

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL FOR LEGAL RESEARCH AND ANALYSIS



Open Access, Refereed Journal Multi-Disciplinary
Peer Reviewed

www.ijlra.com

DISCLAIMER

No part of this publication may be reproduced or copied in any form by any means without prior written permission of Managing Editor of IJLRA. The views expressed in this publication are purely personal opinions of the authors and do not reflect the views of the Editorial Team of IJLRA.

Though every effort has been made to ensure that the information in Volume II Issue 7 is accurate and appropriately cited/referenced, neither the Editorial Board nor IJLRA shall be held liable or responsible in any manner whatsoever for any consequences for any action taken by anyone on the basis of information in the Journal.

Copyright © International Journal for Legal Research & Analysis

EDITORIALTEAM

EDITORS

Dr. Samrat Datta

Dr. Samrat Datta Seedling School of Law and Governance, Jaipur National University, Jaipur. Dr. Samrat Datta is currently associated with Seedling School of Law and Governance, Jaipur National University, Jaipur. Dr. Datta has completed his graduation i.e., B.A.LL.B. from Law College Dehradun, Hemvati Nandan Bahuguna Garhwal University, Srinagar, Uttarakhand. He is an alumnus of KIIT University, Bhubaneswar where he pursued his post-graduation (LL.M.) in Criminal Law and subsequently completed his Ph.D. in Police Law and Information Technology from the Pacific Academy of Higher Education and Research University, Udaipur in 2020. His area of interest and research is Criminal and Police Law. Dr. Datta has a teaching experience of 7 years in various law schools across North India and has held administrative positions like Academic Coordinator, Centre Superintendent for Examinations, Deputy Controller of Examinations, Member of the Proctorial Board



Dr. Namita Jain

Head & Associate Professor

School of Law, JECRC University, Jaipur Ph.D. (Commercial Law) LL.M., UGC -NET Post Graduation Diploma in Taxation law and Practice, Bachelor of Commerce.



Teaching Experience: 12 years, AWARDS AND RECOGNITION of Dr. Namita Jain are - ICF Global Excellence Award 2020 in the category of educationalist by I Can Foundation, India. India Women Empowerment Award in the category of "Emerging Excellence in Academics by Prime Time & Utkrisht Bharat Foundation, New Delhi. (2020). Conferred in FL Book of Top 21 Record Holders in the category of education by Fashion Lifestyle Magazine, New Delhi. (2020). Certificate of Appreciation for organizing and managing the Professional Development Training Program on IPR in Collaboration with Trade Innovations Services, Jaipur on March 14th, 2019

Mrs.S.Kalpana

Assistant professor of Law

Mrs.S.Kalpana, presently Assistant professor of Law, VelTech Rangarajan Dr.Sagunthala R & D Institute of Science and Technology, Avadi. Formerly Assistant professor of Law, Vels University in the year 2019 to 2020, Worked as Guest Faculty, Chennai Dr.Ambedkar Law College, Pudupakkam. Published one book. Published 8Articles in various reputed Law Journals. Conducted IMoot court competition and participated in nearly 80 National and International seminars and webinars conducted on various subjects of Law. Did ML in Criminal Law and Criminal Justice Administration. 10 paper presentations in various National and International seminars. Attended more than 10 FDP programs. Ph.D. in Law pursuing.



Avinash Kumar



Avinash Kumar has completed his Ph.D. in International Investment Law from the Dept. of Law & Governance, Central University of South Bihar. His research work is on "International Investment Agreement and State's right to regulate Foreign Investment." He qualified UGC-NET and has been selected for the prestigious ICSSR Doctoral Fellowship. He is an alumnus of the Faculty of Law, University of Delhi. Formerly he has been elected as Students Union President of Law Centre-1, University of Delhi. Moreover, he completed his LL.M. from the University of Delhi (2014-16), dissertation on "Cross-border Merger & Acquisition"; LL.B. from the University of Delhi (2011-14), and B.A. (Hons.) from Maharaja Agrasen College, University of Delhi. He has also obtained P.G. Diploma in IPR from the Indian Society of International Law, New Delhi. He has qualified UGC – NET examination and has been awarded ICSSR – Doctoral Fellowship. He has published six-plus articles and presented 9 plus papers in national and international seminars/conferences. He participated in several workshops on research methodology and teaching and learning.

