INDIAN JOURNAL OF LEGAL REVIEW

VOLUME 6 AND ISSUE 6 OF 2026

INSTITUTE OF LEGAL EDUCATION

INDIAN JOURNAL OF LEGAL REVIEW

APIS – 3920 – 0001 | ISSN - 2583-2344

(Open Access Journal)

Journal's Home Page – https://ijlr.iledu.in/

Journal's Editorial Page - https://ijlr.iledu.in/editorial-board/

Volume 6 and Issue 6 of 2026 (Access Full Issue on - https://ijlr.iledu.in/volume-6-and-issue-6-of-2026/)

Publisher

Prasanna S,

Chairman of Institute of Legal Education

No. 08, Arul Nagar, Seera Thoppu,

Maudhanda Kurichi, Srirangam,

Tiruchirappalli – 620102

Phone : +91 73059 14348 - info@iledu.in / Chairman@iledu.in

INDIAN JOURNAL OF LEGAL REVIEW [IJLR – IF SCORE – 7.58]

VOLUME 6 AND ISSUE 6 OF 2026

APIS – 3920 - 0001 *(and)* ISSN - 2583-2344

Published by

Institute of Legal Education

https://iledu.in

A CRITICALLY ANALYSIS OF ZERO-CLICK INFRINGEMENT LIABILITY FOR AI-GENERATED SUMMARIES

AUTHOR – S.DEEPIKA* & M. LAXMI PRIYA**

* STUDENT AT SCHOOL OF LAW, VELS INSTITUTE OF SCIENCE, TECHNOLOGY AND ADVANCED STUDIES (VISTAS)

** ASSISTANT PROFESSOR AT SCHOOL OF LAW, VELS INSTITUTE OF SCIENCE, TECHNOLOGY AND ADVANCED STUDIES (VISTAS)

BEST CITATION – S.DEEPIKA & M. LAXMI PRIYA**,** A CRITICALLY ANALYSIS OF ZERO-CLICK INFRINGEMENT LIABILITY FOR AI-GENERATED SUMMARIES, *INDIAN JOURNAL OF LEGAL REVIEW (IJLR),* 6 (6) OF 2026, PG. 870-874, APIS – 3920 – 0001 & ISSN - 2583-2344. DOI - https://doi.org/10.65393/IJLRV6I6491

ABSTRACT :

Nowadays, artificial intelligence along with new search tools has reshaped how folks find things online. Instead of clicking through, search platforms often show instant replies or condensed details right on the screen. Because of that, visitors sometimes never land on source sites at all. Called zero-click searches, this habit brings up questions around whether using protected material in these snippets is fair.

This work looks into cases where AI pulls content without clicks, copying bits of someone else's creation. When summaries made by machines mirror protected material, questions pop up about who might be responsible. Developers behind artificial intelligence systems could face scrutiny, just like the companies hosting them or the search tools delivering results. Responsibility might fall on middlemen too, depending on how laws like India's IT Act from 2000 are applied. Clearer guidelines seem necessary, so innovation does not override the rights of those who make original work.

INTRODUCTION :

Fast progress in artificial intelligence along with new search methods reshaped how folks find things online. These days, answers pop up right on the results screen thanks to smart software pulling out key bits. That means readers get what they're looking for fast, skipping the source pages entirely. Easier info hunting comes at a cost though - legal questions have started piling up around creative rights. Copyright issues now bubble under the surface as machines copy and show protected work without clear permission.[1530]

Something big came up because of how things have changed lately - zero-click copying. Search results or artificial intelligence tools show short versions of material taken straight from protected content, yet never send visitors to the actual site. Even though these quick answers mean to make searching faster, they sometimes step on the toes of writers and publishers. People stay on the platform instead of clicking through, which means those who made the work might miss attention, visits, their name being seen, even money. Seeing full pieces less often shifts value away from where it started.[1531]

[1530] Studies on artificial intelligence and digital information access in modern search systems.

[1531] Academic discussions on zero-click searches and their impact on online publishers.

