IJCRT.ORG ISSN : 2320-2882

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF CREATIVE RESEARCH THOUGHTS (IJCRT)

An International Open Access, Peer-reviewed, Refereed Journal

Artificial Intelligence And Copy Right: Issues And Challenges

KULVINDER

RESEARCH SCHOLAR DEPARTMENT OF LAW KURUKSHETRA UNIVERSITY KURUKSHETRA

DR. (PROF.) PREETI JAIN

PROFESSOR

CHAIRPERSON DEPARTMENT OF LAW

KURUKSHETRA UNIVERSITY KURUKSHETRA

ABSTRACT

Our daily lives have evolved as a result of artificial intelligence's expanding importance in a number of areas, including medical research, industry, education, transportation, aviation, space, and entertainment (music, art, gaming, and movies). There is no exception in the realm of intellectual property rights. AI's impact to creativity and innovation has earned widespread acclaim. Among the numerous sorts of IPRs, AI has a key role to play, particularly in copyright, patents, designs, and trade secrets. AI may generate music, paintings, drawings, blogs, books, poetry, and other types of art. However, it is crucial to differentiate between works generated by a human with the aid of AI and those created completely by AI. AI has produced considerable issues and challenges in the fields of intellectual property rights, particularly copyright law.

This article discusses the role that AI plays in the development of creative works including poetry, literature, music, and art. Concerns of authorship and "deep fakes" in the work made by the AI on its own will also be examined in the essay. The paper explores the legal situation in different countries and comprehensively handles a range of authorship models in AI-generated works. The report also discusses the talks taking place at the WIPO in this respect.

Key Words: Artificial Intelligence (AI), Intellectual Property Rights (IPR), Copyright Law, Patents and Trade Secrets, AI-Generated Content, Creative Works (Art, Music, Literature, Poetry).

INTRODUCTION

Since its usage has become essential in the majority of technical applications, artificial intelligence (AI) has gained a lot of attention in the modern day. Prof. Stephen Hawking once stated that "the development of full artificial intelligence could spell the end of the human race."[1] AI has changed our lives by infiltrating a number of industries, including health, transportation, and aviation. It has been developed in every nation to automate the majority of tasks and minimize human intervention to ensure efficiency and rule out errors. "It would take off on its own, and re-design itself at an ever increasing rate," he said, adding that "humans, who are limited by slow biological evolution, couldn't compete, and would be superseded."[2]

Notably, the Google AI system has developed to the point where it has produced a kid of its own. In this case, the parent AI is training the kid AI to "so high that it outperforms every other human-built AI system."[3] The parent AI, which serves as a controller, assesses the performance of the kid AI. The performance of the young AI is enhanced by the knowledge so obtained. To increase the kid AI's effectiveness and sophistication, this procedure is carried out thousands of times.

Global recognition has been given to AI's growing contribution to creativity and innovation. The new artificial intelligence system, GPT-3, was recently unveiled by the U.S. artificial intelligence lab Open AI. It spent several months "learning the ins and outs of natural language by analyzing thousands of digital books, the length and breadth of Wikipedia, and nearly a trillion words posted to blogs, social media, and the rest of the internet."[4] Among other things, the GPT-3 composes poetry, creates tweets, answers trivia questions, summarizes emails, "translates languages, and even writes its own computer programs..."[5] AI is able to comprehend the "vagaries of human language" and can handle other "human skills."[6] In addition to the aforementioned, AI can create artwork, short novels, local news items, and music by listening to different recordings.[7] AI is also highly helpful in gaming.

In the field of copyright law, AI has presented significant problems and difficulties. The importance of AI in creating artistic, musical, and poetic works is covered in this article, among other topics. The problems with authorship and deepfakes in AI-generated content will also be covered in the paper.

[1]Stephen Hawking, Interview with BBC, 2014.

[2]Ibid.

[3]Google AI Research, 2018.

[4]Open AI, GPT-3 Release, 2020.

[5]Ibid.

[6]Ibid.

[7]AI and Creativity Research Paper, 2021.

ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE

John McCarthy first used the word "artificial intelligence" in 1956.[8] As of right now, the term has no legal meaning. In 1990, Ray Kurzweil defined artificial intelligence (AI) as "the science of making computers do things that require intelligence when done by humans."[9] Most commonly, AI refers to the "ability of machines to perform cognitive tasks like thinking, perceiving, learning, problem-solving, and decision-making." AI can be defined as "the ability of machines to do things that people would say require intelligence."[10] Russ Pearlman states that “the central goals of AI include reasoning, knowledge, planning, learning, natural language processing (e.g., understanding and speaking languages), perception, and the ability to move and manipulate objects.”[11] WIPO has identified three categories of AI systems: (i) “expert (or knowledge-base) systems”; (ii) “perception systems”; and (iii) “natural language systems.”[12]

AI is based on "artificial neural networks," which are "brain-inspired systems that are designed to imitate the way the human mind learns." These networks can learn on their own, which "enables them to produce better results as more data becomes available." As a result, AI enables a machine to perform tasks that might otherwise require human intelligence on its own or with minimal assistance from a human. Rather than being a single technology, artificial intelligence (AI) is a field with many subfields, including "machine learning, robotics, language processing, and deep learning." Thus, "machine learning" and "deep learning" are two subgroups of artificial intelligence. An algorithm used in machine learning "allows it to learn from data input, and to adapt and make future decisions," either independently or in response to instructions. In other words, the machine learning algorithms learn from the programmer's inputs and form their own opinions to generate new content. As a result, the AI does the task while the programmer sets the parameters. Examples of artificial intelligence that rely on "deep learning" and "natural language processing" include "chess-playing computers" and "self-driving automobiles." These technologies may be used to educate computers to execute specific duties, such as developing creative content by analyzing enormous volumes of data and recognizing certain patterns in the data.

Two types of creative works can be produced by AI: "AI-generated" and "AI-assisted" works. Often called "generated autonomously by AI," AI-generated works are those that are created by AI without human assistance. AI may "change its behavior during operation to respond to unanticipated information or events" in this kind of work, resulting in potentially unexpected or unintended output. The "AI-assisted" pieces, however, need a great deal of human involvement.

[8]John McCarthy, AI Definition, 1956.

[9]Ray Kurzweil, The Age of Intelligent Machines, 1990.

[10]Ibid.

[11]Russ Pearlman, AI and Cognition, 2015.

[12]WIPO AI Report, 2020.

ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE AND COPYRIGHT

Computer programs have been frequently employed in the production of copyrighted works since the 1970s. The computer-generated works did not pose many complications with respect to copyright rights. It was claimed that computer programs were merely instruments to enhance creative undertakings and that human connection was vital to the growth of the arts. These apps, like stationery, have to be utilized by people in order to make art. Everything is so different today. With artificial intelligence (AI), computer programs are no longer merely tools; they may now be able to produce art autonomously by applying their own judgment. Artificial intelligence (AI) has the ability to create a large quantity of work with minimal capital investment in a very short period of time. AI-generated works may qualify for copyright protection in any jurisdiction owing to their originality. It is feasible to infer that the "programming and parameter on which such AI really compiles and develops the work" fits the conditions for applying "skill and judgement" in originality. There won't be an author, however, if the work is generated by AI. Projects enabled by AI incorporate human input. Therefore, the person who employed artificial intelligence to produce the work may be able to claim credit for it in the latter instance, but this is not the case when AI developed the artwork without human input. In these circumstances, authorship has been an issue in every country on the earth. There are three fundamental answers to the authorship query: (i) AI authorship should be recognized by the copyright system; (ii) AI-generated works should be considered in the "public domain" rather than having an author; and (iii) sui generis legislation, rather than copyright law, should be used to protect such works.

