International Journal for Multidisciplinary Research (IJFMR)
E-ISSN: 2582-2160 ● Website: www.ijfmr.com ● Email: editor@ijfmr.com

Investigate the IPR Implications of AI Including Patentability, Copyright and Trademark Issues

Mahesh B[1], Manohar[2], Manoj Kumar M[3], Manoj Kumar[4], Prof. Shruthi M N[5]

[1,2,3,4]Student, Computer Science and Engineering, R V College of Engineering
[5]Assistant Professor, Industrial Engineering and Management, R V College of Engineering

Abstract

This paper examines the evolving implications of Artificial Intelligence (AI) on Intellectual Property Rights (IPR), with a focus on inventorship, patentability, copyright, and trademarks. Courts and patent office's globally have addressed the legal status of AI as an inventor, prompting discussions about the need for legal reforms. AI-generated content presents unique challenges to copyright law, particularly regarding authorship and the use of copyrighted materials for training AI models. Trademark law is also adapting to AI's role in brand creation and infringement detection. The paper explores the patentability challenges posed by AI-driven inventions and the application of copyright to the use of copyrighted material when detecting the infringements. Case studies illustrate key issues in patent and copyright disputes. It addresses innovation strategies using AI tools and relevant legislative policies. The review concludes by discussing the economic impacts of AI on creative industries, ethical considerations, and the necessity for legal reforms to balance innovation with IPR protection in the age of AI.

Keywords: AI, IPR, inventorship, patentability, copyright, trademarks, authorship, infringement, regulation, innovation, AI Generated Content, Fair Use, AI Training Data, Patent Monitoring, Legal Reform

INTRODUCTION

The rapid advancement of artificial intelligence (AI) is transforming the landscape of intellectual property rights (IPR), raising fundamental questions about the legal recognition and protection of AI-generated works. Traditionally, IPR frameworks have been designed to protect human inventors, authors, and brand owners, ensuring that their creative and innovative contributions are adequately recognized and rewarded. However, as AI systems become more sophisticated, they are increasingly capable of autonomously generating inventions, artistic works, and even brand elements, challenging the conventional understanding of ownership and authorship. One of the most debated issues is AI inventorship whether AI can be considered an inventor under patent law. Current legal frameworks, including those in the U.S. and the U.K., have ruled that only natural persons can be recognized as inventors, sparking debates on whether patent laws should be reformed to accommodate AI contributions. Similarly, patentability challenges arise as AI generated innovations complicate traditional requirements like non-obviousness and sufficiency of disclosure. In the realm of copyright law, AI-generated content poses challenges regarding authorship, copyright protection, and fair use. While some jurisdictions allow AI-assisted works to be copyrighted

under human supervision, many others insist on human authorship as a prerequisite. Moreover, AI's use of copyrighted material for training large models—such as image generation and text synthesis has sparked legal disputes over fair use, data ownership, and unauthorized reproduction. Trademark law is also evolving in response to AI's role in brand creation and infringement detection. AI-powered tools assist in generating logos, brand names, and marketing content, raising concerns about originality and potential trademark conflicts. At the same time, AI-driven monitoring systems have enhanced the ability to detect and enforce trademark rights, though they also present challenges related to algorithmic biases and enforcement across different jurisdictions. Beyond legal considerations, AI's growing influence on the economy and creative industries has raised concerns about job displacement, data privacy, and ethical implications in enforcement. As AI-generated music, art, and literature become more prevalent, human creators face increased competition and uncertainties regarding the protection of their work. Furthermore, AI-driven enforcement mechanisms, such as copyright detection systems, often lead to false claims, impacting legitimate content creators.

