



Original Article

The Role of AI in Intellectual Property Law: Protecting Innovation in the Age of Automation

Rana Hiteshvariben Sarjansinh¹, Anil Jain²

¹Scholar of law (Pacific academy of higher education & research university Udaipur)

²Guide, (Prof. Faculty of law Pacific University Udaipur)

Manuscript ID:
RIGJAAR-2025-020402

ISSN: 2998-4459

Volume 2

Issue 4

Pp. 7-9

April 2025

Submitted: 25 Jan. 2025

Revised: 15 Feb. 2025

Accepted: 25 Mar. 2025

Published: 30 Apr. 2025

Correspondence Address:
Rana Hiteshvariben
Sarjansinh
Scholar of law (Pacific
academy of higher education
& research university
Udaipur)
Email:
hiteshwarirana31@gmail.com

Quick Response Code:



Web: <https://rlgjaar.com>



DOI:
10.5281/zenodo.15542602

DOI Link:
<https://zenodo.org/records/15542602>



Creative Commons



Abstract

The rapid advancement of Artificial Intelligence (AI) is reshaping the landscape of intellectual property (IP) law, raising novel challenges and opportunities for protecting innovation in the digital age. This research paper explores the evolving role of AI in the creation, management, and protection of intellectual property, with a particular focus on its implications for existing legal frameworks. As AI systems increasingly contribute to the development of inventions, artistic works, and designs, questions arise regarding authorship, ownership, and the applicability of traditional IP protections. The paper analyzes how AI-generated content fits within current patent, copyright, and trademark laws, and whether legal reforms are necessary to address emerging ambiguities. It also examines the use of AI tools in IP enforcement, such as automated trademark monitoring, infringement detection, and predictive analytics in legal decision-making. Furthermore, the study investigates ethical concerns, including the balance between incentivizing human innovation and recognizing AI contributions, as well as potential risks of monopolization and access inequality. By reviewing national and international policy developments, case law, and regulatory proposals, this research highlights the need for a dynamic and adaptive IP regime that can accommodate the realities of AI-driven innovation. The paper concludes with strategic recommendations to policymakers and legal practitioners for fostering a balanced, innovation-friendly IP ecosystem in the age of automation, ensuring that both human and AI contributions are fairly protected and regulated.

Keywords:- Artificial Intelligence, Innovation, Automation, AI-generated Works, Copyright, Patent Law, Ownership, Authorship, IP Enforcement, Legal Reform, Technological Advancements, AI and Creativity.

Introduction

Creating original works of art to developing new inventions and automating complex problem-solving processes, AI is redefining the boundaries of creativity and productivity. However, As machines begin to play a central role in generating intellectual output, legal systems around the world are grappling with questions about authorship, ownership, and protection. This paper explores the intersection of AI and IP law, examining the evolving legal landscape and proposing pathways to safeguard innovation in the age of automation. In the rapidly evolving digital age, Artificial Intelligence (AI) is reshaping the landscape of creativity, innovation, and legal protection. From automated content generation to AI-driven inventions, the traditional frameworks of Intellectual Property (IP) law are being challenged like never before. As AI systems increasingly contribute to the development of artistic works, inventions, and design processes, questions arise regarding authorship, ownership, and the scope of protection under existing IP regimes. This convergence of technology and law presents both unprecedented opportunities and complex legal dilemmas. The central issue lies in adapting IP laws—originally crafted for human creativity—to accommodate machine-generated outputs and automated innovation. This study explores the critical role of AI in the realm of Intellectual Property, examining how legal systems around the world are responding to these advancements, and assessing whether current laws are sufficient to protect innovation in the age of automation. It also delves into the ethical, regulatory, and practical implications of AI's growing role in shaping the future of IP rights.

AI as a Creator and Innovator

AI systems today are capable of performing tasks that once required human intellect. Generative models can produce music, literature, visual art, and even scientific discoveries. For instance, tools like OpenAI's GPT models and image generators such as DALL·E have demonstrated the ability to create coherent and sometimes compelling content. In the field of invention, AI systems like DABUS (Device for the Autonomous Bootstrapping of Unified Sentience) have generated novel ideas, prompting legal debates about whether such machines can be listed as inventors in patent applications. The central legal issue revolves around whether AI-generated works can be protected under existing IP laws, which are typically predicated on human authorship.

