# Comparative Analysis of Global Legislations on AI Authorship: Legal Frameworks and Emerging Trends

Sriyaa Sambasivam
*5th year, BA LLB (Hons.), SASTRA Deemed to Be University*

***Abstract*—Artificial Intelligence (AI) has emerged as a transformative technology capable of performing complex tasks with minimal human intervention. Within this spectrum, Generative AI—exemplified by models such as ChatGPT, Google Bard, and DeepAI—creates diverse forms of content, including text, images, and music. While these tools have been widely adopted by academicians, students, and professionals, they simultaneously raise pressing concerns surrounding copyright. A significant portion of training datasets comprises copyrighted works, yet the legal implications of such usage remain inadequately addressed. This paper examines the subsistence and scope of copyright protection in AI-generated works, analysing their copyrightability under global frameworks and within the Indian legal regime. It further also sheds light on the copyrightability of such AI-generated work by tracing the mechanisms of generative AI content creation, the challenges posed to existing copyright principles, and the potential disruptions to traditional notions of authorship and originality. Finally, the paper assesses the broader impact of AI-generated works on India's copyright landscape and proposes recommendations to address the evolving challenges in this domain.**

***Index Terms*—Generative AI, ChatGPT, Copyright, Authorship.**

## I. INTRODUCTION

The Cambridge Dictionary defines AI as a 'computer technology that allows something to be done in a way that is similar to the way a human would do it'[1] Such AI can be used in any form and format whether in a computer or in a communication device such as smartphones, it can perform various tasks in a blink of the human eye without the requirement of harsh and long human labour, it also in addition to the same AI also produces work that requires creativity such as creating musical work, literary work, artistic work, etc., the reason behind its popularity and one of its main features is that AI can carry out tasks with little or no human involvement at all.[2] On account of this technological development, a distance has occurred between human creativity and artificial creativity as there is either little or no human contribution at all in AI-generated work. The current Copyright regime does not include AI-generated work to fall under the ambit of an author and there is no current legal system to govern the copyright issues which arise from AI authorship through the globe. The copyright principles trace their origin in human labour on account of which the work of human creators is protected for their use only or for others' use but only with the prior permission of the human creators.[1] Copyright law has an inherent assumption that there are human creators who creatively, originally, and independently create work.[3] Such AI-generated work is threatening the inherent and traditional aspect of "originality" and "human involvement" under the present copyright law. This paper further seeks to address the problems involved in Generative AI works and authorship for the same.

## II. GENERATIVE AI TOOLS AND THE FUNCTIONING OF AI TOOLS

The Generative AI uses various tools to generate images, such as various software, hardware and other extensions to perform tasks which generate such images, audio videos etc., All these AI tools are designed to perform various functions, which have specific algorithms and function behind the "black

[1]Football Dataco Ltd. and Ors. v. Yahoo! UK Ltd and Ors., Case C-604/10; University of London Press v. University Tutorial Press, (1916) 2 Ch 609; Ladbroke (Football) v. William Hill (Football), [1964] 1 WLR 273; Independent Television Publications Ltd. v Time Out Ltd., [1984] FSR 64.

box" or an opaque structure. Thus, AI tools are developed keeping in view specific needs and uses in a variety of industries, ranging from education, law, finance, and healthcare to the marketing industry, to automate tasks, analyse data and enhance productivity. These AI generative toolkits are trained on numerous amounts of data which is being brought into question, the datasets used for the said training of data also contain copyrighted material. Under this light, any work created by such Large Language Models (LLM) of AI is subject to be scrutinized under the ambit of copyright infringement. Thus, AI generated work comes in with a legal question of ownership and authorship. The human intervention in production of any AI generated work is close to negligent in all cases, thus raising the question of human element being present in any such cases. Humans are not required to perform any task other than giving commands to the tools for the generation of work.[4] Whether such minimal human intervention is enough to obtain copyright for AI generated work is still in the grey area as the same cannot be brought under the legal ambit of the existing copyright laws in India and throughout the world, as the training datasets used infringe the copyright of many such owners which automatically renders the AI generated work to not be original in nature.