AI INVENTORSHIP

The concept of AI inventorship has emerged as a significant topic in the context of intellectual property rights (IPR). As AI technologies advance, they increasingly contribute to innovative processes, raising questions about the legal status of AI as an inventor. Globally, various jurisdictions are grappling with this issue, leading to a patchwork of legal interpretations and frameworks. One notable case is the UK Supreme Court's decision in Thaler v. Comptroller of Patents, which ruled that AI cannot be recognized as an inventor under current patent laws. This ruling emphasizes the need for human agency in the inventorship process, which some scholars argue may hinder innovation by failing to recognize the contributions of AI systems. The ruling has sparked discussions about potential reforms to patent laws that could accommodate AI-generated inventions without human intervention. For instance, proposals have been made to amend patent statutes to include provisions that recognize AI as a contributor or co-inventor, thereby expanding the scope of patentability. In the United States, the USPTO has maintained a similar stance, asserting that inventorship must be attributed to a natural person. However, there are calls for a more nuanced approach that considers the role of AI in generating inventions. Some jurisdictions, such as Australia and South Africa, have begun exploring alternative frameworks that may allow for greater recognition of AI's role in innovation. This divergence highlights the need for international harmonization in addressing AI inventorship issues. Moreover, scholarly research emphasizes the importance of establishing clear guidelines for patentability criteria when it comes to AI-generated inventions. The lack of clarity regarding what constitutes an invention when generated by an autonomous system complicates patent prosecution and raises concerns about the sufficiency of disclosure required for patent applications. As such, ongoing global efforts aim to develop standardized criteria that can effectively address these challenges while fostering innovation in the field of AI.

AI AND PATENTS

A patent is a legal right granted to inventors, providing them with exclusive ownership and control over their inventions for a specified period. It serves as a crucial mechanism for promoting innovation by ensuring that creators can benefit from their novel ideas while preventing unauthorized use or replication. Patents play a vital role across industries, from pharmaceuticals and biotechnology to artificial intelligence and engineering, fostering technological advancements and economic growth. As innovation accelerates,

particularly with the rise of AI-driven inventions, the scope and implications of patent laws continue to evolve, raising critical questions about inventorship, eligibility, and enforcement in an increasingly complex technological landscape.

A. Patentability Challenges

The advent of artificial intelligence presents numerous challenges to traditional intellectual property frameworks, particularly concerning patentability. One major challenge is defining what constitutes a patentable invention when the inventive process is primarily driven by AI systems. Traditional patent laws are predicated on human creativity and ingenuity; however, with AI systems capable of generating novel solutions autonomously, existing frameworks may struggle to adapt.

One significant issue is the requirement for "non obviousness," which is a critical criterion for patentability. The question arises: how do we assess non-obviousness when an invention is generated by an algorithm? The traditional standards for evaluating inventive steps may not adequately account for the complexities introduced by machine learning and other AI technologies. Scholars argue that this necessitates a reevaluation of how non-obviousness is defined and assessed in the context of AI-generated inventions.

Additionally, the sufficiency of disclosure requirements poses challenges when dealing with "black box" algorithms that do not easily reveal their internal workings. Patent applications often require detailed descriptions of how an invention works; however, many AI systems operate in ways that are not fully transparent or understandable even to their developers.

This opacity can hinder effective patent prosecution and raise questions about whether applicants can meet disclosure requirements.

Furthermore, there is ongoing debate about whether existing patent laws are equipped to handle the rapid pace of technological advancement brought about by AI. The traditional framework may not be agile enough to keep up with innovations occurring at unprecedented rates. As a result, some scholars advocate for creating specialized patent regimes tailored specifically for AI technologies that could streamline processes and provide clearer guidance on patentability criteria.

B. Patent Monitoring

AI tools have revolutionized patent analysis by allowing organizations and patent offices to efficiently monitor global filings for potential infringements. Traditional patent searches are time-consuming and labor-intensive, requiring legal experts to manually compare new applications against existing patents. AI simplifies this process by employing natural language processing (NLP) and machine learning algorithms to sift through thousands of patent documents, identifying similarities and potential conflicts. This technology is particularly beneficial for multinational corporations and research institutions seeking to protect their innovations. By proactively flagging potential infringement cases, AI-driven patent monitoring enhances legal compliance and prevents costly litigation.

Case Study: Patent Dispute – Monsanto vs. Nuziveedu Seeds

Monsanto, a global agricultural biotechnology company, filed a lawsuit against Indian seed company Nuziveedu Seeds Ltd. (NSL) for using its patented genetically modified (GM) cotton seeds without paying royalties. The dispute revolved around Monsanto's Bt Cotton technology, which helps cotton plants resist pests.

