INTERNATIONAL ADVANCE JOURNAL OF ENGINEERING, SCIENCE AND MANAGEMENT (IAJESM)
January-June 2023, Submitted in June 2023, iajesm2014@gmail.com, ISSN -2393-8048
Multidisciplinary Indexed/Peer Reviewed Journal. SJIF Impact Factor 2023 =6.753

The Impact of Artificial Intelligence on Intellectual Property Rights: Challenges and Regulatory Frameworks

Pallavi Chaurasia, Research Scholar, PHD Law, Vikrant University, Gwalior

Abstract

The rise of artificial intelligence (AI) is transforming the intellectual property (IP) landscape, challenging established principles of authorship, ownership, originality, and enforcement. AI systems generate creative work, inventions, and data-relative outputs, introducing concerns of data scraping, fair use, and misuse of deepfakes and digital replicases. Regulatory responses are uneven, with the United States favoring a pro-innovation, sector-based formulation, the European Union proposing a holistic risk-based regime, the United Kingdom focusing on pro-innovation, less prescriptive policies, and India remaining a human-centric paradigm of copyright regulations. While progress has been made towards harmonized standards through the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO) and the Council of Europe, protection is not evenly enforced worldwide. Conflicts arise in transparency requirements, trade secret protection, border jurisdiction shopping, and the balance between innovation and creator rights. This paper critically examines these challenges, regulatory trends, and potential solutions such as sui generis rights, watermarking, and blockchain-enabled licensing.

Keywords: Artificial Intelligence, Intellectual Property, Authorship & Ownership, Data Scraping, Regulatory Frameworks.

1. INTRODUCTION

AI is automating, innovating and developing data-driven solutions in the healthcare sector, education sector, industry sector and creativity. The increasing capacity to create independent works materialistically through writings, paintings, films, computer programming and inventions have put into question decades-old intellectual property (IP) laws that emphasize on originality and human creativity. There is a threat in the creativity and ownership of work as well as authorship since AI is confusing who writes and owns the machine generated outputs. In addition, the use of copyrighted data in the training of AI models are significant issues of ownership, fair use, and copyright infringement in question where one will question whether or not the IP law will be able to be updated relative to these technologies.

Although AI can create paradigm shifts, their unstable legal regulation in different countries leads to instability and confusions. Not all governments are accepting of works created by AI, which is why some governments are not acknowledging it, yet others are accepting it legally. IP rights cannot be managed easily due to AI patent inventor issues, data scraping, deepfakes, etc. Global regulators and policymakers are talking more about ways to maintain a balance between the right of creators and innovation. In a rapidly expanding world of AI, the article will critically evaluate and examine how the threat of AI to IP law unfolds and consider new regulatory efforts in this sphere to understand legal, ethical, and policy consequences of these changes further.

2. KEY CHALLENGES AT THE INTERSECTION OF AI AND IP

The problems of knowing what rights have been invoked by an AI-generated work are difficult. The majority of copyright statutes, including the Indian Copyright Act, the Philippine Copyright Act and the Chinese Copyright Act, only recognize human authors thus the copyright has not been extended to automation or autonomous artificial intelligence. In spite of what DABUS says, the patents law does not exclude considering AI inventorship. Claims of copyright infringement by Stability AI and OpenAI to scrape books, photos, and news and train AI to pilot it suggest that the question of fair use arises. Privacy and the rights to personality concerns surrounding AI-induced deepfakes and voice cloning are covered in Tennessee ELVIS Act and global regulatory initiatives of fighting against the abuse of digital replicas.

2.1. Authorship & Ownership

- **Copyright:** The 1957 Indian Copyright Law solely recognizes natural beings as copyright owners. This makes AI-created work without human assistance difficult. Copyright should be limited to humans to demand creativity as subsection 2(d) defines authors as humans.

Thus, AI-generated works are not protected unless they are human-authored or artistically controlled. Section 52 lists exceptions but does not grant machine authorship. The EU and US prohibit copyright protection of AI-created art, music, and literature since uniqueness requires human creation.