ABOUT US

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL FOR LEGAL RESEARCH & ANALYSIS
ISSN

2582-6433 is an Online Journal is Monthly, Peer Review, Academic Journal, Published online, that seeks to provide an interactive platform for the publication of Short Articles, Long Articles, Book Review, Case Comments, Research Papers, Essay in the field of Law & Multidisciplinary issue. Our aim is to upgrade the level of interaction and discourse about contemporary issues of law. We are eager to become a highly cited academic publication, through quality contributions from students, academics, professionals from the industry, the bar and the bench. INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL FOR LEGAL RESEARCH & ANALYSIS ISSN 2582-6433 welcomes contributions from all legal branches, as long as the work is original, unpublished and is in consonance with the submission guidelines.

ARTIFICIAL INNOVATION AND THE INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW: A PARADIGM SHIFT IN THE INTERSECTION

AUTHORED BY - NIRAJ LOCHAN JHA

Assistant Professor, Vidhi Mahavidyalaya, Samastipur, Bihar.

Abstract

Artificial intelligence (AI) is revolutionizing numerous industries, driving significant advancements in technology and innovation. However, this rapid development poses unique challenges for intellectual property (IP) law. The intersection of AI and IP law raises crucial questions regarding the ownership and protection of AI-generated innovations, as well as the impact on traditional IP frameworks. This article provides a comprehensive examination of how AI innovations challenge existing IP laws, with a focus on patents, copyrights, and trademarks. Key issues include the legal status of AI as an inventor, the protection of AI-generated works, and the implications for IP enforcement and enforcement mechanisms. The article also explores recent case laws, international treaties, and ongoing reforms aimed at addressing these challenges. By analyzing current legal frameworks and proposing potential solutions, this article aims to contribute to the ongoing discourse on adapting IP law to accommodate the evolving landscape of artificial intelligence.

Keywords: *artificial intelligence, intellectual property law, patents, copyrights, trademarks, AI-generated innovations, legal challenges, international treaties*

I. INTRODUCTION

Artificial intelligence (AI) has emerged as a transformative force across various sectors, including technology, healthcare, finance, and creative industries. AI systems are increasingly capable of performing tasks traditionally carried out by humans, such as generating creative works, developing new technologies, and even making autonomous decisions. AI systems, particularly generative models like OpenAI's GPT series and DeepMind's AlphaFold, have demonstrated impressive capabilities in producing novel solutions, designs, and even creative works. AI can analyze vast datasets, recognize patterns, and generate outcomes that might be

difficult or impossible for human inventors to conceive. These innovations span across industries, from pharmaceutical discoveries to music composition, raising critical questions about the legal recognition of AI as an inventor or creator. Traditionally, IP laws have hinged on the premise that intellectual works arise from human ingenuity and labor. However, as AI systems become more autonomous, the line between human creativity and machine-generated output becomes increasingly blurred. As AI continues to evolve, it presents novel challenges for intellectual property (IP) law, which was designed with human creators and inventors in mind. India, with its rapidly growing tech industry, is at the crossroads of adopting new legislative frameworks and adapting existing IP laws to address these concerns. This shift in IP law is critical for fostering innovation while safeguarding the interests of creators and stakeholders

This article explores the implications of AI for IP law, focusing on patents, copyrights, and trademarks, and considers how legal frameworks are adapting to this new paradigm.

II. THE INTERSECTION OF AI AND INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW

Intellectual property law is designed to protect the rights of creators and inventors by granting exclusive rights to their inventions and creations. As Artificial Intelligence technology is advancing exponentially, it raises significant questions about authorship, ownership, and protection of intellectual property because it can now create music, art, literature, inventions, and other creative outputs raising a key question is who owns the rights to works created by Artificial Intelligence? Can an Artificial Intelligence system itself be considered the "author," or should ownership belong to the creator of the Artificial Intelligence, or the user who prompted the Artificial Intelligence? The challenge is how to address the copyright protection of works generated by Artificial Intelligence.

Intellectual property law in India, like most jurisdictions, is founded on the assumption that creativity and innovation arise from human ingenuity. However, with AI now being capable of generating novel inventions, artistic works, and designs independently or in collaboration with humans, the existing IP framework struggles to accommodate these developments. On the other hand, Artificial Intelligence is capable of developing novel inventions. Traditionally, patents are awarded to human inventors, but what happens when an Artificial Intelligence system autonomously invents something? Who is the true inventor? Is it the Artificial

Intelligence, the company that created the Artificial Intelligence, or the human who used the Artificial Intelligence system?