The case began in 2015 when Monsanto sued NSL in the Delhi High Court for patent infringement. It later escalated to the Supreme Court of India and was settled in 2019. The case questioned whether genetically modified seeds could be patented in India, given that the Indian Patents Act, 1970, does not allow patents

on plants or animals. Monsanto argued that its technology was an invention, while NSL claimed that it was an essential biological process excluded from patent protection under Indian law.

In 2018, the Delhi High Court ruled against Monsanto, stating that plant varieties and seeds are not patentable under Indian law. However, in 2019, the Supreme Court of India set aside the Delhi High Court's ruling and reinstated Monsanto's patent rights, allowing it to collect royalties. Eventually, Monsanto settled the case out of court, and Bayer (which had acquired Monsanto) continued its operations in India under revised agreements.

Impact on India's Patent System The case clarified India's stance on patents related to biotech innovations. It reinforced that while plant varieties cannot be patented, technological modifications that enhance crops might be eligible for protection under certain conditions.

AI AND COPYRIGHT

Copyright is a legal framework designed to protect the rights of creators by granting them exclusive control over their original works, including literature, music, films, and software. It ensures that authors, artists, and innovators can benefit from their creative efforts while preventing unauthorized reproduction or distribution. Unlike patents, which safeguard inventions, copyright applies to the expression of ideas rather than the ideas themselves. As digital technology and artificial intelligence reshape content creation, copyright laws face new challenges in defining authorship, fair use, and infringement. The evolving landscape of AI-generated content, automated enforcement, and intellectual property disputes underscores the need.

A. Authorship and Copyright Protection for AI Generated Works

Copyright law protects creative expressions rather than novel ideas. AI's ability to create literature, music, and visual art complicates the legal definition of authorship. One of the primary challenges in this area is determining whether AI-generated content qualifies for copyright protection. In many jurisdictions, copyright law requires a human creator as a prerequisite for protection. This presents difficulties when AI systems generate content autonomously or with minimal human intervention.

The growing use of AI in creative industries, from AI composed music to AI-generated visual art, has sparked debate over whether copyright laws should be reformed to accommodate AI contributions. While some argue that AI should be recognized as an author or co-author, others maintain that legal protections should remain exclusively for human creators.

B. Use of Copyrighted Materials in AI Training

One of the biggest legal debates in AI and copyright concerns the use of copyrighted works as training data. Many AI models, including large language models (LLMs) and image generators, rely on vast datasets sourced from books, articles, artwork, and music often without explicit consent from rights holders.

This practice raises significant concerns regarding Fair Use vs. Infringement. Some legal scholars argue that AI training qualifies as fair use, similar to how humans learn by analyzing multiple sources of information. Proponents claim that AI does not directly reproduce copyrighted material but instead extracts patterns, making its output transformative rather than derivative. However, critics contend that this process constitutes unauthorized reproduction, as AI systems ingest large amounts of copyrighted data without compensating or obtaining permission from the original creators. Lawsuits involving major AI firms highlight the growing tension between innovation and intellectual property rights.

Another crucial issue is Transparency in AI Training. Many AI companies do not disclose the specific datasets used to train their models, making it difficult for copyright holders to determine whether their works have been incorporated into AI systems. This lack of transparency has led to demands for greater accountability in AI development, with some experts calling for mandatory dataset disclosures and opt-out mechanisms for creators who do not wish to have their work used in AI training. The ongoing legal battles and regulatory discussions emphasize the urgent need for clarity in balancing AI innovation with copyright protection.

C. Detecting Copyright Infringement

Platforms like YouTube's Content ID and Google's AI driven copyright scanning are at the forefront of detecting unauthorized use of copyrighted material. These systems leverage machine learning algorithms to scan, analyze, and compare uploaded content against a database of copyrighted works. When a match is found, the system can automatically issue takedown notices, restrict monetization, or notify the original rights holder. While these AI-driven tools significantly improve the speed and accuracy of copyright enforcement, they are not without challenges. False positives where AI incorrectly identifies legal use cases such as parody or fair use have sparked criticism and legal debates on the limitations of automated enforcement mechanisms.

The lack of clear legal protection creates uncertainty for AI creators and companies. This ambiguity affects businesses that develop AI-driven creative technologies, as they cannot reliably protect their outputs under current copyright frameworks.

