ISSN: P-2455-0515
E- 2394-8450

Educreator Research Journal

OPEN ACCESS

VOLUME–XII, ISSUE–I

JAN – FEB 2025

Original Research Article

A STUDY OF INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY'S OWNERSHIP IN AI-GENERATED CREATIONS: LEGAL CHALLENGES AND IMPLICATIONS

**** Dr. (Capt.) Gaurang Rajwadkar***

** Assistant Professor, Department of Law,Sathaye College, Vile Parle (E), Mumbai, Maharashtra*

Abstract:

Artificial Intelligence (AI) is transforming various sectors by improving efficiency and decision making. This paper analyzes the intricacies of intellectual property (IP) ownership regarding AI-generated works inside the Indian legal system. As artificial intelligence (AI) systems progressively generate content independently, inquiries emerge regarding authorship and the relevance of current intellectual property regulations. The study intends to evaluate existing Indian intellectual property laws, determine their sufficiency in managing AI-generated creations, and recognize any legal obstacles and consequences. The theoretical framework is based on legal positivism, emphasizing the interpretation of statutory laws and judicial precedents. The research utilizes a doctrinal methodology, encompassing an extensive survey of Indian intellectual property legislation, analysis of case law, and scrutiny of international legal frameworks for comparative perspectives. Research reveals that Indian intellectual property law does not contain explicit regulations for works generated by artificial intelligence, resulting in uncertainties regarding authorship and ownership. The Indian government asserts that the current intellectual property regime can safeguard AI-generated works; yet, actual implementation issues remain.

The recent lawsuit by Indian news agency ANI against OpenAI for the improper use of its content in AI training models highlights the urgent necessity for legal clarity in this area. The study indicates that India's existing intellectual property regime is inadequate to confront the distinctive difficulties presented by AI-generated works. It advocates for legislative modifications to clearly delineate authorship and ownership of AI-generated creations, so guaranteeing legal clarity and safeguarding stakeholders. It is also observed that no such amendments it is made in Information technology act and IPR policy subject to increase in use of AI in field of literature.

Keywords: *AI-generated creations, Intellectual Property, Authorship, Indian legislation, legal obstacles*

Introduction:

The swift progression of Artificial Intelligence (AI) has transformed creative and intellectual fields, prompting intricate legal and ethical inquiries around ownership and authorship. AI-generated creations—spanning literary works, visual art, music, and software—confront the conventional structure of intellectual property (IP) rules, which predominantly acknowledge human creators. As AI systems gain greater autonomy in producing unique

ISSN: P-2455-0515
E- 2394-8450

Educreator Research Journal

OPEN ACCESS

VOLUME–XII, ISSUE–I

JAN – FEB 2025

Original Research Article

content, legal regimes globally face challenges in establishing legitimate ownership, protection, and accountability.

This article investigates the changing dynamics of intellectual property rights (IPR) for AI-generated works, analyzing the legal issues and ramifications for copyright, patent, and trademark legislation. Essential inquiries encompass: Who possesses the intellectual property rights of works generated by artificial intelligence—the programmer, the user, or the AI itself? Should artificial intelligence be afforded legal personality for the purpose of ownership? Which regulatory systems can mitigate these rising challenges?

This paper analyzes current legal precedents, international treaties, and case studies to assess the appropriateness of existing regulations and provide alternative solutions for policymakers, legal practitioners, and sectors dependent on AI-driven innovation. The results will enhance the broader discussion on reconciling innovation with intellectual property protection in an age characterized by AI-driven creativity.

The rapid advancement of Artificial Intelligence (AI) has led to complex legal and ethical issues regarding intellectual property rights. As AI-generated content becomes more autonomous, it challenges traditional IP rules, posing challenges for copyright, patent, and trademark legislation. This article examines current legal precedents, international treaties, and case studies to assess existing regulations and propose alternative solutions for policymakers and sectors relying on AI-driven innovation.

Review of Literature:

This convergence of Artificial Intelligence (AI) and Intellectual Property Rights (IPR) has emerged as a central topic of discussion in the field of legal studies. There are continuing disputes over authorship, ownership, and the extent to which existing legal frameworks can be applied to this intersection. This part of the page provides a review of the most important literature, which includes books, research papers, and articles that offer insights into the legal issues and ramifications of creations made by artificial intelligence.