INDIAN JOURNAL OF LEGAL REVIEW [IJLR – IF SCORE – 7.58]

VOLUME 6 AND ISSUE 6 OF 2026

APIS – 3920 - 0001 *(and)* ISSN - 2583-2344

Published by

Institute of Legal Education

https://iledu.in

Nowadays, old copyright rules like the 1957 Act were built for simpler times - back when sharing meant photocopying or mailing tapes. Since then, machines that write, draw, or compose without human hands have shaken things up. Because of this shift, looking closely at instant-use breaches makes sense - even if no one actively downloads anything. Content chopped into snippets by artificial brains also raises questions about who owns what. Figuring out where blame might land - in systems run by coders, platforms, or users - is part of the puzzle.[1532]

WHAT ZERO CLICK INFRINGEMENT MEANS :

Most times now, people find what they want right on the search page. Information shows up fast - inside little boxes or quick lines under the query. These come from websites but stay put, never needing a visit to see them. Snippets answer questions before anyone clicks through at all. The full article sits untouched while its details appear elsewhere. Search tools pull facts out and show them straight away. Readers get answers without ever leaving that first screen. Original sources lose traffic just because responses land so close.[1533] What happens next often depends on where the summary came from. When bits pulled from articles, blogs, news stories, or studies start showing up in condensed form, legal lines blur. These shortened versions might cross into risky territory if they keep too much of the original wording. Instead of just sharing ideas, they could be copying voice, structure, even unique phrasing - something courts tend to notice. Once that occurs, permission matters more than intent.Nowadays machines pull answers straight from websites without sending visitors your way. These tools make finding info faster yet often skip asking permission first. Suddenly creators lose control while systems grow smarter. Ownership gets fuzzy when bots reuse words behind the scenes. [1534]

AI SUMMARIES AND POTENTIAL COPYRIGHT ISSUES :

Out there, bits of text get pulled together when machines scan websites - papers, posts, updates, stories. Important pieces rise to the top because clever code knows what stands out. From all that noise comes something brief, easier to digest. Fast facts arrive without flipping through pages. Trouble pops up though - someone might have written those words first. Ownership questions linger once content gets reshaped.[1535]

When an AI copies large parts of a source or sticks too close to its distinctive wording, legal issues can arise. The form in which thoughts appear matters just as much as the thoughts themselves under copyright rules. Pulling exact lines, key sequences, or mimicking how a creator shaped their material might cross into prohibited reuse according to India's 1957 law on such matters. How something is said becomes protected once it shows personal creative effort.[1536]

Here's a twist. AI learning often pulls data from online sources, some of which hold protected work. When systems absorb that material without clear approval, lines blur. Who owns what becomes unclear. Learning from others' creations might cross legal boundaries. Permission gaps spark doubt. Creators may find their efforts reused in silence. Quiet borrowing doesn't always mean fair use[1537].Some folks worry that quick AI snapshots might mean fewer clicks through to full articles. One result could be less attention - also income - for writers and sites making the real thing. [1538]

[1532] Copyright Act, 1957 and debates on copyright protection in the digital environment.

[1533] Research on search engine snippets and AI-generated summaries.

[1534] Legal scholarship discussing copyright infringement in automated content extraction systems.

[1535] World Intellectual Property Organization, WIPO Issues Paper on Artificial

[1536] Copyright Act, 1957, Sections 13 and 14

[1537] Copyright Act, 1957, Section 51 (Copyright infringement).

[1538] Academic discussions on zero-click searches and digital publisher revenue loss.

INDIAN JOURNAL OF LEGAL REVIEW [IJLR – IF SCORE – 7.58]

VOLUME 6 AND ISSUE 6 OF 2026

APIS – 3920 - 0001 *(and)* ISSN - 2583-2344

Published by

Institute of Legal Education

https://iledu.in

DIRECT AND INDIRECT COPYRIGHT LIABILITY :

Copying someone else's work without asking can lead to legal responsibility. When artificial intelligence writes summaries, trouble might start if it lifts big chunks from protected material. A company or individual could be held accountable should the output mirror too closely the source. What matters is whether the result takes more than just ideas - crossing into actual expression.[1539]