Case Study - I: R. Lance Hill vs Amazon Studios

In 2024, screenwriter R. Lance Hill initiated a copyright infringement lawsuit against Amazon Studios and MGM Studios concerning their remake of the 1989 film Road House. Hill alleges that the studios employed artificial intelligence (AI) technology to replicate actors' voices during production, circumventing union agreements and infringing upon his original screenplay's copyright. He contends that the studios expedited the film's production to reclaim the rights to the screenplay, which were set to expire in November 2023, and that AI was used to generate content without proper authorization. The lawsuit underscores the escalating concerns regarding AI's role in the entertainment industry, particularly its impact on intellectual property rights and union agreements. The case raises critical questions about the application of traditional copyright laws to AI-generated content and the extent to which AI can be utilized in creative processes without infringing upon existing rights.

In response to the allegations, Amazon Studios has denied the claims, asserting that any use of AI was limited to early stages of production and was subsequently removed. They maintain that the final version of the film does not incorporate AI generated content this legal dispute highlights the need for a comprehensive reevaluation of copyright laws to address the challenges posed by AI in creative industries. As AI technologies continue to advance, the entertainment sector faces the imperative of balancing innovation with the protection of creators' rights.

Case Study II: R.G. Anand vs. Delux Films

R.G. Anand, a playwright, sued Delux Films, claiming that their movie "New Delhi" copied his play "Hum Hindustani." He argued that the film had the same storyline and themes, constituting copyright infringement. The case was filed in 1971 and was heard in the Supreme Court of India in 1978.This was one of India's earliest landmark cases in copyright law, setting legal precedents for determining substantial similarity between works. It questioned how much resemblance between two works constitutes copyright infringement. The Supreme Court ruled that while the movie and the play had similar themes, ideas and

concepts are not copyrightable—only their specific expression is protected. Since the film's execution and characters were different from the play, the court ruled in favor of Delux Films, stating that mere similarities in theme do not amount to infringement Impact on India's Copyright Law the ruling established that for copyright infringement to be proven, the substantial expression of the work, not just the underlying idea, must be copied. This principle remains a key test in Indian copyright cases today.

AI AND TRADEMARKS

The rapid evolution of artificial intelligence (AI) is reshaping industries worldwide, and intellectual property is no exception. Within this domain, the intersection of AI and trademarks presents both unprecedented opportunities and complex challenges for brand protection in the digital economy. As businesses increasingly adopt AI technologies for brand creation, management, and enforcement, the implications for trademark law become ever more pronounced.

AI technologies are transforming brand creation and management by leveraging machine learning algorithms to analyze vast datasets, identify consumer preferences and trends, and even generate potential brand names and logos. This allows for the development of data-driven branding strategies tailored to specific market segments. However, this AI-driven acceleration introduces complexities concerning trademark registration, originality, and potential conflicts with existing marks. Determining the distinctiveness of AI generated marks is a unique challenge, as these creations may inadvertently resemble existing trademarks, raising concerns about brand dilution and consumer confusion

A. Impact of AI on Brand Creation and Management

AI technologies are transforming how brands are created and managed. Machine learning algorithms can analyze vast amounts of data to identify trends, consumer preferences, and potential brand names or logos that resonate with target audiences. This capability allows companies to develop unique branding strategies that are data-driven and tailored to specific market segments. However, the rapid pace of AI driven brand creation introduces complexities regarding trademark registration and protection.

One significant challenge is the originality requirement for trademarks. Traditional trademark law mandates that a mark must be distinctive and not confusingly similar to existing marks. However, as AI systems autonomously generate brand names or logos, determining whether these creations meet the distinctiveness criterion becomes increasingly complicated. The potential for AI-generated marks to inadvertently resemble existing trademarks raises concerns about brand dilution and consumer confusion.

B. Challenges in Trademark Registration

The registration process for trademarks is inherently designed to assess human creativity and intent. When AI systems are involved in generating trademarks, questions arise regarding authorship and ownership. Current legal frameworks typically require a human applicant for trademark registration, which may not adequately address situations where an AI system has autonomously created a mark. This gap in the law creates uncertainty for businesses seeking to protect their AI-generated brands.

