Act of 1976, 17 U.S.C. § 102(a) (2024), <https://www.copyright.gov/title17/> .

²⁸ U.S. Copyright Office, Copyright Office Releases Part 2 of Artificial Intelligence Report, NewsNet Issue No. 1060 (Jan. 29, 2025).

through the originality requirement and states that the creative work must constitute to be the author's own intellectual creation. This principle was established through “Infopaq International A/S v Danske Dagblades Forening” where it was stated that “Copyright within the meaning of Article 2(a) of Directive 2001/29 is liable to apply only in relation to a subjectmatter which is original in the sense that it is its author’s own intellectual creation”²⁹. Thus, in situations where AI merely assists the creative process, copyright protection may remain available under EU standards however, where the majority of the elements are generated autonomously by AI without sufficient human creative input and originality, satisfying the EU originality standard may be difficult. Additionally, provision for exclusive rights of authorship to AI for such AI generated works also remains unavailable.

In India, the “Copyright Act, 1957” expressly provides that, in relation to a computer-generated works, the author means the person who is responsible for such work to be created. The Indian provision offers a statutory method for recognising the authorship for certain computergenerated works however, such application towards modern generative AI still remains uncertain. The requirement of originality and human creativity are mandatory standards to be granted copyright protection under the Act. In this regard the World Intellectual Property Organisation (WIPO) had also expressed that “Traditionally, the ownership of copyright in computer-generated works was not in question because the program was merely a tool that supported the creative process, very much like a pen and paper. Creative works qualify for copyright protection if they are original, with most definitions of originality requiring a human author”³⁰.

In conclusion, the comparison of authorship rights to AI generated and AI assisted works, reveal the absence of a uniform approach towards determining authorship in AI-generated works. It can be inferred that, the requirement of originality and human creativity still subsists across these jurisdictions. However, the level of human contribution required for works generated through AI-assistance continues to remain vague.

VI. ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSION:

The emergence of artificial intelligence has continued to challenge the traditional principles of

²⁹ Infopaq International A/S v. Danske Dagblades Forening, Case C-5/08, [2009] E.C.R. I-6569 (E.C.J.).

³⁰ Andres Guadamuz, Artificial Intelligence and Copyright, WIPO MAG. (Oct. 1, 2017), <https://www.wipo.int/en/web/wipo-magazine/articles/artificial-intelligence-and-copyright-40141> .

copyright laws in concepts of originality, ownership and authorship. Although, traditionally copyright laws across jurisdictions were primarily developed to protect works resulting from human creativity, the increasing ability of AI systems to independently generate literary, artistic, and audiovisual content has exposed the significant gaps in the existing legal frameworks. The primary issue does not arise merely from whether AI-generated and AI-assisted works should receive copyright protection but rather how authorship should be attributed to such works and what degree of human creative involvement is necessary to satisfy the requirements of originality to be granted copyright protection to such authors. In India, “the Copyright Act, 1957”, expressly recognises the person who is responsible for the creation a computer-generated work to its author. However, the application of this provision to the works generated through AI remains uncertain, especially in instances where the human contribution is limited. Similarly, the United States places significant emphasis on human authorship by generally excluding purely AI-generated works from copyright protection however, the works that are created with sufficient human contribution are permitted for copyright protection. The European Union adopts an originality centred approach which thereby requires sufficient creativity and originality to be attributable to the human author. In contrast, the United Kingdom provides a statutory mechanism for attributing authorship rights to the person who is responsible making the necessary arrangements which results in the creation of a computergenerated work. However, the Government's proposal for reconsideration of the protection granted to wholly computer generated works demonstrates that such protection remains a subject of policy debate. The comparative analysis therefore reveals a distinction towards the copyright protection granted between AI-assisted works, in which there is predominance of human creative decisions and originality towards the final output and AI-generated works in which the originality and creativity of the human author is limited.

In conclusion, the absence of a uniform approach across India, the US, the UK and the EU highlights the need for clarity of statutory provisions regarding the authorship of AI – generated and AI – assisted works and its copyright eligibility. The Indian legal framework would benefit from clearer guidance towards copyright protection granted to AI generated works, the assessment of the degree human creative contribution and clear distinction between AI-assisted and wholly AI-generated works. Any reform made should balance the protection of human creativity with the need to accommodate the growth of technological innovation while simultaneously avoiding automatic attribution of authorship to either AI systems or to individuals whose creative contribution is insufficient.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Articles

Thushar V. Senan et al., AI, Creativity, and Copyright Law in India: Navigating the Boundaries of Originality and Authorship, 6 INT'L J. L. MGMT. & HUMAN. 2941 (2023).