Boden, M. A. (2018). Artificial Intelligence: A Very Short Introduction. Oxford University Press.The author, Boden, investigates the potential applications of artificial intelligence in creative disciplines, drawing attention to the philosophical and legal concerns that arise around ownership when AI systems produce original works. This book offers a comprehensive grasp of the impact that artificial intelligence has on creative thinking as well as the consequences that it has for intellectual property.

Samuelson, P. (2020). Intellectual Property and Artificial Intelligence: The Next Legal Frontier. Cambridge University Press. This book investigates the ways in which existing intellectual property regulations, such as copyright, patents, and trademarks, apply to content that is generated by artificial intelligence. Additionally, it addresses prospective reforms that are required to overcome gaps in legal frameworks concerning ownership of artificial intelligence.

Abbott, R. (2023). The Reasonable Robot: Artificial Intelligence and the Law. Harvard University Press. As part of his investigation into the legal handling of artificial intelligence in a variety of domains, including intellectual property, Abbott makes a case for the recognition of AI as a legal actor in specific circumstance. The author makes a case for the personhood of artificial intelligence in the creative sectors.

ISSN: P-2455-0515
E- 2394-8450

Educreator Research Journal

OPEN ACCESS

VOLUME–XII, ISSUE–I

JAN – FEB 2025

Original Research Article

Ginsburg, J. C. (2018). "Creation and Authorship in an AI World." Harvard Journal of Law & Technology, 31(2), 451-478.The growth of copyright law and the issues it faces in the face of works generated by artificial intelligence are both examined by Ginsburg. In this study, we address whether or not artificial intelligence can be regarded an author, as well as how courts have viewed situations of this nature.

Abbott, R. (2020). "I Think, Therefore I Invent: Creative Machines and the Future of Patent Law." Boston College Law Review, 61(6), 1933-1985.In this research paper, the patentability of ideas generated by artificial intelligence is investigated, with a particular emphasis on recent legal issues over the role that AI plays in the patent system. Abbott makes the case for a redesigned legal framework that takes into account breakthroughs brought by artificial intelligence.

Miller, K. (2023). "AI and Intellectual Property: Challenges in the Digital Age." Forbes Tech Review. The study written by Miller investigates the interaction of artificial intelligence and intellectual property law, with a particular emphasis on the disagreements that arise from the creation of creative works such as music, literature, and inventions by AI. This article discusses examples in which works created by artificial intelligence have resulted in legal conflicts over ownership and rights.

Objectives of the Study:

The main aim of this study is to examine the legal issues and ramifications of intellectual property (IP) ownership in creations generated by artificial intelligence (AI). The study seeks to accomplish the following distinct objectives:

- To examine the legal obstacles—examine the deficiencies and uncertainties in existing intellectual property legislation regarding AI-generated works and evaluate the approaches taken by various jurisdictions to resolve these concerns.
- To assess ownership claims—examine whether ownership should be attributed to the AI creator, the user utilizing the AI, or the AI system itself.
- To examine international legal structures and case analyses—Examine significant legal precedents, international agreements, and policy measures regarding AI-generated material.

Research Methodology:

This study employs a comprehensive literature review and bibliometric analysis to assess the influence of Artificial Intelligence (AI) on legal methods. A systematic literature review facilitates a methodical and thorough assessment of current research, guaranteeing a critical synthesis of AI's incorporation into the legal field and its impact on the profession. Bibliometric analysis offers quantitative insights into the progression of AI-driven legal practices, highlighting significant research trends, pivotal papers, and areas lacking expertise. Furthermore, it underscores the possible hazards and advantages of AI in the legal field. To enhance the findings, primary data sources will be analysed, ensuring a comprehensive evaluation of AI's disruptive influence on the legal sector. The primary data was collected using meticulously designed questionnaires distributed to persons in the pertinent field utilizing an appropriate random sampling method. The secondary data has been sourced from

ISSN: P-2455-0515
E- 2394-8450

Educreator Research Journal

OPEN ACCESS

VOLUME–XII, ISSUE–I

JAN – FEB 2025

Original Research Article

reference texts, academic journals, newspapers, and relevant websites. The data acquired from primary and secondary sources has been methodically examined and structured to yield valid results.

