INDIAN JOURNAL OF LEGAL REVIEW

COPYRIGHT CHALLENGES IN THE ERA OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE AND GENERATIVE CONTENT

AUTHOR – VIRAT SRIVASTAV, STUDENT AT AMITY UNIVERSITY, PATNA

Abstract

Artificial Intelligence (AI) has revolutionized creative industries, blurring the lines between human authorship and automated generation. This paper explores the complex legal, ethical, and policy challenges surrounding copyright in the era of AI and generative technologies. It examines how existing copyright frameworks—built on human creativity—struggle to accommodate machine-generated works. The analysis incorporates international perspectives, including U.S., U.K., and Indian legal systems, and discusses landmark judicial decisions such as *Naruto v. Slater*, *Thaler v. Comptroller-General of Patents, Designs and Trade Marks*, and relevant Indian jurisprudence. A comprehensive discussion of authorship, originality, ownership, and enforcement challenges is followed by a critical evaluation of possible reform approaches. The paper concludes by suggesting a balanced framework that recognizes human-AI collaboration while upholding the foundational principles of copyright law.

Keywords: Copyright, Artificial Intelligence, Authorship, Originality, Generative Content, Intellectual Property Law, Automation, India.

1. Introduction

Artificial Intelligence (AI) has evolved from a theoretical concept into a transformative force reshaping industries, economies, and creative expression. Tools like ChatGPT, DALL·E, Midjourney, and DeepMind's AlphaCode have made it possible for machines to produce text, music, art, and even inventions indistinguishable from human creativity. These technological advances challenge traditional copyright systems that rest on two core assumptions — *human authorship* and *original expression*.

The growing prevalence of generative AI raises fundamental legal questions:

- Can a machine be an author?

- Who owns the copyright in AI-generated works — the developer, the user, or no one?

- Does the lack of human creativity negate originality?

- How can copyright law balance innovation with public interest?

This research paper critically examines these questions through a comparative legal lens, focusing on India's copyright framework and international developments. It evaluates whether current laws sufficiently protect creative outputs in the age of AI and suggests pathways for reform.

2. Objectives of the Study

1. To examine the conceptual foundations of copyright and their applicability to AI-generated works.

2. To analyze how different jurisdictions interpret authorship and originality in the context of AI.

3. To identify gaps in India's existing copyright framework concerning generative technologies.

4. To suggest reforms that ensure equitable recognition of human-AI creative collaborations.

3. Literature Review

Academic and judicial discourse on AI-generated creativity has expanded significantly in recent years. Early studies (Samuelson, 1986) viewed computer-generated works as extensions of human creativity, arguing that human input in programming justified authorship. Later, legal theorists like Burk (2019) and Gervais (2020) argued that AI challenges the "romantic author" concept foundational to copyright law.

The World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO, 2021) highlighted the growing importance of AI and noted the absence of international consensus on machine authorship. The European Parliament's 2020 report also emphasized the need for new rights categories recognizing human-AI co-creativity.

Indian scholars (Sharma & Narayan, 2022) have noted that while the Indian Copyright Act, 1957, indirectly recognizes computer-generated works, it lacks clarity on AI-generated content. Comparative analyses show that while the UK provides limited recognition under Section 9(3) of its Copyright, Designs and Patents Act (CDPA, 1988), the U.S. Copyright Office explicitly denies protection to non-human creators.

4. Theoretical Framework

4.1. Authorship and Originality

Authorship is the central pillar of copyright protection. It establishes who owns the rights, moral interests, and control over a creative work. Traditional copyright theory ties authorship to *intellectual labor*, *creativity*, and *human expression*. AI systems, however, produce outputs without consciousness or intent, challenging the human-centric definition.

Originality, another cornerstone, has been interpreted differently across jurisdictions:

- In the **U.S.**, the *Feist Publications v. Rural Telephone Service Co.* (1991) case established the "modicum of creativity" standard.

- In the **U.K.**, originality demands "skill, labor, and judgment."

- In **India**, originality is understood as the product of the author's independent skill and labor (*Eastern Book Company v. D.B. Modak*, 2008).

AI-generated works often lack identifiable human creativity, raising doubts about whether they can be considered "original" under these standards.

5. Copyright and AI-Generated Content: Legal Perspectives

5.1. India

The **Copyright Act, 1957**, defines "author" under Section 2(d). In the case of computer-generated works, the author is "the person who causes the work to be created." This phrase could, in theory, cover AI developers or users. However, the Act predates modern AI and offers no clarity on autonomous systems.