Moreover, the global nature of commerce exacerbates these challenges. Different jurisdictions have varying standards for trademark registration, which can lead to inconsistencies in protection for AI-generated brands across borders. Companies operating internationally must navigate these complexities while ensuring compliance with diverse trademark laws.

C. Trademark Infringement Detection

The rise of artificial intelligence has also revolutionized the detection and prevention of trademark infringements. Traditional methods of monitoring trademark use often involve manual processes that can

be time-consuming and prone to errors. However, AI technologies offer innovative solutions that enhance the efficiency and accuracy of infringement detection.

Case Study - I

In January 2025, Perplexity Solved Solutions (PSS), a software company founded in 2017 and specializing in data analytics and AI, filed a lawsuit against Perplexity AI, an AI search engine company founded in 2022, in a U.S. Federal Court. PSS, which holds a federal trademark for the name "Perplexity" in connection with its services, claims that Perplexity AI's use of the same name has created confusion in the marketplace, potentially diluting PSS's brand identity and consumer recognition. The case, filed in response to trademark infringement, is ongoing and could set a legal precedent for future trademark disputes in the growing AI industry.

Case Study - II

In August 2024, a group of visual artists filed a lawsuit against Stability AI, Midjourney, DeviantArt, and Runway AI in the U.S. District Court of California. The artists allege that these companies used their copyrighted artworks without permission to train their generative AI models. The plaintiffs claim that AI-generated content produced by these companies mimics their original works, infringing on their exclusive rights. The court allowed some claims to proceed, including those for induced copyright infringement, which has raised important questions regarding the legal use of copyrighted materials in AI systems. This case, which is ongoing, could have significant implications for copyright and trademark protection in the AI and creative industries.

VI. ECONOMIC AND MARKET ANALYSIS

A. Impact on Creative Industries

The economic impact of AI on creative industries is significant, with potential income loss for creators. According to a global study, music sector workers are projected to lose nearly a quarter of their income to AI in the next four years. Music sector workers will lose nearly a quarter of income to AI in next four years according to a study. This trend is also visible in India, where AI-generated music and digital art are reducing opportunities for human creators. Independent artists are particularly vulnerable as AI-generated compositions and artworks flood the market, leading to reduced demand for human-created content. In the Indian film industry, AI is being used for scriptwriting, dubbing, and even digital avatars, creating concerns among actors and scriptwriters regarding job security. The Federation of Western India Cine Employees (FWICE) has expressed concerns about AI-generated performances replacing real actors, which could lead to loss of livelihood for many.

B. Market Growth of Generative AI

The generative AI market is expected to grow exponentially, with significant implications for the global and Indian economies. A report by McKinsey estimates that the generative AI sector could contribute over $4.4 trillion (approximately ₹3,65,00,000 crore) annually to the global economy. In India, AI-driven startups are witnessing increased investments, particularly in fintech, healthcare, and content creation. According to Nasscom, India's AI market is expected to reach $7.8 billion (approximately ₹64,500 crore) by 2025, with applications in sectors ranging from banking to retail.

Major Indian companies, such as Reliance Jio and HCL Technologies, are actively investing in AI-driven innovations to enhance customer experience and streamline business operations. The Indian government is also fostering AI adoption through initiatives like the National AI Strategy (NITI Aayog) and AI-based research funding to promote indigenous AI development.

C. Business Impact and Innovation Management

Businesses are integrating AI into their operations, impacting intellectual property (IP) management. Indian companies like Tata Consultancy Services (TCS) and Infosys are leveraging AI to optimize workflows and automate processes, leading to concerns about data security and ownership rights. The use of AI in generating business reports, financial forecasts, and even legal documentation raises questions about authorship and the potential for IP disputes.

Moreover, AI is revolutionizing customer service, with AI powered chatbots handling customer queries. While this improves efficiency, it also raises legal concerns regarding data privacy, especially with the rise of AI-generated personalized advertising that may inadvertently infringe upon consumer rights.

EXISTING FRAMEWORKS AND INITIATIVES

A. International Initiatives and Guidelines

Organizations such as the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO) have initiated discussions on the implications of AI for intellectual property. WIPO's "AI IP Year in Review" highlights ongoing efforts to navigate patent rights related to AI inventorship across different jurisdictions. These discussions emphasize the need for harmonization of patent laws to ensure that AI-generated inventions can be adequately protected while fostering innovation. Proposed guidelines suggest that jurisdictions should consider recognizing AI as a contributor to inventions, thereby expanding the scope of patentability for AI-generated outputs.