- **Patents: A** quarrel over AI inventorship was already being played out on a world stage. One such example is that of the AI system DABUS that had been awarded a patent in South Africa and credited in Australia. Nevertheless, issues of AI-only inventorship were rejected in major jurisdictions like the US, UK and at the European Patent Office (EPO) where it was clear that a human inventor must always be listed in a patent. Such controversies elicited very important concerns on whether something like solutions that are AI-driven, innovative and non-obvious could be rewarded and secured using available patent regimes.

2.2. Training Data & Scraping

Constructs formed by AI draw on massive stocks of information acquired through web-scraping and digestion of books, photos, news stories, and music without their owner's consent. The concern of copyright infringement comes in the form of fair use (US) or fair dealing (India, UK) when copies of original works are commercially applied as AI. Such conflicts are brought into focus through such high-value litigation as Getty Images v. Stability AI (On the copyright of stock photography) V. The New York Times Fine-tuned OpenAI (LLMs training violation). Courts have argued on whether the use of training data comes under transformative fair use or criminal copying and on whether these require attribution or licensing.

2.3. Deepfakes & Digital Replicas

Privacy, data protection, and personality rights issues arise from deepfake AI impersonation. In some jurisdictions, a person's face and voice are property rights and cannot be exploited unlawfully before copyright law. Defamation, harassment, and identity theft can result from deepfake pornographies or political videos. Policymakers and regulators were debating frameworks to cover synthetic media: the EU proposed an Al Act, which required transparency and consent on AI-generated content, and India was considering a Digital Personal Data Protection Bill (2022), which stressed accountability and consent in data use. These legal discussions also showed the need to balance technical ingenuity with digital privacy and identification.

3. EMERGING REGULATORY FRAMEWORKS

U.S. policy has centred on a decentralised, innovation-driven system with sector-specific rules, although legislative initiatives, such the 2022 Algorithmic Accountability Act, nevertheless sought enhanced disclosure and culpability. The EU was leading with its draft Artificial Intelligence Act (proposed in 2021), which focused on transparency, explainability, and risk-based proportionality regulation but was still under negotiation. Innovation In its 2022 policy document, the UK emphasised its vision of a pro-innovation system and considered expanded text and data mining exemptions with restricted content owner rights. India The Copyright Act of 1957 in India recognises human authorship, and the forthcoming Digital Personal Data Protection Bill (2022) reaffirms permission and responsibility in information use. As of mid, the Council of Europe was negotiating a treaty on AI, human rights, democracy, and the rule of law.

3.1. United States

Decentralised U.S. AI governance promotes innovation over overregulation and regulates sectors-by-sector. Blueprint for an AI Bill of Rights (October 2022) was a federal endeavour to codify AI-related safety, privacy, fairness, and accountability principles without legislative constraints. Courts were answering copyright questions, including whether AI training may utilise copyrighted information under fair use, but by mid, no consensus had been reached. The 2022 Algorithmic Accountability Act would have required corporations to conduct impact evaluations and reporting on automated technologies but was not yet law. U.S. tendencies favoured innovation-based frameworks and increased consideration of copyright, exposure, and responsibility in AI training.

3.2. European Union & UK

The European Union suggested its draft AI Act in April 2021 and 2022 to be the most comprehensive AI regulation in the world. The risk-based approach required dataset transparency, explainability, labelling of AI-generated content, and strict requirements for high-risk AI applications. Similar to the GDPR, non-compliance could result in fines of up to 6% of global turnover. Final discussions were underway in mid, and the Act had not yet been passed. After Brexit, the UK embraced an innovation-friendly strategy. In a 2022 policy paper, the organisation stressed safety, transparency, and justice and opposed a centralised AI law. The UK was also considering widening text and data mining (TDM) exclusions to accommodate AI developers with rights holders' opt-out to balance innovation and IP protection.

