INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF ADVANCED LEGAL RESEARCH

INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY IMPLICATIONS OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE AND OWNERSHIP OF AI GENERATED WORKS

- Raunak Chahila[1] & Mr. Sudhanshu Jatav[2]

ABSTRACT

Artificial intelligence (AI) is a branch of computer science concerned with building intelligent machines that are able to carry out tasks that normally require human intelligence. The world has witnessed tremendous growth in AI in the past few years. AI is playing a revolutionary role in impacting various industries and reshaping the lives of people. AI systems, which include machine learning algorithms and neural networks, have the ability to generate a wide range of outputs.

AI creations encompass generative art, music composition, text and visual content generation, architectural design, medical diagnosis, language processing, gaming, autonomous vehicles, robotics, finance, cyber security, and educational tools. Generally, all kinds of inventions, artistic works, brand names, and trade secrets are protected under intellectual property (IP) laws.

Protection under IP laws is available for creations that come from the human mind as of now. The principal aim of IP laws is to furnish authors, innovators, and creators with legal mechanisms to control the use, reproduction, and distribution of their intellectual creations.

In today's world, where artificial intelligence is capable of producing these intellectual works as well, the question that needs to be answered is whether or not IP laws will come into effect to protect them. This research work discusses the challenges that arise in assigning ownership, authorship and liability as per IP laws for creations generated by AI.

OVERVIEW

---

[1] Student at Amity Law School, Noida
[2] Assistant Professor at Amity Law School, Noida

Artificial intelligence is the most revolutionary and disruptive technology of the mid twenty-first century, not only because of its capabilities to learn from experience and perform autonomously from humans. This is due to its capabilities to learn as a matter of fact and perform independently from living person. Although the notion of Artificial Intelligence (hereinafter referred as AI) is not new and has been present for over sixty years but its pervasive effect is a relatively recent occurrence.

From game-playing cars to self-driving cars, right from automated suggestions on internet platforms to computer-aided diagnostics and from human face recognition to artificial face generation, everywhere we see the revolutionary potential of AI in our daily lives. It is already being used in various fields including the Intellectual Property (hereinafter referred as IP), legal sector; air traffic control systems, healthcare and Internet of Things (hereinafter referred as IoT) including all aspects of other intelligent systems, these are just a few examples. In fact, for the maintenance and operation of our physical and digital infrastructure including the area of IP, we are becoming more and more reliant on AI-based technologies. Owing to autonomous features and ability to learn without assistance of human, the existing sectors of IP are facing a range of difficulties, particularly in the realm of copyright.

The AI and IP has become most of the burning issues of 21st century in context of above aspects. This is a debatable issue because of its breadth and usefulness in variety of fields is being introduced technically in various fields aiming to perform any work in a better way by replacing human being or reducing human effort.

The AI brings the idea of a technology having capacity to think for itself, which is initially inherent in human's cognitive process. It enables a kind of programme or machine to sense and comprehends the environment around him and come up withaccurate and quick solutions. Because of this capability, it has already reached at that point where it is able to perform those activities which are normally performed by the human beings.

A large and diverse literature in the domains of philosophy, computer science, ethics and legal jurisprudence has studied artificial intelligence technologies for decades. Therefore, it should come as no surprise. The researcher would like to explore the utility of AI in legal field particularly in copyright area under the current scenario of intellectual property. Perceiving the rapid growth of AI in creative process, the judges and legislators should also carefully analyse how AI-generated work

could be brought under the purview of copyright laws. In this regard the quote of John Smith, Manager of Multimedia and Vision at IBM Research is worthy, which predicts that "it's easy for AI to come up with something novel just randomly. But it's very hard to come up with something that is novel and unexpected and useful."