Creative Commons (CC BY-NC-SA 4.0)

This is an open access journal, and articles are distributed under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0 International](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0/) Public License, which allows others to remix, tweak, and build upon the work noncommercially, as long as appropriate credit is given and the new creations are licensed under the identical terms.

How to cite this article:

Sarjansinh, R. H., & Jain, A. (2025). The Role of AI in Intellectual Property Law: Protecting Innovation in the Age of Automation. Royal International Global Journal of Advance and Applied Research, 2(4), 7–9. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.15542602>

Current legislation in most jurisdictions does not recognize machines as legal persons, thereby complicating the attribution of rights to AI-generated content.

Challenges to Existing IP Frameworks

The application of traditional IP laws to AI-generated works raises several complex issues:

1. Copyright:

Copyright law traditionally protects "original works of authorship" created by humans. AI-generated content challenges this notion of originality and human creativity. If no human can claim authorship, should such works enter the public domain, or should there be a mechanism to assign rights to developers or users of the AI?

Moreover, there is growing debate over the extent of human input required for a work to qualify for copyright protection when AI is involved. Some legal scholars suggest that minimal human curation might suffice, while others advocate for a more substantial creative role. Jurisdictions such as the UK have specific provisions for computer-generated works, yet they remain an exception rather than the rule globally. As AI-generated content becomes more prevalent, the need for clear, unified standards on authorship and originality will become increasingly pressing. Copyright law traditionally protects "original works of authorship" created by humans. AI-generated content challenges this notion of originality and human creativity. If no human can claim authorship, should such works enter the public domain, or should there be a mechanism to assign rights to developers or users of the AI?

2. Patents:

Patent systems require a human inventor to be named in applications. The case of DABUS in the UK, EU, and US has highlighted the legal uncertainty surrounding AI as an inventor. Courts have largely ruled against granting patents to AI, emphasizing the necessity of human involvement. One of the primary concerns is that existing patent frameworks are built on the assumption of human creativity and accountability. As AI increasingly contributes to the inventive process—identifying problems, proposing solutions, and even drafting claims—the role of the human inventor becomes less clear. Legal scholars are now debating whether AI should be recognized as a tool used by human inventors or acknowledged in a more autonomous role.

Furthermore, denying patent protection to AI-generated inventions might disincentivize the development of highly innovative AI systems. Some suggest that legal reforms could allow rights to vest in the individuals or entities responsible for programming, training, or deploying the AI. Others advocate for the creation of a new category of inventorship or a sui generis right for AI-generated inventions to ensure both legal clarity and continued technological progress. Patent systems require a human inventor to be named in applications. The case of DABUS in the UK, EU, and US has highlighted the legal uncertainty surrounding AI as an inventor. Courts have largely ruled against granting patents to AI, emphasizing the necessity of human involvement.

3. Trademarks and Trade Secrets:

While AI may assist in analyzing market trends or suggesting brand names, it is less directly involved in the creation of IP assets. However, the use of AI in uncovering confidential information or reverse-engineering products may raise concerns under trade secret laws. In the realm of trademarks, AI can be utilized in selecting and vetting

brand names, performing clearance searches, and identifying potential infringements. This introduces the possibility of automated tools performing due diligence, though they may also lead to errors or misinterpretations without human oversight. Furthermore, issues may arise when AI-generated branding elements mimic or overlap with existing marks, raising complex questions around liability and intent.

Regarding trade secrets, the use of AI for data mining, surveillance, and pattern recognition increases the risk of inadvertent or malicious disclosure of proprietary information. Companies must implement robust cybersecurity and internal governance measures to protect sensitive data accessed or processed by AI systems. Additionally, legal protections for trade secrets may need to evolve to address the nuances of AI involvement, especially as the technology becomes more adept at synthesizing valuable insights from publicly available data. While AI may assist in analyzing market trends or suggesting brand names, it is less directly involved in the creation of IP assets. However, the use of AI in uncovering confidential information or reverse-engineering products may raise concerns under trade secret laws.