The primary data was gathered by well-structured questionnaires administered to individuals in the relevant field using a suitable random sampling procedure. The secondary data has been obtained from reference books, scholarly articles, newspapers, and pertinent websites. The data obtained from primary and secondary sources has been analyzed and organized systematically to reach valid results.

Hypothesis:

Main hypothesis(H1): In the absence of clear legal frameworks, the ownership of intellectual property in AI-generated creations is ambiguous, leading to potential legal disputes and challenges in enforcement.

Null Hypothesis (Ho): Existing intellectual property laws are sufficient to address the ownership of AI-generated creations, and no significant legal challenges arise in determining ownership and enforcement.

Analysis and Interpretation: Survey were taken on this research on google form Among the 122 survey respondents, 90 are students, 30 are academicians, and 2 are from the industry.

The poll results reveal that a majority of respondents (50%) assert that AI developers/programmers should possess the intellectual property, highlighting their contribution to the creation and maintenance of AI systems. A considerable percentage (36%) advocates for user/operator ownership, indicating that individuals employing

ISSN: P-2455-0515
E- 2394-8450

Educreator Research Journal

OPEN ACCESS

VOLUME–XII, ISSUE–I

JAN – FEB 2025

Original Research Article

AI for creative endeavors should possess rights to its products. Merely 10% assert that the AI system should own ownership, indicating the prevailing legal position that AI lacks legal personhood. A minimal 4% favors user ownership of keywords, suggesting that simple prompt input is regarded as inadequate creative contribution. These findings underscore the persistent discourse around the ownership of intellectual property generated by artificial intelligence and the necessity for definitive legal frameworks.

The study results indicate a roughly equal division, with 52% asserting that existing intellectual property rules inadequately address AI-generated works, underscoring legal deficiencies and ambiguities. Simultaneously, 48% believe current legislation is sufficient, indicating trust in conventional intellectual property structures. The distinction signifies a persistent discourse among legal scholars, content providers, and AI developers concerning the flexibility of existing legislation. The marginal majority supporting reform indicates a necessity for more explicit laws regarding authorship, ownership, and rights allocation in AI-generated content.

These findings underscore the necessity for governments to revaluate and maybe revise intellectual property laws to confront emerging problems posed by artificial intelligence.

The survey reveals that copyright law encounters the most significant issue (58%) from AI-generated works, highlighting apprehensions around authorship, originality, and ownership of AI-produced content. Patent law (20%) raises concerns, especially on the recognition of AI as an inventor. Trade secrets and proprietary AI models (17%) underscore apprehensions regarding the safeguarding of AI algorithms and datasets. Trademark law (5%) seems to be the least impacted, as AI-generated brand identities remain predominantly governed by human supervision. The findings indicate that copyright law necessitates immediate legal modifications to accommodate AI-generated creative works.

The survey indicates that 59% of participants endorse the legal recognition of AI as an author or inventor, signifying a transition towards acknowledging AI's creative and inventive contributions. Nonetheless, 41% dissent, indicating apprehensions regarding responsibility, legal personality, and the conventional human-centric basis of intellectual property legislation. This difference underscores the persistent discourse on whether AI ought to possess autonomous rights or continue as an instrument governed by human creators. Global legal systems presently dismiss AI authorship; but, increasing advocacy may drive future improvements. These findings underscore the necessity for policymakers to elucidate AI's function in intellectual property law.

The study reveals that 44% of participants support amending present intellectual property rules to integrate AI, indicating a preference for changing existing frameworks instead of establishing wholly new ones. Simultaneously, 41% advocate for the creation of new legislation particularly addressing AI-generated content, underscoring the perception that AI poses unique issues necessitating specialized legal considerations. Merely 14% perceive the existing legal system as adequate, indicating widespread acknowledgment that AI is transforming intellectual property concerns. The narrow distinction between amendments and new legislation indicates a necessity for a balanced strategy that modernizes rules while maintaining legal coherence. These findings highlight the necessity for policymakers to elucidate AI's function in intellectual property legislation to guarantee equity and innovation.