The Indian judiciary has not yet directly ruled on AI authorship. Still, cases like *Eastern Book Company v. D.B. Modak* emphasized human intellectual effort, implying that AI alone cannot be an author.

5.2. United Kingdom

Section 9(3) of the **Copyright, Designs and Patents Act, 1988**, provides that for computer-generated works, "the author shall be taken to be the person by whom the arrangements necessary for the creation of the work are undertaken." This provision, though pioneering, was intended for rule-based programs, not for

self-learning AI. Courts have not yet tested its limits in generative AI cases.

5.3. United States

The **U.S. Copyright Office** maintains that copyright subsists only in works created by human beings. In its 2022 decision rejecting registration for an AI-generated artwork titled *"A Recent Entrance to Paradise"*, the Office held that "human authorship is a bedrock requirement of copyright." The **Naruto v. Slater** case (2018) further confirmed that non-human entities cannot hold copyright.

5.4. European Union

The **EU Copyright Directive (2019)** reaffirms human authorship, though ongoing debates within the European Parliament explore limited recognition for AI-assisted creativity. The EU's proposed AI Act (2024) may indirectly influence copyright frameworks by imposing transparency obligations on AI developers.

6. Case Law Analysis

Judicial decisions, though limited, provide guidance on the evolving boundaries of authorship and creativity in AI contexts.

6.1. International Jurisprudence

Case Name	Jurisdiction	Year	Key Issue	Decision / Ratio Decidendi	Relevance to AI Copyright
Naruto v. Slater	United States (9th Cir.)	2018	Can a non-human claim copyright?	Only humans can be authors; animals and machines cannot hold copyright.	Reinforces human authorship principle.
Thaler v. Comptroller-General of Patents, Designs and Trade Marks	United Kingdom	2021	Can an AI system be listed as the author/inventor?	Court ruled that only natural persons can be authors or inventors.	Denies AI authorship; only human involvement counts.
Feist Publications v. Rural Telephone Service Co.	United States	1991	What constitutes originality?	Requires minimal human creativity and independent effort.	Highlights creativity requirement absent in AI works.
Eastern Book Company v. D.B. Modak	India	2008	What is originality under Indian law?	Originality involves skill, judgment, and effort by a human author.	Suggests AI-generated works may not qualify.
Thaler v. Commissioner of	Australia	2022	Can AI be recognized as an	Federal Court reversed	Aligns global stance denyin

Case Name	Jurisdiction	Year	Key Issue	Decision / Ratio Decidendi	Relevance to AI Copyright
Patents			inventor?	earlier recognition; only humans qualify.	g AI authorship.

6.2. Key Case Discussions

(1) Naruto v. Slater (2018, U.S.)

Facts:

A macaque named Naruto took selfies using a photographer's unattended camera. PETA sued the photographer, claiming copyright ownership on behalf of the monkey.

Issue:

Can a non-human entity (animal or machine) own copyright?

Judgment and Ratio:

The Ninth Circuit dismissed the case, holding that the Copyright Act only protects works authored by human beings. This principle implies that AI, like animals, lacks legal personhood for copyright purposes.

Significance:

Naruto established that *non-human authorship is legally untenable*—a precedent heavily cited in AI authorship debates.

(2) Thaler v. Comptroller-General of Patents (2021, U.K.)

Facts:

Stephen Thaler sought to register an AI system named "DABUS" as the inventor of certain innovations and author of creative works.

Issue:

Can an AI system be legally recognized as an author or inventor?

Judgment and Ratio:

The High Court rejected the claim, holding that authorship requires a natural person. Section 9(3) of the CDPA (1988) was not intended for autonomous machines.

Significance:

This case reaffirmed that even in technologically advanced jurisdictions, *legal authorship remains confined to humans*.

(3) Eastern Book Company v. D.B. Modak (2008, India)

Facts:

Eastern Book Company (EBC) claimed copyright over judgments published in its law reports after editing and formatting them.

Issue:

Whether editorial work on public domain judgments constitutes originality.

Judgment and Ratio:

The Supreme Court held that originality requires the exercise of skill, judgment, and effort—beyond mechanical labor.

Significance:

This case forms the foundation of India's originality test. AI-generated works, lacking human intellect or creativity, would not satisfy this threshold.

(4) Thaler v. Commissioner of Patents (Australia, 2022)

Facts:

Similar to the U.K. case, Thaler sought to name his AI DABUS as an inventor under Australian law.

