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

Artificial Intelligence and Inventorship: Redefining Patent Law in the Age of AI

Shilpi Rani[1], Abuzar Zeya[2]

[1,2]Students of National University of Study in Research in Law

ABSTRACT

The rapid advancement of artificial intelligence (AI) challenges the traditional human-centric framework of patent law, particularly the designation of inventorship. This paper explores whether AI systems, capable of autonomously generating novel and patentable inventions, should be recognized as inventors. Analyzing key cases like *Thaler v. Hirshfeld*, it examines global legal perspectives, ethical dilemmas, and the economic implications of AI-driven innovation. The study proposes potential reforms, such as redefining inventorship or creating new intellectual property categories, to balance human creativity with AI's transformative role. It underscores the need for international harmonization to address jurisdictional inconsistencies and ensure equitable protection of AI-generated inventions.

Keywords: Artificial Intelligence, Inventorship, Patent Law, Intellectual Property, AI-Generated Inventions, Thaler v. Hirshfeld, Legal Reform, Human Creativity, Global Harmonization, Ethical Challenges.

THE EVOLUTION OF PATENT LAW AND THE RISE OF AI

Patent law has historically incentivized human innovation, evolving from the Venetian Patent Statute of 1474 to modern frameworks like the U.S. Patent Act of 1790 and the TRIPS Agreement of 1994. These systems grant exclusive rights to human inventors for novel, useful, and non-obvious inventions, fostering economic growth and technological progress. The Indian Patents Act of 1970, amended in 2005 to align with TRIPS, emphasizes human creativity, requiring inventors to be natural persons under Section 6.

The advent of AI challenges this human-centric framework. AI systems, such as machine learning algorithms, now generate innovations—ranging from pharmaceutical compounds to material designs—that meet patent criteria without significant human input. Cases like *Thaler v. Hirshfeld* (2021) highlight this shift, where the AI system DABUS was proposed as an inventor, sparking global debate. While jurisdictions like South Africa and Australia briefly recognized AI inventorship, the U.S., EU, and India maintain that only humans can be inventors, citing statutory language and the need for human intellectual contribution.

AI'S ROLE IN INNOVATION

AI's transformative potential spans industries. In healthcare, AI enhances medical imaging and drug discovery; in finance, it detects fraud; and in law, tools like CARA analyze legal documents. The World Economic Forum (2018) and the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office have explored whether AI-driven

inventions warrant new patent frameworks. AI's ability to autonomously generate solutions challenges the traditional requirement of human conception, as seen in systems like DABUS, which created patentable designs independently.

Scholars argue that AI's autonomy signals a paradigm shift. Statements like "the end of patent law is near" reflect concerns that human-centric frameworks are outdated. AI's capacity to produce novel, useful, and non-obvious outputs—such as new chemical compounds—raises questions about whether it should be recognized as an inventor or remain a tool under human direction.

LEGAL FRAMEWORK AND CHALLENGES

Defining Inventorship

Patent laws globally, including 35 U.S.C. § 101 (U.S.) and Section 6 of the Indian Patents Act, define inventors as natural persons capable of mental conception. This excludes AI, which lacks legal personhood and accountability. In *Enercon (India) Ltd. v. Aloys Wobben*, Indian courts emphasized human creative contribution, aligning with global norms. However, AI's ability to independently generate inventions complicates this definition, as it blurs the line between tool and creator.

Judicial Precedents

The *Thaler v. Hirshfeld* case (2021) solidified the U.S. stance that AI cannot be an inventor, citing statutory requirements for natural persons. The European Patent Office (EPO) echoed this in *J 8/20* (2021), rejecting DABUS as an inventor under the European Patent Convention. In Australia, a lower court briefly recognized AI inventorship in *Thaler v. Commissioner of Patents* (2021), but this was overturned on appeal. India's patent law, while silent on AI, aligns with human-centric principles. South Africa's acceptance of DABUS as an inventor remains an outlier, highlighting jurisdictional divergence.

AI as a Tool

Most jurisdictions treat AI as an assistive tool, akin to computers or microscopes. AI-assisted inventions are patentable if attributed to a human inventor who directs or refines the output. For instance, AI-driven drug discovery platforms predict molecular interactions, but human researchers are credited for conceptualizing the invention. This approach ensures compliance with existing laws but raises questions about fairness when AI's contribution is substantial.

CHALLENGES

Legal challenges include identifying the human inventor when AI autonomously generates solutions and ensuring compliance with patent criteria like non-obviousness. AI's "black box" nature complicates disclosure requirements, as deep learning processes are often opaque. Ownership disputes arise when AI's output lacks a clear human contributor, and jurisdictional variations create uncertainty for global patent filings. Ethically, recognizing AI inventorship risks undermining human incentives, while economically, it could concentrate patents among tech giants, stifling competition.