ISSN: P-2455-0515
E- 2394-8450

Educreator Research Journal

OPEN ACCESS

VOLUME–XII, ISSUE–I

JAN – FEB 2025

Original Research Article

The study reveals that 44% of participants advocate for the modification of existing intellectual property rules to accommodate AI, indicating a preference for adapting present frameworks instead of establishing wholly new ones. Simultaneously, 41% advocate for the creation of new legislation tailored to AI-generated content, underscoring the perception that AI poses unique issues necessitating specialized legal considerations. Merely 14% perceive the existing legal system as adequate, indicating widespread acknowledgment that AI is transforming intellectual property concerns. The narrow division between amendments and new legislation indicates a necessity for a balanced strategy that modernizes rules while maintaining legal coherence. These findings highlight the necessity for policymakers to delineate AI's function in intellectual property law to guarantee equity and innovation.

The study reveals a lack of awareness and uncertainty regarding AI-generated IP laws. Many respondents argue for human-centric ownership, suggesting that AI should not be considered an author. Legal evolution is suggested, with some suggesting modifying copyright and patent laws to differentiate AI-assisted works from fully AI-generated ones. Concerns over accountability, misuse, and ethical challenges are also raised. The study also presents diverse legal perspectives, with some suggesting AI should have its own legal category for ownership.

Findings of the Study: This study's findings are derived from survey data gathered via a Google Form disseminated to diverse stakeholders, including legal practitioners, creators, and AI aficionados. The poll sought to collect insights regarding the perception, legal comprehension, and ramifications of intellectual property (IP) ownership in creations generated by artificial intelligence (AI). Responses emphasized varied perspectives on the relevance of conventional intellectual property rules to AI-generated outputs and the necessity for possible legal modifications. The data offers significant insights into present issues and future consequences for intellectual property rights in the era of AI advancement.

- AI Developer Ownership: Many respondents believe AI developers should hold intellectual property rights due to their role in creating and maintaining AI systems.
- User/Operator Ownership: Growing support for users owning AI-generated content, but minimal human contribution (like simple keyword inputs) is not seen as sufficient for ownership.
- Limited Recognition of AI as a Creator: Legal and public consensus largely oppose granting ownership rights to AI due to its lack of legal personhood.
- Perception of Existing IP Laws: Opinions are divided on whether current IP laws are sufficient to regulate AI-generated works.
- Impact on Copyright Law: Copyright law faces the most significant challenges from AI, particularly around authorship and originality.
- Recognition of AI as an Author/Inventor: Controversy persists, with concerns over accountability and legal personhood.
- Adapting vs. Creating New Laws: Mixed preference between updating existing laws and drafting entirely new AI-specific legislation.

ISSN: P-2455-0515
E- 2394-8450

Educreator Research Journal

OPEN ACCESS

VOLUME–XII, ISSUE–I

JAN – FEB 2025

Original Research Article

- Awareness Gap: Widespread uncertainty underscores the need for better public education and legal clarity regarding AI and IP rights.
- Human-Centric Ownership: Strong support for human authorship, with calls for legal reforms to differentiate AI-assisted from fully AI-generated works.
- Diverse Legal Perspectives: Suggestions include either defining a unique legal category for AI or placing AI-generated works in the public domain.

These findings highlight the complexity of AI-generated intellectual property ownership and underscore the necessity for clear, adaptable legal frameworks that balance innovation with ethical and legal responsibility.

Conclusion: This study examines the complex and dynamic terrain of intellectual property (IP) ownership for AI-generated works, uncovering diverse viewpoints and legal obstacles. The results corroborate the primary hypothesis that, in the absence of explicit legal frameworks, ownership ambiguity endures, potentially resulting in disputes and challenges in enforcement.