Judgment and Ratio:

The Full Federal Court overturned the initial acceptance, holding that the law contemplates inventors as natural persons.

Significance:

This reinforced a uniform global stance that *AI cannot hold intellectual property rights* under current frameworks.

7. Discussion and Critical Analysis

AI challenges traditional copyright frameworks in three main areas: **authorship**, **originality**, and **ownership**.

7.1. Authorship and Legal Personhood

The central legal obstacle lies in the absence of personhood for AI. Copyright law confers rights only upon natural or juridical persons capable of holding and enforcing ownership. Extending this to AI would require a fundamental redefinition of legal personhood, raising ethical and policy issues.

7.2. Originality and Creativity Standards

AI outputs often result from algorithmic data training and probabilistic pattern generation. They may appear creative but lack human intention. Courts worldwide have upheld that originality involves intellectual creation—an element absent in autonomous AI.

7.3. Ownership and Accountability

Determining ownership of AI-generated works is contentious. Possible claimants include:

- The **developer**, for creating the algorithm.
- The **user**, for prompting the AI.
- The **employer**, under the "work for hire" doctrine.

None of these categories perfectly fit autonomous generation. Without clear authorship, ownership remains legally uncertain.

7.4. Enforcement and Liability

AI also complicates copyright enforcement. If an AI infringes existing works (e.g., using copyrighted data in training), who is liable? Developers often invoke "fair use" or "transformative use," but courts have yet to define these defenses for AI-generated outputs.

8. Comparative Perspective: India and the World

Aspect	India	United States	United Kingdom	European Union
Statutory Basis	Copyright Act, 1957	U.S. Copyright Act, 1976	CDPA, 1988	EU Copyright Directive, 2019
AI Authorship	Unclear, but human authorship implied	Only human authorship allowed	Limited recognition (Sec. 9(3))	Human authorship required
Key Case	*EBC v. Modak* (2008)	*Naruto v. Slater* (2018)	*Thaler v. Comptroller* (2021)	Ongoing AI policy debates
Policy Direction	Awaiting legislative reform	Explicit rejection of AI authorship	Considering human control criterion	Exploring ethical AI framework

9. Recommendations

1. **Legislative Clarification:** Amend Section 2(d) of the Indian Copyright Act to explicitly address AI-generated works and define the scope of "the person who causes the work to be created."

2. **Recognition of Human-AI Collaboration:** Introduce a "joint authorship" framework where human input (such as training, prompting, or curating) qualifies for protection.

3. **Registration Transparency:** Mandate disclosure of AI involvement in copyrighted works, ensuring accountability and authenticity.

4. **Ethical and Data Integrity Standards:** Require developers to ensure that

training datasets respect copyright and privacy rights.

5. **International Harmonization:** India should collaborate with WIPO and WTO to align AI copyright norms globally, ensuring fair competition and consistent protection.

10. Conclusion

The advent of AI marks a paradigm shift in the concept of creativity and authorship. While technology can emulate human expression, it lacks consciousness, intent, and moral agency—the cornerstones of copyright law. Courts worldwide have consistently upheld the human authorship requirement, but this approach may soon prove inadequate as AI becomes more autonomous.

India stands at a crucial juncture: its Copyright Act provides a partial foundation for computer-generated works but remains silent on AI autonomy. Adopting a nuanced, human-AI hybrid model could safeguard both innovation and artistic integrity.

Ultimately, the goal is not to redefine creativity but to reimagine copyright as a system capable of embracing new forms of it—where human intellect and machine intelligence coexist under a fair and ethical legal framework.

References

1. *Feist Publications Inc. v. Rural Telephone Service Co.*, 499 U.S. 340 (1991).

2. *Naruto v. Slater*, 888 F.3d 418 (9th Cir. 2018).

3. *Eastern Book Company v. D.B. Modak*, (2008) 1 SCC 1.

4. *Thaler v. Comptroller-General of Patents, Designs and Trade Marks* [2021] EWHC 2412 (Ch).

5. *Thaler v. Commissioner of Patents* [2022] FCAFC 62.

6. World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO), "Artificial Intelligence and Intellectual Property Policy Report" (2021).

7. Burk, D.L., "Authorship and Machines," *Stanford Technology Law Review* (2019).

8. Gervais, D., "The Machine as Author," *Iowa Law Review*, Vol. 105 (2020).

9. Sharma, A. & Narayan, K., "AI and Copyright in India: A Legal Analysis," *NUJS Law Review* (2022).

10. European Parliament Report on AI and Intellectual Property, 2020.