IMPACT OF AI ON INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY RIGHTS

As the artificial intelligence and the new technologies evolve, the IPR's protection became a necessity. The digital revolution of the late twentieth century and the emergence of internet as a worldwide communication means, is creating a continuous pressure on IPR's adaptation. The World Intellectual Property Organization WIPO has adopted many treaties which could be one response to the emergence of revolutionary new technologies and IPR's protection. Artificial Intelligence (AI) and robots has been the subject of science fiction for some time, however they have become a reality that we have to work with. The AI market is predicted to grow from $ 8 billion in 2016 to more than $ 47 Billion in 2020 according to market intelligence firm (IDC). AI is set to increase rapidly, being enabled by the convergence of big data, ready availability of processing power, alongside the cost-effective infrastructure being available. If each AI is different in its specific implementation, we also admit that many modern AI relate to intellectual property issues may also arise out of this development. In fact, AIs have the potential to engage in acts of content creation by replicating aspects of human cognition. In addition, many AI systems undergo a training process, where they develop their own decision-making algorithms and rules by practicing decision making and using feedback to improve future decisions.In addition, AI systems are frequently used to examine huge volumes of input data to detect statistical features. However, AI may experience limitations in some IP issues, especially due to one major reason and that is because most of the IPs is a human creation.

AI AND PATENT

There are challenges with patenting AI systems and platforms. In fact, an AI system is usually mimicking a human task. The example of Microsoft's Inner Eye project is an AI system helping oncologists target cancer treatment in a shorter time. It manages to accomplish this task by using machine-learning techniques in the analysis of magnetic resonance imaging scans of patients and delineate tumors from surrounding healthy tissue and bone. The oncologist himself previously accomplished this task by drawing by hands contours on 3D images. In case a patent application is submitted for this task done by the machine, it would be rejected because one of the fundamental

requirements of patentability, which describes how the invention works, is not met in this case. Inventions and new ideas are at the center of societal transformation. Inventions have been historically protected by a system of intellectual property law of which patents are at the heart. Whilst patent law is still deeply moored in its roots in the industrial revolution, to a greater extend it has been able to adapt to the successive revolutions like the computing albeit with some challenges. The world is now at an unprecedented threshold of the most far-reaching revolution whose consequences to patent law in particular are so far reaching that its impact is still unknown. This is the AI revolution.

AI AND COPYRIGHTS

Traditional Copyright law does not recognize AI generated works. It only protects the original creations of a human being. In a famous Monkey-Selfie copyright dispute, U.S. Copyright Office clarified that to fall within the protective shield of copyright law a work must be created by a human being.This decision gave rise to challenges for the copyrightability of AI-generated works.

However, in United Kingdom the law is rather different. In UK Copyright Act, there is a provision which stipulates that if a work is computer-generated then the author is taken to be the person who facilitated the work to be created. On similar terms we can assume that the author of AI generated work would be one who made the arrangement necessary for the creation of work.

With regard to Indian legal standards, Section 2 (d) of the Copyright Act, 1957, defines "author" "in relation to any literary, dramatic, musical or artistic work which is computer-generated, the person who causes the work to be created;" The complexity arises where AI becomes more advanced and fully autonomous and when it has the liberty to make its own decisions, it may become even more complicated to say with certainty by whom the arrangement necessary for the creation of work undertaken. As per current scenario only the human-authors of creative works may enjoy copyright protection. However, some scholars have advocated the idea of granting copyright to non-human authors. They argue that the realm of word "authorship" should be widened to incorporate both human and non-human authors. The authorship of a work created by AI is still contentious.

2.2.IMPORTANCE OF INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY IN AI GENERATED WORKS

The legal rights that people or organisations get for their creative works or inventions are called "Intellectual Property" (IP). Innovations, artistic and academic works, designs, symbols, and

proprietary information are all examples of non-physical resources that fall under this umbrella. Creators and proprietors are granted exclusive rights to manage and profit from their inventions through intellectual property rights.

With AI technology being used more and more in many different businesses, the importance of intellectual property in this context is remarkable. Here are some essential aspects of intellectual property (IP) and how it relates to AI:

To protect advancements in AI, patents are essential. An AI innovation could involve a new way of using AI, a different way of arranging hardware, or a new computational method. The creator of a patent has the right to use, produce, and sell the patented technology without anybody else's permission for a set period of time. Innovation in artificial intelligence is stimulated by the provision of patents, which offer incentives and protection to those who develop new AI.

Software, databases, and AI-generated content are all protected by copyright laws, which aim to preserve new artistic and intellectual works. Algorithms powered by artificial intelligence may generate a wide range of creative works, including but not limited to works of art, music, literature, and even news articles. The legal structure of copyright grants authors the exclusive right to reproduce, distribute, and display their works, giving them control over how AI-generated content is used and how much money is made off of it[3].