Legal and Ethical Considerations

As AI systems become more autonomous, questions arise about the ethical implications of their creations and the accountability for misuse. Moral rights, such as the right to attribution and the integrity of a work, are rooted in the human experience of creation. Assigning such rights to AI may be philosophically problematic. Accountability is another major concern. If an AI-generated invention causes harm or infringes upon existing IP, who is responsible? Developers, users, or the AI itself? The legal system must evolve to address these ambiguities, potentially through new categories of liability or modified doctrines of negligence and responsibility. Moreover, ethical dilemmas arise when AI is used to replicate human styles or identities, such as voice cloning or deepfakes, potentially violating privacy and publicity rights. There is also concern about bias embedded in training data, which may influence the outputs of AI systems and perpetuate existing inequalities in access to innovation and protection. Establishing ethical guidelines and best practices will be essential to ensure AI technologies are used responsibly in the realm of intellectual property.

Global Perspectives and Regulatory Approaches:

Different jurisdictions have adopted varying stances on AI and IP. The European Union has considered recognizing certain AI-generated works under sui generis protection, while the United States maintains a strict human authorship requirement. China has shown openness to recognizing AI-related contributions, albeit within a human-centric framework.

International coordination is critical to avoid regulatory fragmentation and forum shopping. Harmonizing standards through organizations like the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO) could provide more consistent protection and clarity.

Additionally, countries such as South Korea and Japan have begun exploring tailored IP frameworks to address the rise of AI-generated innovation, including provisional guidelines and experimental regulatory sandboxes. These efforts demonstrate a growing awareness of the need for adaptive and flexible legal approaches. As nations test different models, best practices and lessons learned can contribute to a more harmonized international

response that balances innovation, fairness, and legal certainty.

Future Directions

As AI continues to advance, IP law must be reformed to ensure it continues to incentivize innovation while maintaining fairness and accountability.

Potential pathways include:

- Creating new legal categories for AI-assisted and AI-generated works.
- Allowing developers or operators of AI systems to claim IP rights under certain conditions.
- Establishing registries or certification systems for AI-generated content.
- Promoting transparency and explainability in AI systems to support legal claims.

Conclusion:

AI is transforming the landscape of intellectual property creation, posing novel challenges to established legal doctrines. While current laws are not fully equipped to handle the complexities introduced by machine-generated innovation, proactive reform and international cooperation can help bridge this gap. Protecting innovation in the age of automation will require a delicate balance between fostering creativity, ensuring fair attribution, and adapting legal frameworks to the realities of AI-driven progress.

Acknowledgment

Nil.

Financial support and sponsorship

Nil.

Conflicts of Interest

The authors declare that there are no conflicts of interest regarding the publication of this paper

References:

1. Abbott, R. (2020). *The Reasonable Robot: Artificial Intelligence and the Law*. Cambridge University Press.
2. European Parliament. (2020). *Artificial Intelligence and Civil Liability*. Retrieved from <https://www.europarl.europa.eu>
3. U.S. Copyright Office. (2022). *Copyright Registration Guidance: Works Containing Material Generated by Artificial Intelligence*. Retrieved from <https://www.copyright.gov>
4. World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO). (2019). *WIPO Technology Trends 2019: Artificial Intelligence*. Retrieved from <https://www.wipo.int/publications>
5. Thaler v. Commissioner of Patents [2021] FCA 879 (Federal Court of Australia).
6. United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO). (2020). *Public Views on Artificial Intelligence and Intellectual Property Policy*. Retrieved from <https://www.uspto.gov>
7. Gervais, D. J. (2019). *AI and Copyright: Creativity and Authorship*. In *Cambridge Handbook of Intellectual Property and Artificial Intelligence*. Cambridge University Press.
8. WIPO. (2021). *Revised Issues Paper on Intellectual Property Policy and Artificial Intelligence*. Retrieved from <https://www.wipo.int>
9. Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 (UK), Section 9(3) – which references computer-generated works.

10. Surden, H. (2021). *Artificial Intelligence and Law: An Overview*. *Georgia State University Law Review*, 35(4), 1305–1336.