## III. COPYRIGHT OF AI-GENERATED WORK IN INDIA

The Copyright Act, 1957 governs the copyright regime in India. The Act grants copyright protection on literary, dramatic, musical, and artistic work, cinematograph film and sound recordings.[2] AI can generate any literary, musical, dramatic and artistic work, sound recordings, etc., but the current regime imposes the need for originality and creativity on the part of the author. Originality is one of major pre-requisites for any work to be categorised as copyrightable under the law, along with creativity. The basic requirement of originality is that the work must originate from the Author and not be copied.[3] The degree of originality varies with the jurisdiction. The United Kingdom follows the "sweat of the brow" doctrine which prescribes that employing the skill and labour of authors is sufficient for granting copyright protection to a work. The United States follows the "modicum of creativity" doctrine which accepts a work to be original if it is "independently created" and has a "minimum degree of creativity" [4] The doctrine of "sweat of the brow" was used till 2008, post which the Supreme Court of India in the case of D.B. Modak and Anr. v Eastern Book Company and Ors[5]. discarded the sweat of the brow doctrine and shifted to the "modicum of creativity." The application of the "modicum of creativity" test remains a fundamental requirement in evaluating the copyrightability of works generated by Artificial Intelligence (AI). In the context of research, this test operates subjectively by probing whether genuine creativity is embedded within the creation process. Traditionally, human creativity is presumed given the intellectual effort and intention involved. In contrast, AI-generated outputs are fundamentally reliant on vast datasets, which often encompass copyrighted materials, to generate new content through algorithmic processes.

The critical legal issue arises when the data set used to train AI models contains copyrighted materials. Consequently, if the resulting output mirrors, either wholly or in part, pre-existing copyrighted works, such content would inevitably fail the "modicum of creativity" standard and the legal requirement of "originality." This leads to the conclusion that not all AI-generated works meet the originality threshold necessary for copyright protection. The evaluation must be context-driven, requiring careful scrutiny of how the AI system processed inputs, what transformations were undertaken, and the degree to which the output diverges from source materials.

On the other hand, if an AI-generated work enshrines a sufficient degree of novelty and clear independence from any copyrighted content, it may fulfil the originality criterion and thus be eligible for copyright

[2]The Copyright Act, 1957 (Act 14 of 1957), Section 13 (1).

[3]University of London Press v. University Tutorial Press, (1916) 2 Ch 601.

[4]Feist Publications, Inc. v Rural Tel. Serv. Co., 499 U.S. 340, 345 (1991).

[5]D.B. Modak and Anr. v Eastern Book Company and Ors 2008 (1) SCC 1.

protection. Upon establishing originality, the subsequent legal analysis shifts to the identification and attribution of authorship. Copyright regimes, notably those aligned with the Berne Convention, customarily vest authorship in individuals who have made a substantive intellectual contribution to the creation of the work. This presents a formidable challenge when discussing purely machine-generated works where human intervention is minimal or absent, as the attribution of authorship becomes legally ambiguous.

In summary, the copyrightability of AI-generated works is contingent upon a rigorous assessment of originality and creative input, along with clear guidelines for authorship attribution. The Berne Convention and equivalent international frameworks provide foundational guidance, but further legislative and judicial clarification will be necessary to resolve emerging complexities in AI-authorship cases.

Article 2(5) of the Berne Convention grants copyright protection to curated collections of literary and artistic works such as encyclopaedias and anthologiesmprovided they can be classified as intellectual creations. This recognition is not based solely on the content but hinges upon the originality evident in the selection and arrangement of these materials. Historically, the Convention presupposed that such acts of curation required the direct application of human judgment, discretion, and creativity. In effect, the intellectual effort of an individual curator was central to conferring legal protection, reinforcing the anthropocentric foundations of authorship.

The advent of AI-generated works fundamentally unsettles this paradigm. Modern generative AI systems are capable of autonomously selecting and arranging material drawn from vast datasets without significant human intervention, calling into question whether these processes can rightly be described as exercises of human intellect. The conventional assumption that creativity derives from a human agent is increasingly challenged when AI systems themselves perform the process of selection and arrangement. As a result, the legal framework governing collections of intellectual creations faces a new dilemma: the traditional criteria for authorship may prove ill-suited for works produced predominantly or entirely by machines.