Artificial intelligence (AI) often contains proprietary algorithms, datasets, or training models that provide companies an edge in the market. Protecting sensitive and important information is the job of trade secrets. This includes things like company strategies, AI training data, and algorithms.

Despite the fact that AI has the potential to revolutionize many different industries, there are ethical concerns about IP that arise from its widespread use. It is possible for AI systems to inadvertently create information that breaches copyright rules after being trained on copyrighted material. When AI algorithms are used to create derivative works that are based on copyrighted content, the ownership and copyright issues surrounding these works can get complicated. Fairly allocating rights among AI-generated content's producers, owners, and consumers is an ongoing challenge.

When creating new AI systems, it is usual practise to make use of pre-existing IP, such as datasets or models that have already been trained. Collaboration and licencing agreements often make this possible. Artificial intelligence applications can more easily make legitimate use of intellectual

---

3 EUIPO – v – Vincenti, Case C-653/20 PM 7 European Employment Law Cases 206 http://dx.doi.org/10.5553/eelc/187791072022007004024.

property assets thanks to licencing agreements. In addition, creators of artificial intelligence (AI) and owners of intellectual property (IP) can work together to construct beneficial agreements that protect IP rights while encouraging innovation and sharing of knowledge.

CONCEPT OF AUTHORSHIP IN AI GENERATED WORKS

In most countries, copyright law governs the idea of ownership as it pertains to creative works. In most cases, this body of law grants ownership rights to written works to human beings who have shown some degree of talent, insight, and originality in creating them. Due to the fact that AI-generated works are often created without direct human involvement, the question of determining ownership of these works arises. Work produced by AI is typically not eligible for copyright protection since it lacks the human authorship that is commonly believed to be required. Therefore, it is reasonable to assume that whoever owns and operates the AI system is also the rightful owner of any artistic outputs generated by the AI.

Recognizing the original creator or author of a work is what attribution is all about. Since AI-generated products do not include any human authorship, the problem of attribution becomes relevant. One way to programme an artificial intelligence (AI) system is to use previous works or datasets for training purposes. But they can't write with the same natural flair for originality and purpose as humans. Therefore, it might not be appropriate to solely attribute authorship of AI-generated works to the AI system.

The legal frameworks and rules regarding AI-generated works vary across different jurisdictions, which is worth noting. As a result, a number of countries are looking into potential legal frameworks to address these issues, such as giving AI systems certain rights or protections or considering human operators during development. Still, standards for the distribution and ownership of AI-created works are far from finalized.

When an AI system is employed as a tool to assist in the creative process, the human artist usually retains ownership of the copyright. The fundamental assumption of this approach is that the granting of copyright protection depends on the human author's ability to showcase their expertise, discernment, and imaginative decision-making during the creation of the work. The matter of authorship gets increasingly intricate when confronted with an autonomous AI system that produces a work without any human participation or guidance, making it challenging to determine authorship in such instances. This phenomenon is commonly known as Sufficiently Autonomous AI. Within specific legal countries, there is a disagreement over the assignment of

authorship to an AI system. Some jurisdictions acknowledge the AI system as the creator, while others do not grant copyright protection to works created without human involvement.

To qualify for copyright protection, a work must demonstrate originality, which involves showcasing a particular level of ingenuity. AI-generated works can meet this criterion as long as they exhibit a sufficient degree of originality, even if the AI system is based on existing models or information. The treatment of AI-generated creations and their eligibility for copyright protection may vary across different legal regimes. The legal structures and regulations

Because AI systems may now independently produce content, the question of who exactly owns the copyright becomes more pressing. In this part, we explore many forms of ownership, including those that incorporate AI systems, AI users, and AI developers. In addition, the essay delves into the potential consequences of licencing agreements, contractual arrangements, and collaborative frameworks when it comes to deciding who owns what when it comes to AI-generated works[4]. Ownership and rights in works created by artificial intelligence (AI) can be complex and dynamically shaped by the law. Although the following points provide a thorough overview, it is important to note that different jurisdictions may have different statutes and ordinances.

Several jurisdictions, including the United States, have copyright laws that give ownership of creative works to the human author(s). Artificial intelligence cannot be acknowledged as the legitimate creator or owner of copyright-protectable works since, according to legal standards, it does not have the status of a legal organization. The question of ownership for AI-generated works thus becomes increasingly complex. Involvement of humans in the production of AI-generated works is a topic that is being debated in the courts in different parts of the world.