ECONOMIC AND ETHICAL IMPLICATIONS

AI-driven innovation impacts industries like biotechnology, where AI accelerates drug development, and technology, where it designs algorithms. The *Thaler* ruling's rejection of AI inventorship ensures human attribution but may deter investment in AI-driven research if ownership remains ambiguous. Economically, AI patents could generate significant revenue—global AI market projections reach $1.8 trillion by 2030—but without clear frameworks, disputes over rights could hinder progress.

Ethically, granting AI inventorship raises questions about personhood and accountability. If AI is credited, who bears responsibility for misuse? Alternatively, denying AI recognition may undervalue its role, potentially discouraging developers. Balancing human incentives with AI's contributions is critical to maintaining patent law's purpose of fostering innovation.

THE ROLE OF AI IN PATENT EXAMINATION

AI's potential to assist patent offices is significant. Tools like AI-driven prior art searches enhance efficiency, processing vast databases faster than humans. However, replacing examiners entirely is problematic. AI struggles with contextual legal reasoning, assessing non-obviousness, or handling novel technologies. Its "black box" nature undermines transparency, and biased training data risks unfair decisions. Ethical concerns include job displacement and reduced public trust in automated systems. A hybrid approach—AI assisting human examiners—offers a balanced solution, leveraging AI's efficiency while retaining human judgment.

REFORM PROPOSALS

To address AI inventorship, several reforms are proposed:

1. **Redefining Inventorship**: Amend laws to recognize AI as a co-inventor, acknowledging its autonomous contributions while retaining human oversight. This could involve a dual-credit system, attributing inventions to both AI and human collaborators.
2. **New IP Category**: Create a sui generis framework for AI-generated inventions, offering shorter-term protections or open-access licensing to balance innovation and accessibility.
3. **Ownership Clarification**: Assign rights to AI developers or users, ensuring legal clarity. For example, developers could be default owners, similar to corporate ownership of employee inventions.
4. **Global Harmonization**: Encourage WIPO to lead efforts in standardizing AI inventorship rules, reducing jurisdictional inconsistencies and facilitating cross-border protection.
5. **Ethical Safeguards**: Implement oversight to address bias and accountability, ensuring AI-driven patents align with public interest.

These reforms face challenges, including defining AI's role, securing international consensus, and addressing ethical concerns about AI personhood. Without reform, patent systems risk lagging behind technological advancements, potentially stifling innovation.

FUTURE OUTLOOK

By 2030, AI's role in innovation will likely expand, driven by advancements in generative models and autonomous systems. Patent laws may evolve to recognize AI contributions through hybrid inventorship models or new IP categories. International harmonization will be critical to avoid fragmentation, with WIPO playing a pivotal role. AI's integration into patent offices will enhance efficiency but require human oversight to maintain fairness. The balance between incentivizing human creativity and leveraging AI's potential will shape the future patent landscape, ensuring innovation benefits society.

CONCLUSION

AI's rise challenges the human-centric foundations of patent law, as seen in cases like *Thaler v. Hirshfeld*. While AI-driven inventions meet patent criteria, legal systems globally resist recognizing AI

as an inventor, emphasizing human creativity. Proposed reforms—redefining inventorship, creating new IP categories, and harmonizing global standards—aim to bridge this gap. However, ethical, legal, and economic challenges persist, requiring careful policymaking. As AI reshapes innovation, patent law must evolve to incentivize creativity, ensure equitable ownership, and foster global technological progress.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Abbott, R. (2020). *The Reasonable Robot: Artificial Intelligence and the Law*. Cambridge University Press.
2. European Patent Office. (2021). *Decision J 8/20 (DABUS Case)*. EPO Legal Board of Appeal.
3. Thaler v. Hirshfeld, 558 F. Supp. 3d 238 (E.D. Va. 2021).
4. World Intellectual Property Organization. (2019). *WIPO Technology Trends 2019: Artificial Intelligence*. WIPO.
5. Abbott, R. (2020). *The Reasonable Robot: Artificial Intelligence and the Law*. Cambridge University Press.
6. European Patent Office. (2021). *Decision J 8/20 (DABUS Case)*. EPO Legal Board of Appeal.
7. Thaler v. Hirshfeld, 558 F. Supp. 3d 238 (E.D. Va. 2021).
8. World Intellectual Property Organization. (2019). *WIPO Technology Trends 2019: Artificial Intelligence*. WIPO.