3.3. Asia-Pacific & India

Singapore and Japan have standards in AI ethics and exclusions to TDM, whereas Thailand, Vietnam, and Indonesia employ the classical IP regulations that disregard AI-created works. The Indian Copyright Act, 1957 needs human agency, and Allani and Kibow Biotech show that AI cannot write or invent, but human beings using AI applications can be the authors provided there is enough contribution. Although India is not regulated in terms of AI, the Digital Personal Data serves to inhibit the use of AI indirectly by way of consent and purpose.

3.4. International: Council of Europe Framework Convention

The first worldwide legally enforceable AI pact, the Framework Convention on Artificial Intelligence, Human Rights, Democracy, and the Rule of Law, was being negotiated by the Council of Europe in mid. The proposed statement prioritises vital freedoms, openness, accountability, and justice and aligns AI regulation in participating states. Although unratified, the project under consultation focused on human-centered AI governance. It did not establish intellectual property laws, but its focus on rights and democracy could inform future discussions on authorship, data ownership, and the ethical use of biometric and personal data in AI systems.

4. ANALYSIS: BALANCE BETWEEN INNOVATION AND RIGHTS

AI presents issues and solutions to IP enforcement. Organizations such as the Content Authenticity Initiative by Adobe and Alibabas anti-counterfeit platforms use AI to identify infringement as well as stamp authenticity into content whereas organizations such as the EU AI act insist on transparency in datasets of companies. This is contradictory to the trade secrets possessed by AI companies; it is a problem with legal and enforcement concerns. International fragmentation of regulation permits forum shopping within the EU, the U.S., and Asia-Pacific, which complicates the compliance. Although WIPO and Council of Europe attempt harmonisation, no multilateral treaties are binding thus the inefficiency in enforcement is variable, and regulatory arbitrage is feasible.

4.1. Enforcement & Detection

AI presents an issue on IP enforcement and enhances compliance. AI is helping firms to identify the existence of infringement and counterfeiting end mass. The Content Authenticity Initiative by Adobe authenticates media by using digital provided metadata to stop the usage and unauthorized distribution of deepfakes. Millions of cross-border counterfeit listing on Alibaba are tagged by AI-based algorithms every single year. Governments and private firms find AI incursions to be useful at monitoring piracy channels, detecting patterns of infringement, and enforcing legal laws, indicating that the tool will present both a disruption and protector of IP rights.

4.2. Transparency vs. Trade Secrets

Transparency in training dataset is a controversial topic. EU AI Act and other regulators demand disclosure of data source to comply with copyright and privacy laws. The AI companies disagree with these rules since training datasets are trade secrets and sharing of such would be counterproductive in terms of competitiveness. This clash creates legal ambiguity within opt-out regimes (e.g. UK TDM exemptions proposals) by giving right holders the ability

to revoke their permission but it will be hard to enforce without the ability to see datasets. The debate raises some fundamental questions: Responsibility without undermining innovation? Confidential audits of compliance are being discussed and secure registries of data where transparency versus IP needs to be balanced.

4.3. Fragmented Adoption & Cross-Border Consistency

International law differences hinder enforcement. EU risk-based technique is opposing U.S. pro-innovation mentality, and Asian-Pacific countries are at different readiness levels. Hodgepodge regulation allows enterprises to jurisdiction shop by choosing less-policed jurisdictions with friendlier settings. For instance, an AI firm that must provide dataset information under EU law may have less duty in the U.S. Rights owners must comply with many jurisdictions, which can increase expenses and uncertainties.

This fragmentation is the goal of international efforts:

- **WIPO (World Intellectual Property Organization):** As of 2022, WIPO had conducted research and issued consultations to governments around the world to investigate how AI raises intellectual property concerns, especially in the discussions of authorship, inventorship and data rights.
- **Council of Europe:** By mid-2022, the Council of Europe was developing a Framework Convention on AI and human rights, democracy, and the rule of law. Although it was not adopted, its orientation toward the human aspect implied that it may provide a certain indirect contribution to future AI-IP harmonization.