In addition to WIPO, other international bodies are exploring frameworks to address the challenges posed by AI. The European Union has been at the forefront of these discussions, with initiatives aimed at creating a cohesive regulatory environment for AI technologies. The EU's proposed regulations on AI emphasize ethical considerations and accountability, which extend to intellectual property rights. These proposals aim to ensure that creators and innovators can harness the benefits of AI while maintaining robust protections for their intellectual property.

B. National Policy Reforms

On a national level, countries are beginning to implement reforms tailored to address the intersection of AI and IPR. For instance, Australia has taken steps to amend its patent laws to recognize the role of AI in the inventive process, allowing for greater flexibility in patent applications involving AI-generated inventions. Similarly, jurisdictions like South Africa have initiated discussions on how to adapt their intellectual property frameworks to accommodate AI technologies, emphasizing the need for clarity in defining inventorship and patentability criteria.

C. Innovation Strategies

To manage innovation in the age of AI, businesses must protect IP while fostering creativity. Indian legal scholars propose hybrid models where AI contributes but human oversight ensures accountability. The Indian Patent Office continues to review policies regarding AI-assisted patents. Several Indian companies are investing in AI governance frameworks to ensure ethical and legal compliance. Startups in India are increasingly filing patents for AI-driven innovations, but existing laws remain unclear on whether AI can be listed as an inventor. Legal experts argue that India should introduce specific provisions for AI-assisted patent applications to avoid legal ambiguity.

PROPOSED LEGAL REFORMS

A. Compulsory Licensing for AI Training:

As artificial intelligence (AI) systems become increasingly reliant on vast datasets for training, concerns over the unauthorized use of copyrighted materials have grown. Many AI models, particularly in natural language processing (NLP), image generation, and music composition, are trained on large datasets that often include copyrighted books, artworks, music, and other forms of intellectual property. This raises critical legal and ethical questions about whether AI companies should be allowed to use such content without compensating the original creators. A compulsory licensing system would address this issue by requiring AI companies to pay royalties to rights holders when copyrighted content is used for model training. Under such a framework, AI developers would be legally obligated to obtain a license for the datasets they use, ensuring that creators and copyright owners receive fair compensation. This model is similar to existing compulsory licensing schemes in industries such as music, where streaming services and radio broadcasters pay royalties to musicians and songwriters.

B. Transparency in AI Data Use

Transparency in AI model training is a crucial issue, as many AI developers do not disclose the datasets used to train their models. This lack of transparency makes it difficult for copyright holders to determine whether their works have been included in training data, raising concerns about intellectual property rights and potential unauthorized usage. A mandated transparency framework would require AI developers to disclose detailed information about the datasets used in training their models. This would allow content creators and copyright owners to track how their works are being utilized and take appropriate action if necessary. Opt-Out Mechanisms for Copyright Owners- New regulations could mandate disclosure and opt-out options for content creators who do not wish their work to be used for AI training.

C. Specialized AI Patent Categories

Creation of specialized patent categories for AI-generated inventions, particularly in fields such as pharmaceuticals, materials science, and software development. These categories would enable AI-driven innovations to be assessed under modified criteria for non-obviousness and disclosure, ensuring that patent laws remain adaptable to the unique nature of AI-assisted discoveries. By establishing distinct classifications, patent offices could develop tailored evaluation standards that recognize the role of AI while maintaining the integrity of the patent system.

D. Cross-Border IP Enforcement Challenges

Intellectual property laws differ across jurisdictions, complicating AI-driven IP enforcement on a global scale. Since copyright protection, trademark laws, and patent regulations vary from country to country, enforcing rights across multiple regions poses a significant challenge. For example, a copyrighted work protected in the United States may not receive the same level of protection in China or India, leading to inconsistencies in AI enforcement actions. Organizations must navigate regional compliance requirements and establish frameworks that allow AI enforcement mechanisms to adapt to multiple legal standards, ensuring effectiveness while upholding international legal obligations.