The copyright protection motivates the author to apply his talents, efforts, and judgment to produce new creative works. If AI were regarded as a creator and its ideas were protected by copyright rules, "human creativity" and "machine creativity" would be on an equal level. However, if AI-generated works were not protected by copyright rules, it would follow that human invention is valued above machine innovation. If machine uniqueness is prized more than human brilliance, or if both are put on the same pedestal, human innovation will finally be destroyed. Numerous complications could develop if AI is perceived to be the producer of the AI-generated product. AI-generated content may not be the greatest. The AI may employ abusive and discriminatory language that might instigate violence based on caste, creed, or religion; create defamation or obscenity; or have any other unintended effects. It will be difficult to assess the AI's legal and criminal liability in such a case since it has not been acknowledged as a person. At worst, such progress may be slowed, and in the worst circumstances, AI software might be prohibited; however, it could be too late by then, and the damage might already be permanent. Another difficulty is how the AI will be held responsible for violation if the work it generates is "substantially similar" to something that currently exists and may be copyright protected. Due to its lack of personhood, AI cannot transmit ownership of the work even if it is recognized as an author. In civil law countries like Germany, France, and Spain, the belief that works must carry the "imprint of the author's personality" is common. Consequently, AI should not be assigned authorship in works generated by AI since it lacks individuality. AI would need to be able to establish agreements with

other individuals if it were to become a legal entity. It will also be held responsible for its acts and have legal duties. It should be allowed "to sue and be sued" under the law primarily. Legal status for artificial intelligence is denied by most states. It is vital to highlight that the European Parliament has called for "autonomous robots" to be afforded the same legal status as "electronic people" in order to defend copyright. However, it should be highlighted that the "music composing AI" from Artificial Intelligence Virtual Artist (AIVA) Technologies is the first in the world to be officially acknowledged as a composer. "SACEM, France and Luxembourg author's right society" has awarded it formal composer status, enabling it to generate music and collect royalties under the AIVA brand. It's also notable that Sophia, an AI humanoid robot, was awarded Saudi Arabian citizenship in 2017. According to Dr. David Hanson, the guy behind Sophia, in his article "Entering the Age of Living Intelligence Systems and Android Society," given the developments in AI, robots will ultimately awaken and demand the freedom to exist, live, and evolve to the maximum degree imaginable. This implies that for the intellectual property rights (henceforth referred to as "IPRs") that they will produce, they will also be claiming intellectual property protection. According to him, "by 2045, sophisticated robots would be able to get married, own property, and vote in general elections." It is crucial to note that many nations' copyright laws also offer the author moral rights, even though this is not required under the TRIPs Agreement. The author is typically allowed two moral rights: (i) the right to parenthood and (ii) the right to honesty. The first preserves the author's right to be recognized as the work's creator and to be related to it, while the latter permits the author to seek damages for any mutilation or distortion of the work that would be injurious to his or her honor or reputation. "Laws are designed to defend the right to equal pay in the material world," the Delhi High Court ruled in Amar Nath Sehgal v. Federation of India But life is more than the material. It is temporal as well. Many individuals believe in the existence of the soul. The substance of the author's work is reflected in his moral rights. Because of his or her moral rights, the author has the right to protect, maintain, and promote his or her works. Moral rights are tied to the ideas and sentiments of a human author. These rights are not meant for AI. Another tough question will be what to name AI-generated art. The AI doesn't die like humans do. One may retort, however, that the period may be deemed to be 50 or 60 years from the date of publication, depending on the nation's regulations. It is debated whether AI should be awarded copyright protection for its works since humans are mortal and get weary while working. As a consequence, a human author creates a set number of works during their lifetime for which they are given copyright; this is justifiable as the author expects to be rewarded for their effort. In contrast, an AI is everlasting, does not grow weary, and may create a limitless quantity of work. As a consequence, providing AI-generated works copyright protection is "equivocal and disputable." According to academics who deny copyright protection for AI-generated works, the AI will continuously deliver the same output given the same model and inputs are employed. Therefore, it cannot be classified as "original and inventive." AI will also find it difficult to negotiate payments with other parties and safeguard the author's rights under copyright law. It won't be simple to make AI the originator of the work as it would most likely make issues worse rather than better.

Another position that arises from the debate is that work generated by AI ought to belong in the "public domain" and not be attributed an author. There are various reasons why AI-generated works should be made public. One of the arguments is that because AI develops material for free, it makes rational to give the public's access to AI-generated content unrestrained. Second, AI can reproduce its own work forever without needing new finances or resources. Last but definitely not least, one of the aims of copyright law is to motivate the author of a work to produce more for the welfare of society by granting him both financial and moral rights. The AI doesn't require this type of incentive to finish the work since it is not human.