A person might not make copies themselves yet still face legal blame for helping others do so. When someone runs a service where stolen material spreads, they can get caught up in the issue just by letting it happen. If warnings come their way about illegal sharing on their system and nothing changes, responsibility often shifts closer to them. Online spaces enabling unauthorized distribution may find consequences knocking even without direct involvement.[1540]

So, whether someone's held responsible directly or through connection matters when sorting out who answers for AI-made work that might break copyright rules.[1541]

AI DEVELOPER AND PLATFORM LIABILITY OVERVIEW :

When machines write summaries or replies, the people who build them often stay behind the scenes. Yet those creators might face scrutiny if their tech copies large chunks of someone else's work. Ownership issues can surface even when code does the copying. Systems trained on protected material push gray areas into sharper relief. Who answers when automation crosses lines? Builders and hosts both sit near the edge of liability

Most times, artificial intelligence learns by pulling vast datasets off the web - some of which might be protected by copyright laws. When that material goes into training models without clear permission, or when outputs look too much like the source, legal questions appear. Who knew what, who could have stopped it, and how much influence someone had over the system all weigh into decisions later. How far responsibility reaches - for builders or hosts - is still being figured out under today's copyright rules law.

SEARCH ENGINE LIABILITY OVERVIEW :

Out there, search engines pull data from different corners of the web, bundling it into something people can actually navigate. Some today rely on artificial intelligence to show bite-sized takeaways right up front - no clicking needed. These previews pop up fast, often answering questions before you visit a site. Yet pulling pieces from protected work might step into murky legal territory. Speed comes at a cost when original creators aren't part of the equation.[1542]

When big online tools copy large chunks of someone else's work without asking, it can step on the toes of writers and publishers - sometimes crossing into illegal territory. Still, those services usually claim they show just small pieces so people can find what they need, a practice some laws might allow under certain conditions. So whether it's okay hinges on how much gets copied and how badly it hurts the person who made it first.[1543]

INTERMEDIARY LIABILITY IN THE IT ACT 2000 OVERVIEW :

Online platforms might face legal consequences when users post something on their sites. The rules about these responsibilities come from a law made in 2000 in India. That law shields companies like search tools, social networks, and internet carriers under specific conditions. Instead of blaming them automatically, the system looks at what role they played.[1544]

[1539] Copyright Act, 1957, Section 51 – When copyright is infringed.
[1540] Information Technology Act, 2000, Section 79 – Intermediary liability
[1541] World Intellectual Property Organization, Artificial Intelligence and Intellectual Property Policy Guidance.
[1542] Copyright Act, 1957, Sections 51 and 52 – Copyright infringement and fair dealing provisions.
[1543] Information Technology Act, 2000, Section 79 – Liability of intermediaries
[1544] Information Technology Act, 2000 – Section 79 (Exemption from liability of intermediaries).

INDIAN JOURNAL OF LEGAL REVIEW [IJLR – IF SCORE – 7.58]

VOLUME 6 AND ISSUE 6 OF 2026

APIS – 3920 - 0001 *(and)* ISSN - 2583-2344

Published by

Institute of Legal Education

https://iledu.in

Most times, companies hosting user material won't face blame for what others post - so long as they stay neutral and avoid shaping the message themselves. That shield goes by another name: safe harbour rule. Yet these platforms still need to pay attention, acting carefully when alerted about illegal posts. Upon learning of such issues through clear notification, they have to take down or block that content without delay.[1545] When summaries come from AI or searches deliver answers without clicks, questions arise about who pays if copyrighted material gets used. Platforms might once have hidden behind legal shields meant to limit blame - now those defences face tougher scrutiny. Responsibility shifts depending on how much control they exert over what appears. Protection once assumed automatic now demands closer inspection. Courts start asking: were these systems just tools, or active participants? What seemed clear-cut before now hangs in uncertainty.[1546]

ETHICAL CONCERNS WITH AI MADE CONTENT :

Out here, more folks are turning to artificial intelligence to create digital stuff. These tools pull from tons of web-based writings - essays, personal posts, academic texts - without always saying where they got them. Without clear credit, creators might see less visibility for what they originally made.[1547] Wrong details might slip into summaries made by artificial intelligence. Because these systems build answers using whatever data they find, gaps or mistakes can show up now and then. Trust in what users read takes a hit when that happens.[1548]