CONCLUSION

The evolution of artificial intelligence has introduced unprecedented challenges and opportunities in the realm of intellectual property rights. As AI-driven technologies continue to reshape innovation, creativity, and brand management, existing legal frameworks struggle to keep pace with these rapid advancements. Current laws in most jurisdictions recognize only human inventors and authors, raising fundamental

questions about AI's role in patents, copyrights, and trademarks. While some countries and international organizations are exploring reforms, there is still no universal consensus on how AI-generated works should be treated under intellectual property law. The growing influence of AI in generating content, assisting in patent filings, and monitoring trademarks has also sparked legal and ethical concerns. Issues such as authorship, fair use, transparency in AI training data, and algorithmic bias in enforcement mechanisms require careful consideration. Additionally, the economic impact of AI on creative industries highlights the need for balanced policies that protect human creators while fostering technological advancement.

To address these challenges, governments, legal experts, and industry leaders must collaborate to develop adaptive IPR frameworks that accommodate AI-driven innovation without undermining fundamental principles of intellectual property protection. Proposed solutions such as compulsory licensing for AI training, transparent AI data usage policies, and hybrid models that recognize AI-assisted works under human oversight may provide a viable path forward.

Ultimately, the goal is to strike a balance between innovation and legal certainty, ensuring that intellectual property laws evolve in a way that both encourages AI driven progress and safeguards the rights of human inventors, artists, and businesses. As AI continues to advance, a proactive approach to legal reform will be essential in shaping a fair, ethical, and sustainable future for intellectual property in the AI era.

REFERENCES

1. World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO). (2023). Berne Convention for the Protection of Literary and Artistic Works.
2. Impact of Artificial Intelligence on Copyright Law: Challenges and Prospects (2024)
3. Impact of artificial intelligence on patent law. Towards a new analytical framework – [the Multi-Level Model] Garikai Chimuka (2019)
4. Exploring the Impact of Artificial Intelligence on Trade Mark and Copyright: Challenges and Opportunities Vanshika Dabriwal, Amity Law School, Noida
5. Ai in Ipr : Leveraging Technology for Efficiency and Addressing Concerns Author – Ananya Ray, Student at Kiit School of Law, Bhubaneshwar
6. The Impact of Artificial Intelligence on Intellectual Property Rights in the Legal Perspective Author- Mahima Singh, Student at Integral University Lucknow.
7. Gervais, D. (2019). *AI and Copyright: A Positive View*. Berkeley Technology Law Journal, 34(3), 1023–1070.
8. Thaler, S. v. Comptroller General of Patents, Designs and Trade Marks [2021] EWCA *Civ* 1374.
9. Bently, L., & Sherman, B. (2014). *Intellectual Property Law* (4th ed.). Oxford University Press
10. Samuelson, P. (2021). *Allocating Ownership Rights in AI-Generated Works*. **UCLA Law Review**, 68, 34–67.
11. Solaiman, S. M. (2017). *Legal Personality of Robots, Corporations, Idols and Chimpanzees: A Quest for Legitimacy*. Artificial Intelligence and Law, 25(2), 155–179.
12. McLaughlin, J. (2020). *AI, Authorship, and the Copyright Conundrum*. Harvard Journal of Law & Technology, 33(2), 689–713.
13. Grimmelmann, J. (2016). *There's No Such Thing as a Computer-Authored Work—And It's a Good Thing, Too*. Columbia Journal of Law & the Arts, 39, 403–416.

14. Kur, A., & Dreier, T. (2013). *European Intellectual Property Law: Text, Cases and Materials*. Edward Elgar Publishing.
15. Torrance, A. W., & Kesan, J. P. (2011). *The Challenges of Patenting Artificial Intelligence*. Intellectual Property Today, 18(3), 6–9.
16. *Naruto v. Slater*, 888 F.3d 418 (9th Cir. 2018) — Copyright standing and non-human authorship.
17. *Infopaq International A/S v Danske Dagblades Forening* (C-5/08) — Originality requirement in EU copyright law.
18. *Burrow-Giles Lithographic Co. v. Sarony*, 111 U.S. 53 (1884) — Defining "authorship" in U.S. copyright law.
19. *Feist Publications, Inc. v. Rural Telephone Service Co.*, 499 U.S. 340 (1991) — Originality and facts in copyright.