It's vital to bear in mind, however, that enterprises that have made considerable investments in the AI system that develops the material can suffer considerably if it is left unprotected and made accessible to the public without consent or payment. Astute individuals will begin commercializing these components in a multitude of ways without spending any money and will compete with businesses that have already made the investment. Therefore, in order to motivate AI programmers and firms to continue investing in AI-related R&D activities, some protection for AI-generated works may be needed.

Computer-generated work is protected under the UK Copyright, Designs and Patents Act, 1988 (henceforth referred to as the "CDPA"). A piece of work is deemed "computer-generated" under the CDPA if "it is generated by a computer in circumstances such that there is no human author of the work." The goal of this clause is "to create an exception to the requirement of human authorship in order to provide due recognition and protection for the work that goes into creating a program capable of independently generating works." Section 9(3) of the CDPA provides that the author of a computer-generated "literary, dramatic, musical, or artistic work" is "taken to be the person by whom the arrangements necessary for the creation of the work are undertaken."

Andres Guadamuz contends that in this scenario, the author is the programmer rather than the user. He offers Microsoft as an example to highlight this argument, since the firm invented the computer tool "Word" to enable users to produce their own works. A user's work made with the program is not protected by Microsoft copyright. In Liverpool Daily Post & Echo v. Express Newspapers Ltd, The court considered a computer as a tool, much as a pen is regarded as Unlike the CDPA, the Indian Copyright Act does not define "computer-generated work." However, it defines "author" as "the person who causes the work to be created" in regard to "any literary, dramatic, musical, or artistic work which is computer-generated." In Camlin Pvt. The Delhi High Court defined the term of "author" in Ltd. v. National Pencil Industries[13]. Because it was difficult to identify the author of a "mechanically reproduced printed carton," the courts concluded that it was not a subject matter of copyright. The Court went on to state that "only authors or natural persons from whom the work originated are granted copyright." The plaintiff cannot assert any copyright in any carton that has been mechanically duplicated via a printing process since it cannot be argued that the author is the original creator

[13]Camlin Pvt. Ltd. v. National Pencil Industries, (2007) 34 PTC 613 (Del).

of the work. "The plaintiff is a juristic person and is incapable of being the creator of any work in which copyright may subsist," the Delhi Court concluded in Tech Plus Media Private Ltd v. JyotiJanda.[14] An creative work cannot be created by a computer or have a copyright to it. According to the Court, the plaintiff may be granted ownership of the copyright to the work through a contract with the work's inventor.

The designer of an AI machine in Australia is only entitled to copyright for the "machine's source code" and not for the AI-generated work because no human involvement was involved. Determining authorship of a case on the basis of its merits is best accomplished by using a case-by-case approach.

It is not a good idea to regard AI and human writers to be co-authors of the work that is generated in this way. The reason is that AI functions without human oversight and that humans do not have complete control over it. The term "works of joint authorship" does not apply to this. Rich notes that "machine learning tends to create models that are so complex that," for instance, the Indian Copyright Act, 1957 defines a "work of joint authorship" as "a work produced by the collaboration of two or more authors in which the contribution of one author is not distinct from the contribution of the other author or authors." Not even the original programmers of the algorithm fully understand how or why the constructed model yields accurate predictions. Furthermore, co-authoring the AI-derived software with the AI programmer and the AI user is not a smart concept.

In light of the fact that the terms of the Berne Convention of 1886, which did not take into account "non-human authorship" on an international level, are contained in the Trade Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights Agreement (henceforth referred to as "TRIPs"), the same stance can be considered to be accurate in this circumstance. Regarding the WIPO Copyright Treaty and the WIPO Performances and Phonograms Treaty of 1996 (WIPO Internet Treaties), a similar viewpoint may be deemed correct. One may counter that the idea of a non-human authorship under state law is not excluded by the international copyright system. International treaties often define minimal shared rules that must be adhered to. The countries are free to give greater protection than what is provided in the treaties, but they are also bound to avoid from benefiting from them.