This disruptive potential of AI technologies generates critical legal and theoretical questions. Should the AI developer, who designs and trains the system, be recognized as the author or, is it the end-user who initiates and guides the creative process through prompts and instructions who should be treated as such. Alternatively, it might be more appropriate to classify these works as falling outside the ambit of copyright authorship altogether a position with profound implications for innovation, public access, and the protection of creative outputs.

Addressing these issues will require a nuanced reassessment of the notion of intellectual contribution, exploring whether AI-mediated selection and arrangement genuinely reflect human creativity or if they represent a new and distinct category of authorship for copyright law. The challenge for contemporary legislators and courts is to articulate principles that preserve the integrity of copyright while accommodating the complexities of autonomous AI creativity and its growing role in the production of intellectual property.

Therefore, intellectual creation generally entails only human creation and the selection and arrangement of certain contents is recognised as a copyrighted work to protect the ‘fruits of human labour and authorship’ and not commercial considerations. [8] The second requirement to be satisfied by an AI when it comes to the ownership of copyrighted works is the requirement to fall under the aegis of an ‘author’ as defined under the Indian Copyright Law. This would be problematic as an AI has generally been regarded to not have a legal personality.[9] Under the Copyright Act, 1957, an author is the first owner of the copyright. [6] The Act provides that an author refers to, in relation to literary or dramatic work, the author of the work, in relation to a musical work, the composer and in relation to an artistic work other than a photograph, the artist.[7] In the case of AI-generated works, it is the AI system itself that performs the functions traditionally attributed to those categories of persons who are recognised as authors under copyright law. Consequently, the conventional definition of “author” becomes inapplicable to works generated autonomously by AI.

[6] The Copyright Act, 1957 (Act 14 of 1957), Section 17.

[7] The Copyright Act, 1957 (Act 14 of 1957), Section 2(d).

It may, however, be contended that AI-generated works could, under the existing legal framework, be subsumed within the category of "computer-generated works," given that AI tools operate through computers, servers, and mobile devices, and that no separate statutory classification has yet been created for AI-generated content.

In this regard, Section 2(d)(vi) of the Indian Copyright Act assumes relevance, as it stipulates that the "author," in relation to any computer-generated literary, dramatic, musical, or artistic work, shall be deemed to be the person who causes the work to be created. Accordingly, the individual who initiates or otherwise causes the creation of a computer-generated work may be recognised as its author, provided that such person has played a sufficiently significant role in the process of causation. By this interpretation, the user engaging with the AI could arguably be regarded as the author, albeit in a limited sense, as their contribution lies primarily in initiating the AI's operation rather than exercising creative discretion over the final output. Moreover, from the point of view of contributing to the creation of work like in the case of choosing the lighting and other aspects in taking a photograph, the user does not make such creative choices in using AI which directly reflects in the output of the AI.[10] Thus, the user cannot be considered to be an author. Further, a practical problem with making the user of AI the author of the generated work would be to choose the author amongst different users who may use the same AI to generate the same output.[11] Furthermore, it is not imperative to restrict the scope of "the person who causes the work to be created" under Section 2(d)(vi) of the Copyright Act solely to end-users of AI systems. The process of generating AI outputs is contingent upon the contributions of multiple upstream actors, including developers, programmers, system designers, trainers, and even data suppliers, all of whom play a critical role in enabling the functioning of the AI tool. Their collective involvement in conceptualising, designing, training, and supplying the underlying datasets may, in principle, qualify them as significant contributors for the purposes of authorship. This interpretation underscores the complexity of attributing authorship in AI-generated works, as the act of causation is not confined to a single participant but dispersed across a spectrum of contributors. The challenge, therefore, lies in determining whether authorship should vest in the immediate user who engages with the AI system, or whether it should extend upstream to that whose intellectual and technical labour made the generation of the work possible. The role of the developer/programmer in laying the rules for the working of AI and in supervising the working of AI favours the programmer being considered the person who causes the creation of the work under Section 2(d)(vi). [12] The developer or programmer of an AI system contributes substantially to its functioning and to the eventual creation of outputs by undertaking tasks such as coding the system, training it on extensive datasets, and subsequently reconfiguring or recoding the system in light of the results obtained during training. These activities are central to ensuring that the AI operates effectively and is capable of generating the desired work. A more detailed examination of the significance of these roles will be undertaken in the subsequent section addressing the analysis of authorship in AI-generated works. In light of the foregoing, it may be observed that the element of originality cannot be assumed to be inherently present in AI-generated works. Moreover, even in circumstances where originality is established, the determination of authorship presents considerable difficulties. This complexity arises from the diverse and often overlapping contributions made by multiple participants ranging from developers and programmers to trainers, data suppliers, and end-users at various stages of the creation process. Consequently, the attribution of authorship in AI-generated works remains highly contested and unsettled within the framework of copyright law.