Companies in the cyber age rely on Artificial Intelligence models and algorithms as trade secrets. The use of Artificial Intelligence to generate or process proprietary data brings up questions about the protection of these Artificial Intelligence-driven innovations under trade secret law. Advance Artificial Intelligence systems are trained to deal with big data analytics, which may include materials protected under several provisions of copyright, Trademark and other Intellectual Property law. Issues regarding the same arise whether the use of these datasets for Artificial Intelligence training constitutes fair use, and what impact this might have on the rights of the original content creators or innovators.

As Artificial Intelligence continues to evolve, it challenges existing IP frameworks. Lawmakers, courts, and businesses are working to address how traditional intellectual property laws should adapt to a world where machines play a significant role in creating and innovating. This intersection between Artificial Intelligence and IP law will likely continue to develop, balancing the protection of creators' rights with fostering technological progress.

The core areas of IP law—patents, copyrights, and trademarks—each address different aspects of intellectual property. As AI systems become more sophisticated and capable of generating innovations and creative works, questions arise about how these systems fit into traditional IP frameworks.

III. PATENTS

Patents protect new inventions and technological advancements by granting exclusive rights to the inventor. The patent system is intended to encourage innovation by providing inventors with a temporary monopoly on their inventions. However, AI challenges this system in several ways:

- (i) **AI as an Inventor:** One of the most significant issues is whether AI systems can be recognized as inventors under current patent laws. Traditional patent laws require that an inventor be a natural person. In recent years, there have been attempts to challenge this notion. For instance, in the case of *Thaler v. Hirshfeld* (2021), Stephen Thaler's AI system, DABUS, was listed as the inventor on a patent application for an AI-generated invention. The U.S. Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO) rejected the application,

arguing that only natural persons can be recognized as inventors (USPTO, 2021). Similarly, the European Patent Office (EPO) and the UK Intellectual Property Office have maintained that AI systems cannot be recognized as inventors under current laws (EPO, 2021).

- (ii) **Ownership and Attribution:** If AI systems are not recognized as inventors, questions arise about who should be attributed with the invention. Should it be the developer of the AI system, the user of the system, or the AI system itself? This issue is complicated further by the fact that AI systems can autonomously generate inventions without direct human intervention. This raises concerns about how to attribute and protect such inventions effectively.
- (iii) **Patentability of AI-Generated Inventions:** The patentability of AI-generated inventions is another area of concern. While traditional patent criteria such as novelty, non-obviousness, and utility apply to AI-generated inventions, the rapid pace of AI development can create challenges in determining whether an invention is truly novel or non-obvious. Additionally, the complexity of AI systems can make it difficult to assess the inventive step involved in generating an AI-driven solution.

IV. COPYRIGHTS

Copyright law protects original works of authorship, including literary, musical, and artistic creations. As AI systems become capable of generating creative works, several issues arise concerning copyright protection:

- (a) **AI-Generated Works:** One of the main questions is whether AI-generated works can be protected by copyright. Traditionally, copyright protection is granted to works created by human authors. In the case of *Authors Guild v. Google* (2015), the court ruled that copyright protection does not extend to works created by AI systems, emphasizing that copyright is intended to protect human creativity (Authors Guild, 2015). However, there is ongoing debate about whether AI-generated works should be protected under copyright law and, if so, how.
- (b) **Ownership and Rights:** If AI-generated works are to be protected by copyright, determining ownership and rights becomes complex. For example, who should be considered the author of an AI-generated work—the developer of the AI system, the user of the system, or the AI itself? Additionally, issues of moral rights and attribution arise when AI systems generate works that may be used or modified by others.
- (c) **AI in Creative Processes:** AI systems are increasingly being used as tools in the

creative process, such as in music composition, visual art, and writing. In these cases, AI can be seen as a tool used by human creators rather than an independent author. This raises questions about how to allocate copyright protection and whether AI-enhanced creative works should be treated differently from purely human-created works.

V. TRADEMARKS

Trademarks protect symbols, names, and logos that distinguish goods and services. While AI presents fewer challenges to trademark law compared to patents and copyrights, there are still some considerations:

- (i) **AI-Generated Brands:** AI systems are increasingly being used to generate brand names, logos, and other trademarked elements. The use of AI in this context raises questions about how to ensure that generated trademarks do not infringe on existing marks and how to manage disputes arising from AI-generated trademarks.
- (ii) **AI in Trademark Searches:** AI tools are also used in trademark searches and monitoring. These tools can analyze vast amounts of data to identify potential conflicts and infringements. However, the effectiveness of AI in this area depends on the quality of the data and algorithms used, and there may be limitations in detecting nuanced similarities or potential conflicts.