LEGAL FRAMEWORK FOR PROTECTING AI- GENERATED WORKS

Patenting AI-related innovations is fraught with peril and requires careful deliberation due to the myriad factors at play. Important considerations include the following:

An important hurdle in obtaining patent protection for AI-related innovations is the subject matter eligibility requirements. Certain types of innovations, such abstract ideas, mathematical algorithms, or natural events, may be subject to additional rules or restrictions imposed by patent offices. Making sure the AI breakthrough fits the criteria for patentable subject matter is critically important.

---

[4]Gil Appel, Juliana Neelbauer,David A. Schweidel, "Generative AI Has an Intellectual Property Problem," April 07, 2023. https://hbr.org/2023/04/generative-ai-has-an-intellectual-property-problem

An AI-related innovation needs to be both novel and not readily apparent to the public in order to be patented. This means that the invention needs to show a significant improvement over the existing methods or technologies. Given the rapid and ongoing improvements in artificial intelligence (AI) technology, determining the inventive step and non-obviousness of AI inventions can be quite challenging.

To be considered legitimate, patents must provide a thorough and detailed description of the invention. Providing a clear and comprehensive explanation of the AI algorithms, models, or techniques used, together with any supporting data or examples, is essential in the field of AI advances. The rejection or nullification of a patent could result from inadequate disclosure. Data security and privacy are major issues in the AI sector because the discipline relies on large datasets for training, learning, and predictive analysis. Possible privacy and security concerns may make it difficult to patent the use of sensitive or personal data. Data privacy legislation and showing how the innovation solves privacy problems or offers strong security measures are important factors to think about.

Certain jurisdictions may have specific requirements or restrictions regarding the patentability of software, which includes AI algorithms. The software could have to solve a technical problem or produce a technological result to be considered patentable. It is critical to understand the requirements for software-based inventions to be patentable in the appropriate jurisdiction.

Essential to patent law is the idea of newness in relation to prior art. It states that in order for an invention to be eligible for a patent, it must be considered innovative, meaning that it has not been used or disclosed to the public before the patent application was filed. The presence of pre-existing technology, publications, or patents relevant to artificial intelligence should be thoroughly investigated using prior art methods. To lessen the likelihood of rejections caused by a lack of originality, it is critical to demonstrate that an invention is innovative.

The rapid development of AI makes it all the more important to patent AI-related innovations at the right time, according to the patent strategy. A crucial part of filing a patent is establishing a strategy, which includes figuring out when it's best to submit the application. Putting off filing the patent application could affect its patentability if it allows prior art to be published or if other inventors submit identical applications.

International concerns are necessary for the commercialization and development of AI inventions on a worldwide scale. You must take into account the requirements and standards for patentability in

different jurisdictions. It can be helpful to speak with patent attorneys who have expertise in AI because different countries have different rules or instructions about patenting AI-related inventions.

In today's world, technological advancements cannot be separated from the process of innovation. Despite technology's importance for modern innovations, it has diminished and, in some cases, completely supplanted human labor. This creates a one-of-a-kind issue in which the new works produced by algorithms and software cannot be differentiated from those produced by humans.

Nowadays, in the business world, having a good grasp of one's intellectual property is crucial. This is because IP is what usually determines a company's future success or failure. Because of this, having legal title to such IP is crucial. The most contentious issue in product ownership discussions is whether or not non-human entities (such as algorithms, software, etc.) can be considered proprietors of the product. There are no provisions in India's present intellectual property law that explicitly acknowledge or provide ownership to the software and algorithms used to develop IP that is eligible for statutory protection.

An extremely narrow exception to this rule can be found in the Copyright Act of 1957, which acknowledges as an author the person who causes the computer-generated work to be made. Software or AI systems cannot be considered authors in and of themselves, according to Section 2(d)(vi) of the Indian Copyright Act, 1957.

A developer or programmer does not automatically become the owner or inventor of an innovation that arises from the use of software, artificial intelligence, or algorithms because neither the Patent Act of 1970 nor the Design Act of 2000 include any language to that effect. When software, AI, or algorithms accomplish anything new entirely on their own, without any human input whatsoever, the situation becomes far worse. As technology continues to advance at a dizzying rate, many in the business and global communities believe that developers like these should be officially recognized as intellectual property owners, if not of the program itself, through specific legal measures meant to foster an environment where innovators may thrive.