## IV. ANALYSIS OF AI AUTHORSHIP AND TRANSFORMATIVE WORK

Copyright protection requires work to be essentially original. In the case of London University Press Ltd v University Tutorial Press Ltd[8] the court held that "originality under copyright law means the expression of the idea must be in original form, i.e., it originates

[8] University of London Press v. University Tutorial Press, (1916) 2 Ch 601.

from the author in the sense that the work must not be a copy of another work." When the authorship is looked into under the copyright law, the element of originality cannot be neglected, in pursuance to authorship, as mentioned in previous paragraphs, it can be noted that the training data sets used to train the AI systems to generate any work is part of work already available on the internet such as other literary work, musical work, etc., which may be copyrighted already, thus when the AI systems are trained on such datasets then automatically it constitutes as an infringement of another author's copyright, therefore it goes in contravention to the aspect of originality as the expression of the idea is not in its original form and does not fall under the ambit of an original work originating from the author and the work will be a copy of another work. If a generated work is not original, no question as to its copyright protection arises. However, if an AI-generated work is original, another prominent question that arises is who shall be the author of the AI-generated work. All work created must have a human intellect attached to it making it fall under copyrightable material. Law does not protect every expression. The law affords protection to expressions that are fixed in a medium and are original.

A work may be protected by copyright even though it is based on something already in the public domain if the author, through his skill and effort, has contributed a distinguishable variation from the older works.[9] In Macmillan & Co Ltd v K. and J Cooper[10], it was held that the question is not whether the materials which are used are entirely new and have never been used before, but the true question is whether the same plan, arrangement and combination of materials have been used before for the same purpose or for any other purpose. If they have not, then the plaintiff is entitled to copyright although he may have gathered hints from existing and known sources. Therefore, intellectual creation generally entails only human creation and the selection and arrangement of certain contents is recognised as a copyrighted work to protect the 'fruits of human labour and authorship' and not commercial considerations.[8] It may be noted that reserving the concept of authorship to humans not only affirms basic human values but also stands as a welcome reminder of human individuality and uniqueness.[13]

Therefore, the motivation and stimulation that human seeks through copyright protection and authorial rights to undertake various innovations do not apply to AI.[14] In the cases of Rupendra Kashyap v. Jiwan Publishing House Pvt. Ltd.[11], Tech Plus Media Private Ltd. v. Jyoti Janda[12], Camlin Pvt. Ltd. v. National Pencil Industries[13] the courts of India held that there can be no authorship granted to legal persons involving copyright. Accordingly, in light of the foregoing principles, the recognition of authorial rights in AI-generated works does not appear to be a feasible proposition in the immediate future. Nevertheless, an alternative perspective suggests that extending protection to such works does not entirely displace the humanist foundation of copyright law. Human agency remains present in the creative process not in the direct act of producing the work, but rather through the formulation of queries or the provision of instructions to AI systems, which in turn generate the final output. This development may be understood as a transformation of the human role in authorship from that of a creator to that of an instructor. The human contribution, though indirect, persists as an essential element of the causal chain leading to the creation of the work. On this reasoning, the fundamentally human-centred character of the Berne Convention may still be considered preserved, as human intellectual input, however attenuated, continues to underpin the process of creation. In furtherance to the same, when such training data which is already available on the internet is used, it arises the question of copyright infringement, and further brings the question if it falls under the anvil of Section 52 of the Copyright Act.[14] Such rights include, inter alia, rights of reproduction,