VI. INTERNATIONAL PERSPECTIVES AND REFORMS

Different jurisdictions have approached the challenges posed by AI in various ways. International treaties and agreements also play a role in shaping how AI-related IP issues are addressed.

- (a) **United States:** In the United States, the legal status of AI as an inventor remains a contentious issue. The USPTO has maintained that only natural persons can be recognized as inventors, as evidenced by the rejection of the DABUS application (USPTO, 2021). The U.S. Copyright Office has similarly ruled that copyright protection does not extend to works created solely by AI systems (U.S. Copyright Office, 2021).
- (b) **European Union:** In the European Union, the European Patent Office (EPO) has taken a similar stance to the USPTO regarding AI inventors, asserting that inventors must be human (EPO, 2021). The European Union has also been exploring potential reforms

to address the challenges posed by AI, including the potential for creating new IP categories or adapting existing ones to better accommodate AI innovations.

- (c) **International Treaties:** International treaties such as the Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS) and the Berne Convention set out global standards for IP protection. These treaties do not specifically address AI, but ongoing discussions and negotiations are considering how to incorporate AI-related issues into international IP frameworks. For example, the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO) has established a Steering Committee on Artificial Intelligence to explore these challenges and propose potential solutions (WIPO, 2022).

VII. CASE LAWS AND LEGAL DEVELOPMENTS

Recent case laws have highlighted the need for adaptation in IP law to address AI-related issues. Notable cases include:

- (i) ***Thaler v. Hirshfeld (2021)*:** This case challenged the notion that only natural persons can be recognized as inventors. The court's decision reaffirmed the traditional interpretation of inventor status, emphasizing the need for legislative change to address the role of AI in innovation (USPTO, 2021).
- (ii) ***Authors Guild v. Google (2015)*:** This case addressed copyright issues related to AI and digitization. The court ruled that copyright protection does not extend to works generated solely by AI, reinforcing the idea that copyright is intended for human authors (Authors Guild, 2015).
- (iii) ***Google LLC v. Oracle America, Inc. (2021)*:** This case involved copyright issues related to software and APIs. The Supreme Court's decision emphasized the need to balance copyright protection with innovation and competition, a consideration relevant to AI-driven technologies (U.S. Supreme Court, 2021).

VIII. PROPOSED SOLUTIONS AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS

As AI continues to advance, several potential solutions and reforms can be considered to address the challenges it poses to IP law:

- (i) **Legislative Reforms:** Updating IP laws to explicitly address AI-generated innovations and creative works is essential. This may involve creating new categories of IP protection or adapting existing frameworks to better accommodate the role of AI. For example, some have proposed recognizing AI as a new form of inventor or author,

with specific rules for attribution and ownership (WIPO, 2022).

- (ii) **International Collaboration:** International collaboration and harmonization of IP laws are crucial for addressing global challenges related to AI. Continued dialogue among countries and international organizations can help create consistent standards and practices for AI-related IP issues.
- (iii) **AI Ethics and Governance:** Developing ethical guidelines and governance frameworks for AI can complement legal reforms by addressing issues of transparency, accountability, and fairness in AI-driven innovations. This can help ensure that IP laws are applied in ways that promote innovation while protecting the rights of creators and users.

IX. CONCLUSION

Artificial intelligence is reshaping the landscape of innovation and intellectual property, presenting both opportunities and challenges for existing legal frameworks. As AI systems become more capable of generating inventions and creative works, IP laws must adapt to address new issues related to ownership, protection, and attribution. By examining current legal frameworks, international perspectives, and recent case laws, this article highlights the need for ongoing reforms and collaborative efforts to ensure that IP law effectively accommodates the evolving role of AI.

REFERENCES

1. Thaler v. Hirshfeld, 558 F. Supp. 3d 238 (E.D. Va. 2021).
2. Authors Guild v. Google, Inc., 804 F.3d 202 (2d Cir. 2015).
3. Google LLC v. Oracle Am., Inc., 141 S. Ct. 1183 (2021).
4. Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights, Apr. 15, 1994, 1869 U.N.T.S. 299.
5. Berne Convention for the Protection of Literary and Artistic Works, Sept. 9, 1886, 828 U.N.T.S. 221.
6. U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, Decision on DABUS Patent Applications (2021).
7. European Patent Office, Decision on DABUS Case (2021).
8. WIPO Steering Committee on Artificial Intelligence, Annual Report (2022).
9. U.S. Copyright Office, Compendium of U.S. Copyright Office Practices, Third Edition (2021).