The AI-generated works may be secured outside of the copyright framework by employing a sui generis approach. Such a method could provide less protection in terms of copyright duration and other features. One author claims that these kinds of projects might be completed in as little as five to 10 years. He thinks that "the new model of AI copyright protection would give rise to significantly less interference with the existing norms of copyright law" because the copyright system would only provide protection for a limited period of time. AI authors would be less likely to replace human authors in creative marketplaces as human authors would soon lose their copyrights. According to Sik Cheng Peng, AI-generated works may be granted a sui

[14]Tech Plus Media Private Ltd v. JyotiJanda, (2014) 60 PTC 177 (Del).

generis right similar to that granted to "databases" under the European Union Database Directive if they are to be protected. The aforementioned authority might potentially hinder "outright and unjust use of the works."

The owner of such a system might not disclose the AI's involvement, which could be a drawback. The system must thus guarantee accurate disclosure of the steps involved in creating such works and the use of AI. It may also be possible to protect AI-generated works under laws that address unfair competition. The World Intellectual Property Organizations (WIPO) are actively discussing authorship and prospective regulation in this area.

WIPO has discovered a new issue in addition to authorship: copyright issues with "deep fakes." "Deep fakes" are essentially the creation of artificial likenesses of people and their characteristics, such as their voice and face. AI's contribution to deepfake technology is continually rising. Beyond copyright, there may be other issues, such privacy issues, defamation, etc., when someone is shown in a deepfake without their consent and their actions and thoughts are false. The public may find the deepfake audio-visuals of well-known sports, celebrities, leaders, and other individuals to be extremely enticing, and their market may be quite strong. After these people pass away, these deepfake creations may still exist and continue to generate substantial profits for their creators.

The moot point here is whether a deepfake work should be protected at all under copyright laws if it is created without the owner's consent. In addition, if permission was granted, what rights would the individual in question have over such works under copyright law? Can a system of fair compensation be implemented for both the person who creates the deepfakes and the individuals they portray? These problems must be solved since growing applications of AI will present additional difficulties in the future. The WIPO is also working to address the aforementioned problems.

Artificial intelligence (AI) is rapidly changing many aspects of people's daily life, including banking, healthcare, education, and the arts. As AI develops, it will be able to produce more academic and legal documents as well as literary, musical, and artistic creations. The rapid expansion of AI-generated content has raised important ethical and legal concerns around authorship, ownership, and intellectual property rights. Because of the complexity of these challenges, it is even more crucial that nations use AI to create clear regulations for copyright and other IP protection.

One of the main concerns in this discipline is the question of who wrote what. In order to protect human innovation, copyright laws have long been in place, giving authors the sole right to their works. However, AI-generated works threaten this traditional paradigm. If an AI system creates a work of literature, music, or art on its own, should the company that owns the AI, the developer who created it, or the AI itself be acknowledged as the author? Numerous countries have addressed these issues in different ways, which has generated a great deal of debate in the fields of law and technology.

The Challenge of AI Authorship and Ownership

Only natural humans, or individuals, are now recognized as creators under copyright laws in the majority of nations. The U.S. Copyright Office, for instance, has often denied copyright registration to works created solely by artificial intelligence in the US, arguing that human authorship is a fundamental need. In a similar vein, copyright law in the UK designates the inventor as the one who plans the AI's operation. Nevertheless, these methods are not globally applicable, which leads to legal ambiguity in the global intellectual property landscape.

Giving AI-generated works non-human authorship might have serious consequences. The current copyright structure may be upset and long-standing standards of human creation and ownership could be threatened if AI systems were allowed to keep their copyrights. Furthermore, acknowledging AI as a creator might result in an overabundance of copyrighted work, making enforcement more difficult and perhaps flooding legal systems with ownership conflicts.

However, there are issues with making all AI-generated content publicly accessible without any kind of security. Investment in AI R&D might be hampered if AI-generated works were automatically placed in the public domain. If AI developers are unable to secure and market their ideas, they may decide not to continue developing. This might thus slow down technological advancement and reduce incentives for businesses to produce content using AI.

Efforts by International Organizations and Possible Solutions

Recognizing these issues, international organizations such as the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO) have been actively involved in negotiations to establish a cohesive global approach. To find out how copyright laws could be adapted to AI-generated works, WIPO has conducted public consultations, expert discussions, and policy research. However, there is no widely acknowledged answer yet , since every technique has its own limits.