[9] O. W. Donald v. Zack Meyer's T. v. Sales and Service et al., Moore Business Forms, Inc., 426 F.2d 1027 (5th Cir. 1970)
[10] Macmillan & Co Ltd v K. and J Cooper [AIR 1924 PC 75]
[11] Rupendra Kashyap v. Jiwan Publishing House (P) Ltd., 1993 SCC OnLine Del 660
[12] Tech Plus Media Private Ltd. v. Jyoti Janda, 2014 SCC OnLine Del 1819
[13] Camlin (P) Ltd. v. National Pencil Industries, 1985 SCC OnLine Del 378
[14] The Copyright Act, 1957 (Act 14 of 1957), Section 52.

communication to the public, adaptation, and translation of the work. Any copyrighted work when accessed or used without authorization amounts to an infringement under Section 51 of the Act.[15] The doctrine of "fair usage" was primarily developed in the US Copyright realm and US jurisprudence established the four-factor test which must be satisfied to uphold the defence of "fair usage".

In M/s. Blackwood & Sons Ltd. v. A N Parasuraman,[16] it was established that for invoking the defence of fair dealing, the alleged infringer must not intend to compete with the owner of the copyrighted work with the goal of making money from that competition. In the case of Sony Corp. of America v. Universal City Studios, Inc.,[17] it was held that "every commercial use of copyrighted material is presumptively an unfair exploitation of the monopoly privilege that belongs to the owner of the copyright" In Syndicate of the Press of the University of Cambridge on Behalf of the Chancellor, Masters and School[18] it was held that on analysing the provision of Section 52(1)(h) of the Copyright Act, "it is clear from the reading of the aforesaid provision that this would not come to the aid of the respondents who have published the guide for commercial exploitation. In view of the law laid down in various cases, commercial exploitation will take the matter outside the ambit of 'fair use'. In another view, In Authors' Guild v. Hathi Trust,[19] the Court was called to examine whether text mining and compilation of works to make them accessible to the especially abled would constitute fair use. The Court, deciding in favour of the defendants, said that data mining in itself could not constitute infringement and held that the use of text mining to create a searchable database, in fact, created a transformative work which changed the essential purpose of the work. An important focus of the first factor is whether the use is "transformative." A use is transformative if it does something more than repackage or republish the original copyrighted work. The inquiry is whether the work "adds something new, with a further purpose or different character, altering the first with new expression, meaning or message.[20] With respect to transformative works, the Court held, have a greater change of falling within the fair use defence and such 'works thus lie at the heart of the fair use doctrine's guarantee of breathing space within the confines of copyright.[21]

In R.G. Anand v Deluxe Films,[22] it was held that if the work was transformative, then the degree or substantiality of the copying might not matter, and further, as the secondary work could not act as a substitute for the original work, the market of the latter would remain unaffected. Viewing any AI-generated work from the aspect of monetizing the said generated work, will create a dent under "fair dealing" under the copyright principles. Thus, the said work created by the AI trained on copyrighted datasets cannot be monetized under the current framework of laws. Thus, derivation of a commercial gain from the usage of copyrighted material exempts AI-generated work from availing the exception under Section 52. In furtherance of the same, such unauthorized usage of copyrighted material for training AI datasets are being addressed in the ongoing case of ANI Media Pvt. Ltd v. Open AI Inc[23] wherein the Delhi High Court had heard the submissions with regards to the defence of "publicly available information" and copyrighted material being part of the datasets used to train AI systems, which is further being scrutinized. On the anvil of this, the requirement of a humanist nature does not prove fatal to recognizing authorship to humans in AI-generated work if it is original as there still exists human involvement in the work creation process.[13]

## V. GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES ON AI-AUTHORSHIP

UNITED STATES

[15] The Copyright Act, 1957 (Act 14 of 1957), Section 51.
[16] M/s. Blackwood & Sons Ltd. v. A N Parasuraman, AIR 1959 Mad 410
[17] Sony Corp. of America v. Universal City Studios, Inc., 464 US 417 (1984)
[18] Syndicate of the Press of the University of Cambridge on Behalf of the Chancellor, Masters and School, (2011) 185 DLT 346
[19] Authors Guild, Inc. v. Hathi Trust, 755 F.3d 87 (2d Cir. 2014)
[20] Campbell v. Acuff-Rose Music, Inc., 510 U.S. 569, 574 (1994)
[21] University of Cambridge v. B.D. Bhandari, 2011 SCC OnLine Del 3215
[22] R.G. Anand v. Delux Films, (1978) 4 SCC 118
[23] Ani Media (P) Ltd. v. Open AI Inc, 2024 SCC OnLine Del 8120