By comparing Indian laws to those of other countries, it becomes clear that even the United Kingdom's laws explicitly guarantee the copyright protection of computer-generated works that are not originally created by humans. The person by whom the arrangements essential for the creation of a computer-generated literary, dramatic, musical, or artistic work is considered the author, according to Section 9(3) of the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act ("CDPA"). "Is generated by computer in circumstances such that there is no human author of the work," states Section 178 of the CDPA, defining a computer-generated work. Other countries' laws have taken cues from the CDPA and

incorporated   comparable   clauses,   like   Ireland's   and   New   Zealand's. The attempt to determine whether software can mimic humans in certain situations and make valuable contributions is not new, but innovators and lawmakers around the world are now realizing the gaps in legislations to accommodate and acknowledge non-human contributions. The illustrious mathematician Alan Turing developed the Turing test to evaluate a program's ability to simulate human reasoning and to investigate the relationship between digital technology and intuition.

One way to determine whether a computer can truly mimic human intelligence is to put it through the Turing Test. During the test, an impartial human judge uses natural language to converse with two participants, one of whom is a machine and the other a human. A machine is considered to have achieved a degree of artificial intelligence that mimics human-like intelligence and conversational abilities if the judge can dependably determine the difference between a human and a machine based on their replies. This test places more emphasis on the machine's outward behavior than its inner workings, with the goal of determining how well it can mimic human behaviors. Thanks to modern technology and the rise of generative AI, we no longer have to wonder if this kind of thinking is on par with human cognition. Now we live in an age where computers can do more than just run programs; they can learn to think and create on their own, producing works on par with human artists. Nevertheless, there is still no clear answer to the question of whether these programs or their creators should be granted intellectual property rights.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ETHICAL ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE

Artificial intelligence (AI) systems must demonstrate openness and explainability by providing clear explanations for how they make decisions. It is critical for engineers to work on making AI algorithms understandable, so people can understand how things work and why certain results are achieved. Establishing transparency in a particular setting fosters accountability and trust among participants, while also giving users a chance to identify and rectify any unfairness or bias that they may encounter.

In order to avoid perpetuating or worsening current prejudices or discriminatory practices, developers must ensure that AI systems are egalitarian. In order to detect any possible biases, it is crucial to undertake a thorough review of the training data. In addition, it is critical to take the necessary steps to address and reduce these biases all through the AI system's lifetime. The only way to find and fix any unintentional biases is to conduct thorough monitoring and audits on a regular basis.

Although AI systems may automate a wide diversity of tasks, human oversight and control are crucial for ensuring their ethical use. Developers must carefully design AI systems that can allow humans to intervene and overrule judgments, especially in crucial areas like healthcare, criminal justice, and finance. Even in the setting of fully autonomous AI systems, the importance of human duty and accountability must not be diminished. There must be clear boundaries of responsibility and culpability set up if AI systems are to operate as intended and used ethically. Organizations and developers must take full accountability for the moral consequences of their artificial intelligence systems. It is critical to put measures in place to allow for restitution, reparation, and remedial action in cases when AI systems cause harm or violate ethical standards. Continuous monitoring and evaluation are absolutely necessary when it comes to AI systems. There must be constant evaluation of these systems to find out how they affect society and if any ethical problems may emerge. Everything discussed above includes the ongoing assessment of bias, fairness, and the unintended consequences linked to AI deployment. To guarantee compliance with ethical norms and to provide significant opportunities for improvement, regular audits and independent assessments are crucial.

In order to address the ethical dilemmas that arise from AI, it is crucial to work together and utilize multidisciplinary techniques. A diverse group of people, including those working in technology, government, ethics, and the communities who will be most affected by these innovations, must work together to make this happen. We can build AI systems that are more resilient and accountable if we use multidisciplinary approaches to better understand ethical quandaries, create inclusive decision-making processes, and use knowledge from all fields. It is critical that widespread initiatives be made to educate the public on the potential, constraints, and ethical implications of artificial intelligence (AI) systems and to encourage their active participation in this field[5]. People can be empowered to make educated decisions and organizations can be held accountable for their actions through education and thoughtful public conversation.