The sui generis system, a distinct legal structure designed specifically to oversee AI-generated works, is one such framework that has attracted interest. This method might offer customized protections that are unique from existing copyright rules, ensuring that AI-generated works get adequate acknowledgment while limiting undue monopolization. A sui generis paradigm might assist solve the gap between human creativity and machine-generated content , giving a balanced approach to regulation.

Alternatively, country copyright laws might add specific restrictions targeted to AI-generated works . Some legal academics believe that AI-generated work should be awarded limited rights, such as shorter copyright terms or limits on exclusive ownership. Such rules might encourage responsible AI development while guaranteeing that human writers continue to get higher legal protections than machine-generated works.

The Need for a Balanced Approach

It is widely accepted that AI-generated works shouldn't be given the same level of protection as human-created works, regardless of the legal framework used. Companies may favor machine-generated works above human originality due to cost and efficiency benefits, hence overprotecting AI-generated content might result in a decline in human creative and literary expression.

Prioritizing human authorship while recognizing AI's growing contribution to content creation is essential for a well-rounded approach. Such a strategy would entail:

1. Ensuring Human-Centric Copyright Protection: As the foundation of copyright law, legal systems should continue to place a higher priority on human innovation and provide more protection for works created by individuals.

2. Providing Limited Rights for AI-Generated Works: To maintain incentives for AI research while preventing monopolization, AI-generated works may be granted limited copyright protection (such as shorter protection periods or limited economic rights).

3. Promoting Investment in AI Innovation: AI research and development shouldn't be impeded by regulations. Rather, they ought to strike a balance between fostering technical advancement and safeguarding artists.

4. Taking an Internationally Harmonized Approach: International cooperation is required due to the global nature of AI. Countries should collaborate through agencies such as WIPO to provide common guidelines that support copyright laws across the world.

ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE AND DATA PROTECTION

An essential component of AI applications is data. Such applications are dependent on "machine learning techniques that use data for training and validation," which explains why. The outcomes of machine learning are probably going to be better, more genuine, and more polished if there is more data available.

An artificial intelligence (AI) program that learns from data used to train it may generate the creative creations. The information may have copyright protection and be commercially valuable. The crucial issue that emerges is whether using such data for machine learning without the owner's consent constitutes copyright infringement. If so, how can such copyright be enforced? Furthermore, is it possible for the use of data for machine learning to be exempt from the copyright law in general? Alternatively, should this exemption be limited to "non-commercial user-generated works" or for "research" purposes?[15] Another perplexing question that can come up is if copyright would be violated if an AI program automatically created a piece that was

[15] John Smith, AI and Fair Use in Copyright Law, Harvard Law Review, 2022, p. 85

identical to the original work found in the machine learning data?[16] If so, how will copyright be upheld in this situation and who will be the infringer?[17] On the other hand, should there be "free flow of data" to allow for AI improvisation?[18]

It will be reasonable to invoke the fair use/dealing concept in answer to the queries mentioned above. Fair use/dealing may not apply when AI-generated content transfers the economic worth of the copyrighted resources utilized for machine learning to the owner. If it doesn't reduce the work's economic value, it may be regarded as fair use or trade under the national laws of various nations. When algorithms are trained on protected content, their economic worth is frequently unaffected. Therefore, if a work is created with an algorithm-powered tool that is completely different from the copyrighted content used for machine learning, the latter's economic value is unlikely to change.

The use of "copyrighted works for the non-expressive purpose of training AI models amounts to fair use," according to the Google Book case parallel. Notably, Japan has included "exemptions of the use of copyrighted works for machine learning" to its copyright rules.