In February 2022, the Copyright Office's Review Board issued a final decision affirming the refusal to register a work claimed to be generated with no human involvement.[15] The United States Copyright Office had granted copyright protection to an AI-generated graphic novel called "Zarya of the Dawn"[15] In one notable instance, the author of a novel failed to disclose to the Copyright Office that the images incorporated within the work had been produced using Midjourney, a generative AI tool. Subsequently, when the Copyright Office became aware through the author's own statements on social media that the images had, in fact, been generated by Midjourney, the Office issued a letter to the author requesting further clarification and additional information regarding the nature of the work. Based on her reply, the Copyright Office, taking cognizance of images generated by AI tool, cancelled the copyright registration of images in the novel as they were not the product of human authorship. Therefore, while copyright protection was upheld for the textual elements of the novel as well as for the overall selection, coordination, and arrangement of the images, protection for the individual AI-generated images themselves was expressly denied by the Copyright Office. In early 2023, the Office announced the launch of a broad AI Initiative and issued a statement of policy providing guidance on the registration of works incorporating AI-generated material (the "Guidance" or "AI Registration Guidance"). As reaffirmed in the U.S. Copyright Office's Guidance, copyright protection in the United States is contingent upon the presence of human authorship. This foundational requirement derives from the Copyright Clause of the U.S. Constitution and has been consistently upheld through judicial interpretation of the Copyright Act. The Supreme Court in the case of Cmty. for Creative Non-Violence v. Reid [24] held that, "the author [of a copyrighted work] is . . . the person who translates an idea into a fixed, tangible expression entitled to copyright protection." Thus, not providing any copyright for AI-generated work in the United States.

EUROPEAN UNION

The European Union has added new provisions in the proposed AI Act which mandates generative AI tools, like ChatGPT, to disclose copyrighted materials that have been used to develop them.[16] The EU AI Act, 2024 though not in force under Clause 105 discussed that the General-purpose generative AI models offer significant innovation opportunities but also raise challenges for creators whose works may be used in their training. Such models rely on vast datasets of text, images, videos, and other content, often accessed through text and data mining (TDM) techniques. Since much of this material is protected by copyright, authorization from rightsholders is required unless an exception applies. Directive (EU) 2019/790 introduced TDM exceptions, permitting use under certain conditions. However, rightsholders may expressly reserve their rights, in which case AI developers must obtain authorization unless the mining is conducted for scientific research. Therefore, there is a global dilemma regarding the authorship of AI-generated work.

CHINA

Unlike the United States or the European Union China has spearheaded the debate of copyrightability of AI-generated work, by interpreting the aspect of originality and authorship in varied senses. In the recent decision of Li v Liu,[25] the Beijing Internet Court was asked, once again, to recognise the copyrightability of an AI-generated artwork. On 24 February 2023, the plaintiff, Mr. Li Yunkai, created the image in question by inputting specific prompts into Stable Diffusion, an open-source generative AI software. He subsequently published the resulting image on the social media platform Xiaohongshu under the title "Spring Breeze Brings Tenderness." Generally, when individuals use the Stable Diffusion model to generate images, the specificity of their prompts particularly regarding picture elements, layout, and composition determines the degree of personalization in the resulting output. In the present case, the image created by the plaintiff displayed discernible differences from prior works. With respect to the process of creation, the plaintiff neither manually drew the image nor explicitly instructed Stable Diffusion on every aspect of line work or colouring; these elements were executed autonomously by the model, marking a clear departure

[24] Cmty. for Creative Non-Violence v. Reid ("CCNV"), 490 U.S. 730, 737 (1989)

[25] Beijing Internet Court Civil Judgment (2023) Jing 0491 Min Chu No. 11279.

from traditional artistic methods involving manual drawing or digital painting. Nonetheless, the plaintiff selected and refined prompt words to define elements such as the character and its presentation, and set parameters governing the layout and composition. These actions reflected the plaintiff's creative choices and arrangement. Furthermore, the plaintiff iteratively adjusted the prompts and parameters—first generating an initial image, then modifying and refining it until achieving the final version in question. Such adjustments demonstrated the plaintiff's aesthetic judgment and personal input, evidencing a degree of human creativity in the overall process. In particular, the Court, in recognising the plaintiff as the copyright owner of the AI-generated work, observed that "generative AI technology has transformed the way people create." As with many other technological advancements throughout history, the process of technological development represents a gradual outsourcing of human labour to machines. Although the evolution of technology and tools has reduced the extent of human involvement, the copyright system must continue to operate so as to encourage the creation of works. Finally, the Court concluded that recognising the copyrightability of AI-generated works serves to promote and encourage creative activities that utilise emerging and advanced technologies.