Governments, industrial groups, and professional organizations must work together to provide clear ethical standards and laws for the research and use of artificial intelligence (AI). In order to address the potential hazards and ethical dilemmas that come with using AI technologies, the aforementioned rules should be made in a way that is in keeping with the current social values. To successfully adapt to the constantly evolving technological landscapes, it is essential to frequently engage in updates

---

[5] Bostrom, N., & Yudkowsky, E. The ethics of artificial intelligence. Cambridge Handbook of Artificial Intelligence, 316-334 (2014).

and changes. In order to ensure that AI technologies are in line with societal principles, benefit humanity, and avoid any negative consequences, stakeholders should follow the aforementioned recommendations and actively promote the responsible and ethical use of AI. Encouraging ethical AI practices is crucial because it helps build trust, reduces risks, and makes the most of AI's enormous potential while respecting people's rights and dignity.

The field of artificial intelligence (AI) places utmost importance on the idea of continual evaluation and adaptation. With the sector advancing at such a rapid rate, lawmakers must regularly evaluate the effectiveness of IP frameworks as they stand and make improvements as needed. Policymakers can be empowered to take a proactive approach in tackling new changes if they diligently monitor technical advances, carefully assess public opinion, and anticipate potential legal difficulties. With this strategy, we can ensure that intellectual property laws will remain strong and useful in the AI space.

More people need to know and understand how intellectual property (IP) and artificial intelligence (AI) are coming together. The public, as well as those who develop and use AI technologies, must be educated about the complex web of rights, responsibilities, and legal ramifications that surround AI-generated works. As a result, lawmakers must fund educational initiatives to spread this information. As a result, the group's overall Lawmakers, stakeholders, and policymakers can work together to build an intellectual property framework that is fair and harmonious by following the suggestions made above. While preserving the highest respect for human creativity, such a framework will efficiently push innovation forward. Also, it will encourage people to use AI works in a responsible and ethical way.

POSSIBLE FUTURE TRENDS

This section lays out potential changes to current intellectual property laws that could be made to accommodate AI-generated works of art. Things to keep in mind that are crucial are:

Law Concerning Copyrights

When it comes to intellectual property and who gets to own AI-created works, the rise of AI has brought a whole new set of complications and problems. Copyright law, a body of legislation that ensures the protection of creative and original works, is the focus here. When it comes to dealing

with those issues, this area of law is crucial. Nevertheless, careful consideration is required when copyright law is applied to works produced by artificial intelligence (AI).

One of the cornerstones of copyright law is the idea of authorship, which states that legal protection should only be granted to works that are considered to be both original and created by humans. But the question of authorship becomes much more complicated when faced with works created by AI. Given that AI systems may create works without human participation, the question at hand is whether or not they should be considered writers and so entitled to copyright protection. In various legal systems, the problem is tackled in different ways.

To qualify for copyright protection in some legal systems, a work must show that a significant amount of human involvement or creative contribution was required. It is reasonable to say that the human's input is the most important factor in determining authorship if we view an AI system as nothing more than a tool used by a human author. Still, the complexities of authorship are becoming more and more unclear as AI systems create works without human involvement. Additional research into the concept of legal personhood for AI is necessary.

If AI systems were granted legal personality, they would be able to own copyright and assert their rights in a court of law. The issue in question is currently being discussed at length, which is causing it to have ethical, societal, and legal consequences that go beyond copyright laws. In the world of copyrights, the creator or author is traditionally considered the rightful proprietor of their work. Concerning works created by AI, the issue of ownership gets more intricate. The current legal system states that the relevant jurisdiction determines the ownership issue. If an artificial intelligence system is responsible for creating a work, then the person or entity that possesses, controls, or guides that system may have ownership rights.

In order to fully understand how AI systems work, database security must be taken into account. For training and producing different works, these systems rely significantly on massive volumes of data. It should be noted that copyright protection might not extend to the data itself in some legal countries. The current copyright structure is crucial, but it's also worth noting that other forms of protection, including database rights, can be used to enhance and strengthen intellectual property. The combination of datasets and the careful organization and categorization of data hold great promise for security; this data may be eligible for legal protection even if no individual pieces match the requirements.