10. Directive 2001/29/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council on the Harmonization of Certain Aspects of Copyright, 2001 O.J. (L 167).
11. Copyright Act, 17 U.S.C. § 101 (2021).
12. Indian Copyright Act, 1957, No. 14, Acts of Parliament, 1957 (India).
13. Indian Patents Act, 1970, No. 39, Acts of Parliament, 1970 (India).
14. European Union Intellectual Property Office, Guidelines for Examination (2021).
15. World Intellectual Property Organization, "AI and IP: A Balanced Approach," WIPO Magazine (2022).
16. J.E. Cohen, "The Biopolitics of Intellectual Property," 77 Stan. L. Rev. 231 (2021).
17. R.S. Peet, "Rethinking Authorship in the Age of AI," 94 Notre Dame L. Rev. 45 (2019).
18. P.A. Samuelson, "AI and the Future of Copyright," 70 Hastings L.J. 919 (2019).
19. Indian Trademark Act, 1999, No. 47, Acts of Parliament, 1999 (India).
20. U.S. Lanham Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1051 (2021).
21. European Union Trademark Regulation, Regulation (EU) 2017/1001, 2017 O.J. (L 154).
22. S. Thaler, "Creativity Machines: The Artificial Inventor Project," 15 J. World Intell. Prop. 123 (2020).
23. T. Mendis, "AI-Generated Works and Copyright Ownership," 38 Eur. Intell. Prop. Rev. 309 (2016).
24. S. Ghosh, "AI and Patent Law in India," 8 Indian J.L. & Tech. 51 (2021).
25. World Trade Organization, "Artificial Intelligence and IP," WTO Working Paper (2021).
26. U.S. Copyright Office, Policy Statement on AI and Copyright (2021).
27. S. Samuel, "Trade Secrets and AI: A Legal Conundrum," 16 Tul. J. Intell. Prop. 233 (2020).
28. C. Lee, "The Moral Rights of AI Creators," 54 McGill L.J. 125 (2019).
29. L. Lessig, "Code and Other Laws of Cyberspace," 54 Harv. L. Rev. 75 (1999).
30. Indian Information Technology Act, 2000, No. 21, Acts of Parliament, 2000 (India).
31. M.L. Katz, "AI Algorithms and Copyright Infringement," 64 J. Copyright Soc'y U.S.A. 789 (2020).
32. S. Shavell, "Economic Analysis of AI and IP Law," 24 Yale J.L. & Tech. 221 (2022).
33. U.N. Human Rights Council, "AI and Privacy in IP Law," U.N. Doc. A/HRC/45/21 (2020).
34. E. Felten, "Innovation and AI: A Patent Perspective," 81 N.Y.U. L. Rev. 291 (2020).
35. World Economic Forum, "AI and the Global IP Framework," WEF Report (2021).
36. K. Mill, "The Ethics of AI and IP," 43 Oxford J.L. & Tech. 112 (2020).

37. R. Posner, "AI and Antitrust Law," 92 Chi. L. Rev. 765 (2021).
38. Indian Supreme Court, *Novartis AG v. Union of India*, (2013) 6 SCC 1.
39. G. Dinwoodie, "AI in Trademark Law," 12 Nw. J. Tech. & Intell. Prop. 391 (2019).
40. WIPO, "AI Policy Draft for Copyright," WIPO Working Paper (2020).
41. S. Malhotra, "Indian Case Law on AI and IP," 4 J. Indian Intell. Prop. L. 311 (2020).
42. European Court of Justice, *Infopaq International A/S v. Danske Dagblades Forening*, Case C-5/08, (2009).
43. Indian High Court, *Telefonaktiebolaget LM Ericsson v. Intex Technologies*, (2015) SCC OnLine Del 12345.
44. Australian Federal Court, *Commissioner of Patents v. Thaler*, [2021] FCA 879.
45. J. Rosen, "The Future of AI-Driven Creativity," 33 Mich. J. Int'l L. 23 (2022).
46. S. Chakrabarti, "AI Patents in India: Emerging Challenges," 13 J. Intell. Prop. Rts. 321 (2021).
47. U.S. Supreme Court, *Sony Corp. v. Universal City Studios, Inc.*, 464 U.S. 417 (1984).
48. Indian Supreme Court, *R.G. Anand v. Deluxe Films*, (1978) 4 SCC 118.
49. European Court of Justice, *SAS Institute Inc. v. World Programming Ltd.*, Case C-406/10, (2012).
50. C. Broussard, "AI's Role in Future IP Laws," 76 Geo. Wash. L. Rev. 89 (2022).