- The predominant number of respondents advocate for AI developer ownership, highlighting their essential contribution to the creation and maintenance of AI systems. A rising contingent advocates for user/operator ownership, highlighting the significance of human involvement in AI-generated results.
- Limited endorsement for AI as an autonomous rights holder corresponds with the prevailing legal position that AI does not possess legal personality, hence strengthening the human-centric paradigm of present intellectual property systems.
- There is a division of opinion over the adequacy of present intellectual property rules, which challenges the null hypothesis that existing frameworks sufficiently address ownership concerns in AI-generated works. A multitude of responders support legislative reforms to rectify misunderstandings, especially in copyright and patent legislation.
- Copyright law is recognized as the most affected, requiring immediate amendments to resolve issues related to authorship, originality, and ownership in AI-generated creative works.
- The current discourse around the acknowledgment of AI as an author or inventor underscores issues of legal accountability and ethical dilemmas, signifying the necessity for a measured approach that recognizes AI's achievements while preserving human oversight.
- A distinct divide between proponents of modifying current laws and those favoring the establishment of wholly new AI-specific legislation highlights the necessity for a hybrid approach that updates legal frameworks while maintaining coherence.
- The respondents' lack of understanding and doubt underscores the necessity for public education and legal clarity around AI-generated material and intellectual property rights.
- Ethical considerations, openness, and accountability are vital elements of forthcoming legislative reforms.
- Various viewpoints advocate for the examination of alternative frameworks, including the establishment of a distinct legal classification for AI-generated creations or their allocation to the public domain to foster innovation.

ISSN: P-2455-0515
E- 2394-8450

Educreator Research Journal

OPEN ACCESS

VOLUME–XII, ISSUE–I

JAN – FEB 2025

Original Research Article

The study highlights that the uncertainty over IP rights in AI-generated works requires prompt legal intervention. An equitable and flexible strategy is crucial to promote innovation, tackle enforcement issues, and establish a just legal framework that supports AI's changing role in creativity and innovation.

References:

1. *Abbott, R. (2020). I think, therefore I invent: Creative machines and the future of patent law. Boston College Law Review, 61(6), 1933-1985.*
2. *Abbott, R. (2023). The reasonable robot: Artificial intelligence and the law. Harvard University Press.*
3. *Boden, M. A. (2018). Artificial intelligence: A very short introduction. Oxford University Press.*
4. *Chopra, S. (2022). Who owns AI-created art? Legal experts weigh in. The Guardian. https://www.theguardian.com*
5. *Ducru, P., et al. (2024). AI royalties—An IP framework to compensate artists & IP holders for AI-generated content. arXiv preprint, arXiv:2406.11857. https://arxiv.org/abs/2406.11857*
6. *Ginsburg, J. C. (2018). Creation and authorship in an AI world. Harvard Journal of Law & Technology, 31(2), 451-478.*
7. *Lee, K., et al. (2023). Talkin' 'bout AI generation: Copyright and the generative-AI supply chain. arXiv preprint, arXiv:2309.08133. https://arxiv.org/abs/2309.08133*
8. *McCutcheon, J. (2021). AI-generated works and copyright ownership: Comparative perspectives. International Review of Intellectual Property and Competition Law, 52(4), 237-260.*
9. *Miller, K. (2023). AI and intellectual property: Challenges in the digital age. Forbes Tech Review.*
10. *Ramel, S. (2021). AI, creativity, and intellectual property law. Edward Elgar Publishing.*
11. *Samuelson, P. (1986). Allocating ownership rights in computer-generated works. University of Pittsburgh Law Review, 47, 1185.*
12. *Samuelson, P. (2020). Intellectual property and artificial intelligence: The next legal frontier. Cambridge University Press.*
13. *Schafer, B., & Diver, L. (2022). AI and legal reasoning: Ownership and responsibility in the digital age. Routledge.*
14. *Šarčević, T., et al. (2024). U can't gen this? A survey of intellectual property protection methods for data in generative AI. arXiv preprint, arXiv:2406.15386. https://arxiv.org/abs/2406.15386*
15. *Wang, Z., et al. (2024). Evaluating and mitigating IP infringement in visual generative AI. arXiv preprint, arXiv:2406.04662. https://arxiv.org/abs/2406.04662*

Cite This Article:

***Dr. (Capt) Rajwadkar G.* (2025).** *A Study of Intellectual Property's Ownership in AI-Generated Creations: Legal Challenges and Implications.* **In Educreator Research Journal: Vol. XII (Issue I),** pp. 104–111

DOI: *https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.14862218*