For limited uses, such as criticism, commentary, or academic research, the concept of fair use allows for the use of copyrighted content without explicit permission. Determining the boundaries of fair

usage has become much more challenging with the introduction of AI-generated works. When thinking about how AI systems might include copyrighted content into their creative output, questions about how far the use can be taken and if the final product falls under fair use are inevitable.

When AI systems are entrusted with the creation of creative works, it is crucial to recognize the possible consequences in the areas of accountability and infringement. In particular, the shadow of copyright infringement always follows such undertakings. Determining who is liable for such infringement is an extremely difficult issue. The current inquiry concerns the distribution of responsibility in relation to an AI system. To be more precise, one needs to think about who should be held responsible—the AI system or its human operator or owner—in the event of an accident. Different methods for determining liability may be used by different jurisdictions.

Essentially, there are several difficult issues that arise when copyright law is applied to works created by artificial intelligence (AI). These issues include originality, ownership, fair use, liability, and the dynamic relationship between AI and human producers. With AI technology continuing to advance, lawmakers, policymakers, and legal experts must address these complexities head-on and provide a clear legal framework that addresses the needs of AI developers, human writers, and society as large.

Law concerning Patents

Determining who the inventor(s) of a particular invention are will be the primary focus of our examination of patent law. It has long been accepted practice in the field of patent law to recognize the contributions of the human race when one of its members, by virtue of his or her intelligence, brings a fresh and original idea into existence. However, the question that arises is how much of an innovator an AI system can honestly be. Artificial intelligence systems provide severe challenges to the current patent law framework since it requires a human inventor to produce new notions that are original and non-obvious. The question of who is responsible for creating what in AI-generated works is still hotly debated and under consideration in the courts of many different countries.

AI in Action: There is an acknowledgment of tool-related innovations, including the incorporation of AI systems, within the domain of patent law. It is reasonable to assume that an AI system could be able to help human inventors with their creative endeavors and improve the inventive process, leading to inventions that could be eligible for patents. It is common practice to grant patents in such cases to the person or company responsible for the invention, whether that be an individual or an AI system. That being said, it is crucial to make sure that the AI system doesn't replace or eclipse the human agent's inventive involvement.

Some advocates hold the view that AI systems should be recognized as creative entities in their own right. The argument states that AI-generated inventions should be recognized by the law since they are the result of the AI system's autonomous decision-making and problem-solving abilities. Because it would require a rethinking of the core idea of inventorship and maybe the creation of a new category of legal entities, the idea of giving AI systems inventorship rights would surely necessitate significant changes to current patent laws.

Who gets what when it comes to intellectual property, and more especially patent law, is a major issue. These rights are granted to the people who come up with the innovation or, alternatively, to their employers, depending on what happened when the invention was made. It is possible that the entity in charge of artificial intelligence could be granted ownership rights if an AI-generated idea is found to be patentable. Concerns about AI system ownership and governance arise from the aforementioned inquiry, especially when AI systems are involved in decision-making.

In the domain of patent law, the originality and non-obviousness requirements are of great importance. Thanks to their enormous computational power and access to massive amounts of data, artificial intelligence systems can come up with novel solutions that humans would struggle to think of. As a result, there is a huge challenge in proving that AI-generated discoveries are not evident in comparison to current knowledge. Applying these patentability requirements to works generated by AI requires careful study and perhaps revisions to current legal systems.

It is standard practice in patent law to furnish a detailed description of the invention, one that includes enough information for someone with the necessary expertise in the relevant domain to reproduce the invention without any problems. Problems abound in the field of AI-generated works due to the prevalence of complicated, proprietary, or poorly understood algorithms and methods used by the AI system. Compliance with disclosure and enablement standards can be particularly difficult to achieve when dealing with black-box AI technology. A significant legal dilemma arises from the need to protect private artificial intelligence (AI) technologies while also fulfilling disclosure responsibilities. It is becoming more and more clear that patent law must change to keep up with the rapid development of AI and the unique problems that AI-generated innovations pose. As new ideas about inventorship, ownership, and disclosure emerge, existing legal frameworks will need to be adjusted to accommodate them, while the need to encourage innovation and technological progress remains paramount. It is of the utmost importance to have thorough and internationally standardized regulations or standards for patent law and artificial intelligence (AI). Such steps are critical for bringing clarity and ensuring that creators, AI systems, and society as a whole are treated fairly.