Worries grow over how AI affects those who make online content. If people start reading machine-made summaries rather than going to real articles, sites might get fewer visitors. Less traffic often means less money for writers and platforms alike. Using smart tools wisely matters - giving credit where it's due keeps things fair. Respecting the work behind content helps everyone stay part of the conversation.[1549]

CONCLUSION:

Out here, artificial intelligence plus today's search tools have reshaped how people find and spread info online. Thanks to machine-made previews and results shown by search engines, readers get details fast - no need to click through to source pages. Still lurking beneath that ease? Questions about fairness, ownership, even whether rules around creative rights still hold weight.

Some folks worry when AI skips showing sources, pulling content into answers without asking first. Authors might lose control over their work, even missing out on income they'd expect. Who ends up responsible isn't clear-cut - makers of the tech, websites hosting it, or companies running searches could all play a part. Blame spreads wide, tangled between builders, servers, and tools people use daily.

Even if older rules such as the Copyright Act, 1957 and the Information Technology Act, 2000 offer partial direction, they might fall short when facing issues brought by fast-moving AI advances. Because of this gap, better-defined legal norms along with mindful usage habits become essential - so progress in tech doesn't override creator rights. For things to move forward fairly, fairness must sit at the center: supporting AI development without weakening digital ownership.

REFERENCES

BOOKS AND ACADEMIC WORKS

1. P. Narayanan, Copyright and Industrial Designs.New Delhi: Eastern Law House.

2. V.K. Ahuja, Law Relating to Intellectual Property Rights.New Delhi: LexisNexis.

[1545] Information Technology (Intermediary Guidelines and Digital Media Ethics Code) Rules, 2021 – Due diligence and content removal obligations.

[1546] Copyright Act, 1957 – Provisions relating to copyright infringement and liability.

[1547] Artificial Intelligence Ethics – Issues relating to attribution and use of online data in AI systems.

[1548] Algorithmic Bias – Errors or inaccuracies that may occur in automated outputs

[1549] Copyright Act, 1957 – Protection of creators' rights and use of copyrighted material.

3. Paul Goldstein and P. Bernt Hugenholtz, International Copyright: Principles, Law and Practice. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

4. Lionel Bently, Brad Sherman, and Dev Gangjee, Intellectual Property Law.Oxford: Oxford University Press.

5. Pamela Samuelson, Intellectual Property and Information Technology. Aspen Publishers.

JOURNAL ARTICLES AND ACADEMIC PAPERS

1. "Artificial Intelligence and Copyright Law: Challenges and Opportunities" – Journal of Intellectual Property Law and Practice.

2. "AI Generated Content and Copyright Infringement Issues" – Harvard Journal of Law & Technology.

3. "Zero-Click Searches and Their Impact on Copyright Protection" – Columbia Journal of Law & the Arts.

4. "Artificial Intelligence, Data Mining and Copyright Liability" – Stanford Technology Law Review.

STATUTES AND LEGAL PROVISIONS

1. Copyright Act, 1957 — provisions relating to copyright protection, reproduction rights, and fair dealing.

2. Information Technology Act, 2000 — Section 79 relating to intermediary liability and safe harbour protection.

3. Digital Millennium Copyright Act — provisions relating to online copyright infringement and intermediary protection.

4. Berne Convention for the Protection of Literary and Artistic Works — international standards for copyright protection.

5. World Intellectual Property Organization Copyright Treaty, 1996 — provisions relating to digital copyright protection.

WEB RESOURCES

1. Supreme Court of India — https://main.sci.gov.in

2. India Code — https://www.indiacode.nic.in

3. Indian Kanoon — https://indiankanoon.org

4. World Intellectual Property Organization — https://www.wipo.int

5. Electronic Frontier Foundation — https://www.eff.org

6. Harvard Law School – https://cyber.harvard.edu

INSTITUTE OF LEGAL EDUCATION

(Managed by L TO J LAW ASSOCIATES)

NO. 08, ARUL NAGAR, SEERA THOPPU,
MARUDHAANDA KURICHI, SRIRANGAM - 620102,
TAMILNADU, INDIA.

ISSN 2583-2344