Deepak Somaya & Lav R. Varshney, Ownership Dilemmas in an Age of Creative Machines, 36 ISSUES SCI. & TECH. 79, 79–85 (2020), <https://www.jstor.org/stable/26949112>.

Camille Alegre, Between Device and Demiurge: AI and the Legal Status of AI Creations, in *Intelligence Artificielle, Culture et Médias* 345, 345–62 (Véronique Guèvremont & Colette Brin eds., Les Presses de l'Université Laval 2024), [<https://doi.org/10.2307/jj.15478489.19>].

Tanisha Chellani, AI as Creative Collaborator: Rethinking Authorship and Copyright in the Digital Era, 5 Indian J. Integrated Rsch. L., no. 1 (2024).

Katyayani Guha, Exploring the Legal Conundrum Under Indian Law: AI-Generated Artworks and Copyright Infringement (Sept. 20, 2026), <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.7520378>.

Baxi, Upendra. "COPYRIGHT LAW AND JUSTICE IN INDIA." *Journal of the Indian Law Institute*, vol. 28, no. 4, 1986, pp. 497–540. JSTOR, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/43951048>.

R. Anthony Reese, What Should Copyright Protect?, in *What If We Could Reimagine Copyright?* 111, 111–46 (Rebecca Giblin & Kimberlee Weatherall eds., ANU Press 2017), <http://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt1q1crjg.7>.

Cheng Lim Saw & Duncan Lim, The Case for AI Authorship in Copyright Law (Oct. 30, 2024), <https://ssrn.com/abstract=5108423> , <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.5108423>.

Tanishka Yadav, Authorship and Ownership of AI-Generated Works: A Comparative Analysis of Copyright Law in India and the United Kingdom, *IJLLR*, ISSN: 2582-8878, PIF: 7.142.

Pratham Ahuja, AI-Generated Works and the Crisis of Authorship Under Copyright Law: An Indian Perspective (Jan. 31, 2026), <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.6266719>.

Statutes

The Copyright Act, 1957 (India).

Copyright, Designs and Patents Act, 1988 (UK).

Copyright Act of 1976, (United States of America).

Indian Cases

Eastern Book Co. v. D.B. Modak, (2008) 1 SCC 1 (India).

V. Govindan v. E.M. Gopalakrishna Kone, AIR 1955 Mad. 391 (India).

ANI Media Pvt. Ltd. v. OpenAI OpCo LLC, 2026:DHC:5900, CS(COMM) 1028/2024 (Delhi H.C. July 24, 2026).

International Cases

Thaler v. Perlmutter, 2023 WL 5333236 (D.D.C. Aug. 18, 2023).

U.S. Copyright Office, Re: Zarya of the Dawn, Registration No. VAu001480196, at 9–10 (Feb. 21, 2023).

Li v. Liu, (2023) Jing 0491 Min Chu No. 11279 (Beijing Internet Ct. 2023), <https://english.bjinternetcourt.gov.cn/pdf/BeijingInternetCourtCivilJudgment112792023.pdf>.

Bartz v. Anthropic PBC, No. 3:24-cv-05417 (N.D. Cal.).

Richard Kadrey v. Meta Platforms, Inc., No. 3:23-cv-03417 (N.D. Cal.).

Infopaq International A/S v. Danske Dagblades Forening, Case C-5/08, [2009] E.C.R. I-6569 (E.C.J.).

Blogs And Articles

Ankit Sahni's AI Co-Authored Artwork Denied Registration by US, Continues to Be Registered in India, SpicyIP (Dec. 2023), <https://spicyip.com/2023/12/ankit-sahnis-ai-coauthored-artwork-denied-registration-by-us-continues-to-be-registered-in-india.html>.

UK Intell. Prop. Off., Report on Copyright and Artificial Intelligence (2026), <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/report-and-impact-assessment-on-copyrightand-artificial-intelligence/report-on-copyright-and-artificial-intelligence>.

U.S. Copyright Office, Copyright Office Releases Part 2 of Artificial Intelligence Report, NewsNet Issue No. 1060 (Jan. 29, 2025).

Andres Guadamuz, Artificial Intelligence and Copyright, WIPO MAG. (Oct. 1, 2017), <https://www.wipo.int/en/web/wipo-magazine/articles/artificial-intelligence-and-copyright40141>.