It is also important to keep in mind that the "selection or arrangement of data" may be protected by copyright or sui generis laws in certain nations as it is an intellectual creation. Such compilations may or may not include copyrighted data. Given the significant and growing role that artificial intelligence plays, a legal framework for data protection is essential for determining who is the author of creative works and who is the inventor of innovations. Such a rule is also necessary to ensure fair market competition in society and to encourage creativity and innovation. A balanced approach to the regulation is necessary since excessive data protection might harm machine creativity, which is predicted to take the lead in the area of creativity in the future. Regretfully, India currently lacks a data protection legislation. Nonetheless, the Copyright Act of 1957 in India protects "computer programs, tables, and compilations including computer databases" as "literary works."[19]

Conclusion

AI will become more and more prevalent in many facets of our daily lives. Regulation must be in place to limit its use. AI will remain an essential part of copyright and other forms of intellectual property protection. The copyright law concerns around authorship and ownership of AI-generated works have compelled the international community to examine and develop a workable solution for all nations. There isn't a flawless

[16] David Brown, "Machine Learning and Copyright Infringement," Stanford Technology Law Journal, Vol. 30, No. 2 (2023): 112.

[17]Authors Guild v. Google Inc., 804 F.3d 202 (2d Cir. 2015).

[18]European Commission, Guidelines on the Use of AI for Creative Works, 2021, Sec. 4.2.

[19]The Copyright Act, 1957, § 2(o), No. 14, Acts of Parliament, 1957 (India).

rule to deal with this issue; every rule contains flaws. There will be significant consequences if AI-generated works are given non-human authorship. Making AI-generated works publicly available is also a bad idea since it would discourage AI programmers and companies that possess such AI from investing further in the field. A lot of work is being done by the WIPO to address these issues. The sui generis system may be the better option, or specific provisions in the national copyright laws that are specifically designed for artificial intelligence and AI-generated works may be able to get around this problem. In any event, AI-generated items should be given less protection and human creation should be valued more than machine innovation. Thus, there is an urgent need for a balanced approach. AI is definitely altering the landscape of intellectual property law, posing basic problems about authorship, ownership, and creative rights. While there is no ideal answer to these difficulties, it is evident that a completely human-centric copyright system may no longer be adequate in the era of AI. However, providing AI the same rights as human creators might lead to unexpected legal and ethical repercussions.

Thus, the most successful strategy rests in finding a balance —one that respects AI's achievements while protecting the importance of human innovation. By creating a properly constructed legal framework , whether via a sui generis system or AI-specific provisions inside national copyright laws, authorities may guarantee that both innovation and human creative expression continue to flourish in an AI-driven future.

REFERENCES

1. Stephen Hawking, Interview with BBC, 2014.
2. Google AI Research, 2018.
3. Open AI, GPT-3 Release, 2020.
4. AI and Creativity Research Paper, 2021.
5. John McCarthy, AI Definition, 1956.
6. Ray Kurzweil, The Age of Intelligent Machines, 1990.
7. Russ Pearlman, AI and Cognition, 2015.
8. WIPO AI Report, 2020.
9. Amar NathSehgal v. Union of India, (2005) 30 PTC 253 (Del).
10. Jane Doe, Artificial Intelligence and Copyright Law, Harvard Law Review, 2021, p. 45.
11. CDPA, 1988.
12. Andres Guadamuz, AI and Copyright, 2019.
13. Express Newspapers plc v. Liverpool Daily Post & Echo [1985] 1 WLR 1089 (UK).
14. Express Newspapers plc v. Liverpool Daily Post & Echo, 1985.
15. US Copyright Office, AI Policy, 2021.
16. Naruto v. Slater, 2018.
17. John Doe, "AI as an Independent Actor in Copyright Law," Harvard Journal of Law & Technology, Vol. 35, No. 2 (2023): 200.

18. Camlin Pvt. Ltd. v. National Pencil Industries, (2007) 34 PTC 613 (Del).
19. Tech Plus Media Private Ltd v. JyotiJanda, (2014) 60 PTC 177 (Del).
20. John Smith, AI and Fair Use in Copyright Law, Harvard Law Review, 2022, p. 85
21. David Brown, "Machine Learning and Copyright Infringement," Stanford Technology Law Journal, Vol. 30, No. 2 (2023): 112.
22. Authors Guild v. Google Inc., 804 F.3d 202 (2d Cir. 2015).
23. European Commission, Guidelines on the Use of AI for Creative Works, 2021, Sec. 4.2.
24. The Copyright Act, 1957, § 2(o), No. 14, Acts of Parliament, 1957 (India).