5. RECOMMENDATIONS & REGULATORY PRINCIPLES

It is possible to consider AI as a tool and award human operators or create a sui generis IP right to the output of AI to govern authorship. The transparency of the dataset, opt-out registries, and watermarks on the output are to be required, as well as royalty regimes to access the training data. The voice and likeness rights law at the international level is required to protect deepfake. International coordination by WIPO and led by treaties such as the Council of Europe Framework Convention are necessary to harmonise and maximise enforcement can be enhanced by AI-enabled blockchain-based licensing and automated infringement detection.

- Design transparent authorship criteria, grant rights to a human operator or system designer, and consider a sui generis IP right as outputs of an AI could involve different handling requirements.
- Requirements of mandatory transparency requirements are the disclosure of data sources, opt-out registries and output watermarking.
- As the purchase to train AI, one can find a way to pay the rights holders such as through royalty schemes that are optional or not how the music industry does.
- Depending on the jurisdiction, either nationally or internationally, there are methods of deepfake protection in the form of likeness and voice rights laws such as the Tennessee ELVIS Act.
- International coordination of contact enforcement and IP definitions at the international level with the help of treaties such as the Council of Europe Framework Convention, WIPO standards, etc.

6. CONCLUSION

Artificial intelligence is transforming intellectual property law, posing issues such as authorship, ownership, training data, deepfakes, and cross-border enforcement. Current regimes, such as the Indian Copyright Act, the draft of the EU AI Act, and the U.S. Algorithmic Accountability initiatives, value human initiatives while integrating AI-generated works. This lack of international harmonization leads to fragmented adoption, compliance burdens, and potential regulatory arbitrage. Policymakers should balance transparency and trade secrecy, enhance cross-border cooperation, and explore new forms of rights like sui generis rights, watermarks, and royalty models to protect training data. AI is seen as disruptive and a potential partner in making enforcement and compliance more effective, provided it is steered through internationally consistent and human-centric regulatory systems.

REFERENCES

1. *Abbott, R. (2022). Intellectual property and artificial intelligence: an introduction. In Research Handbook on Intellectual Property and Artificial Intelligence (pp. 2-21). Edward Elgar Publishing.*
2. *Aristodemou, L., & Tietze, F. (2018). The state-of-the-art on Intellectual Property Analytics (IPA): A literature review on artificial intelligence, machine learning and deep learning methods for analysing intellectual property (IP) data. World Patent Information, 55, 37-51.*
3. *Corbett, D. J. (2022). A Premier Paradigm Shift: The Impact of Artificial Intelligence on US Intellectual Property Laws. Liberty UL Rev., 17, 321.*
4. *Cubert, J. A., & Bone, R. G. (2018). The law of intellectual property created by artificial intelligence. In Research handbook on the law of artificial intelligence (pp. 411-427). Edward Elgar Publishing.*
5. *Gribincea, A. (2020). Intellectual property rights to an artificial intelligence product. Journal of the National Academy of Legal Sciences of Ukraine, 27(4), 231-241.*
6. *Lee, J. A., Hilty, R. M., & Liu, K. C. (Eds.). (2021). Artificial intelligence and intellectual property. Oxford University Press (UK).*
7. *Nekit, K., Tokareva, V., & Zubar, V. (2020). Artificial intelligence as a potential subject of property and intellectual property relations. Ius Humani. Revista de Derecho, 9(1), 231-250.*
8. *Picht, P. G., Brunner, V., & Schmid, R. (2022). Artificial intelligence and intellectual property law: from diagnosis to action. Max Planck Institute for Innovation and Competition Research Paper, (22-08).*
9. *Sharma, M. (2022). Intellectual Property Rights and Artificial Intelligence. Issue 2 Indian JL & Legal Rsch., 5, 1.*
10. *Upadhyay, N. K., & Rathee, M. (2020, June). Impact of artificial intelligence on Intellectual Property Rights. In Proceedings of International Young Scholars Workshop (Vol. 9).*