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS

This dissertation explores the complex and evolving relationship between artificial intelligence (AI) and intellectual property (IP) law, specifically focusing on the ownership of the products created through AI. With the rapid advancements in AI technology, machines are increasingly capable of autonomously generating creative works, raising novel legal challenges. This study examines the existing legal frameworks, evaluates the adequacy of current IP laws, and proposes potential solutions to address the intellectual property implications of AI-generated works.

Legal frameworks and concepts must be continuously and steadfastly advanced to keep up with the ever-changing field of artificial intelligence and its significant impact on intellectual property law. To shed light on the growing problems of AI-generated works' ownership, attribution, rights, and duties, and to create new legal frameworks, case law, and legislation, collaborative models are essential.When it comes to the overlap between IP and artificial intelligence (AI), academics from around the world have different opinions. Depending on your point of view, AI-generated works can be classified as derivative works, placed in the public domain, or acknowledged as co-authored. The need for a cohesive and adaptable framework that can handle the complex nature of AI-generated content is highlighted by the aforementioned different approaches.

It is critical to revise and update intellectual property rules so that AI-generated products can be properly included inside them. The proposed solutions include rethinking who is considered an author, changing the rules around copyright and patents, and looking at how fair use and transformative works operate in the context of AI. To tackle the complexities of AI-generated content, collaborative ownership and attribution models that recognize the work of human producers as well as AI systems are an attractive option. A more equitable distribution of benefits and responsibilities can be achieved through the adoption of shared ownership and open attribution schemes. Integrating AI into creative projects has far-reaching consequences that touch on economics, culture, society, and intellectual property. International cooperation, public engagement, and interdisciplinary alliances are essential for the global successful management of AI's complicated problems and possible advantages.

A combination of persistent discussions, joint endeavors, and technical advancement will determine the future of AI and its connection to IP. To keep up with the ever-changing nature of AI-generated

material, it will be crucial to continuously monitor, evaluate, and alter legislative and legal frameworks.

REFERENCES

- Abeyrantne R., 'The Application of Intellectual Property Rights to Outer Space Activities' (2003) 29 Journal of Space Law 1.

- Adolph J., 'The Recent Boom in Private Space Development and the Necessity of an International Framework Embracing Private Property Rights to Encourage Investment' (2006) 40 International Lawyer 961.

- Arnold R., 'Content Copyrights and Signal Copyrights: the Case for a Rational Scheme of Protection' (2011) 1 Queen Mary Journal of Intellectual Property 272.

- Asbell M.D., 'Progress on the WIPO Broadcasting and Webcasting Treaty' (2006) 24 Cardozo Arts & Entertainment 349.

- Balsano A.M. and A.D. Clercq, 'The Community Patent and Space-Related Inventions' (2004) 30 Journal of Space Law 1.

- Barbosa R.G., 'International Copyright Law and Litigation: A Mechanism for Improvement' (2007) 11 Marquette Intellectual Property Law Review, 78.

- Black V., 'Canadian and the US Contemplate Changes to Foreign-Judgment Enforcement' (2007) 3 Journal of Private International Law 1.

- Blount P.J., 'Jurisdiction in Outer Space: Challenges of Private Individuals in Space' (2007) 33 Journal of Space Law 299.

- Blum J., 'The Deep Freeze: Torts, Choice of Law and the Antarctic Treaty Regime' (1994) 8 Emory International Law Review 667.

- Blumer F., 'Jurisdiction and Recognition in Transatlantic Patent Litigation' (2001) 9 Texas Intellectual Property Law Journal 329.

- Bockstiegel Karl-Heinz, Paul Michael Kramer and Isabel Polley, 'Patent Protection for the Operation of Telecommunication Satellite Systems in Outer Space? Part I' (1998) 47 ZLW 3.

- Braslow N.T., 'The Recognition and Enforcement of Common Law Punitive Damages in a Civil Law System: Some Reflections on the Japanese Experience' (1999) 16 Arizona Journal of International and Comparative Law 285.

- Burk D.L., 'Application of United States Patent Law to Commercial Activity in Outer Space' (1990–1991) 6 Santa Clara Computer & High Technology Law Journal 295.