## VI. CONCLUSION

Artificial Intelligence has redefined the boundaries of creativity by generating works that once required exclusively human effort. This development raises pressing questions regarding copyright protection and authorship. While some advocate extending copyright to AI-generated works through users, others oppose such recognition. The way forward requires legislative and judicial clarity. Copyright law must either be amended to expressly include or exclude AI-generated works, or a separate category of protection with limited rights and shorter terms may be introduced. At the same time, the use of copyrighted material in training AI through text and data mining demands strict regulation to safeguard creators' rights. A robust legal framework is therefore essential one that balances innovation with the protection of human creativity, ensuring that copyright law remains relevant in the age of AI.

## REFERNCES


[1] Cambridge Dictionary, "Artificial Intelligence,"Cambridge Univ. Press, 2025. https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/ai

[2] T.H. Davenport & N. Mittal, "How generative AI is changing creative work," Harvard Business Review,14 Nov 2022.https://hbr.org/2022/11/how-generative-ai-is-changing-creative-work

[3] Yanisky-Ravid S, Generating rembrandt: Artificial intelligence, copyright, and accountability in the 3A era – The human-like authors are already here – A new model, Michigan State Law Review, 659 (2017), https://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2957722

[4] K. Hristov, "Artificial intelligence and the copyright dilemma," IDEA J. of the Franklin Pierce Center for IP, vol. 57, no. 3, p. 444, 2017. https://ssrn.com/abstract=2976428

[5] University of London Press v. University Tutorial Press, 2 Ch 601 (1916).

[6] Feist Publ'ns, Inc. v. Rural Telephone Service Co., 499 U.S. 340 (1991).

[7] D.B. Modak & Anr. v. Eastern Book Co. & Ors., 1 SCC 1 (2008).

[8] Ginsburg J C, People not machines: Authorship and what it means in the Berne Convention, IIC - International Review of Intellectual Property and Competition Law, 49 (2018)131, https://doi.org/10.1007/s40319-018-0670-x Sam Ricketson, The 1992 Horace S. Manges Lecture - People or Machines: The Bern Convention and the changing concept of authorship, Columbia-VLA Journal of Law & the Arts, 16 (1) (1991) 01,https://heinonline.org/HOL/P?h=hein.journals/cjla16&i=11

[9] Ghosh J, Power play of artificial intelligence upon intellectual property rights, Indian Journal of Law and Justice, 11 (1) (2020) 112.

[10] P. Naithani, "Issues of authorship and ownership in AI-created work – Indian copyright law perspective,"NTUT J. of IP Law & Management, vol. 11, no. 1, 2022.

[11] S.F. Hedrick, "I think, therefore I create: Claiming copyright in algorithm outputs," NYU J. of IP & Entertainment Law, vol. 8, p. 324, 2019.

[12] A. Pokhriyal & V. Gupta, "Artificial-intelligence-generated works under

copyright law," NLUJ Law Rev., vol. 6, no. 2, p. 116, 2020.
[13] A. Michel, AI-Generated creations: Challenging the traditional concept of copyright (Doctoral dissertation, Univ. of Tilburg), 2018.
[14] Samuelson P, Allocating ownership rights in computer- generated works, University of Pittsburgh Law Review,47 (1986)1185, https://lawcat.berkeley.edu/record/1112407?ln=en
[15] U.S. Copyright Office, "Decision refusing registration of works with no human authorship (Midjourney case)," 2022.
[16] Mukherjee S, EU proposes new copyright rules for generative AI, Reuters, https://www.reuters.com/technology/eu-lawmakers-committee-reaches-deal-artificial-intelligence-act-2023-04-27/