Page 4337 - 4355 **DOI:** *https://doij.org/10.10000/IJLMH.119272*

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF LAW MANAGEMENT & HUMANITIES

[ISSN 2581-5369]

Volume 8 | Issue 2

2025

Artificial Intelligence and Copyright Law: Challenges and Evolving Legal Frameworks

PRATYUSH PRAKARSH[1]

ABSTRACT

Artificial intelligence (AI) has revolutionized content creation, raising complex legal questions regarding copyright protection, ownership, and liability. This paper explores the intersection of AI and copyright law, analyzing existing legal frameworks, judicial interpretations, and emerging legislative developments. It evaluates key challenges such as authorship of AI-generated works, infringement risks, and fair use considerations. Additionally, the paper examines potential reforms to adapt copyright law to the evolving role of AI in creative industries.

Keywords*: Artificial Intelligence (AI), Copyright Law, AI-Generated Content, Authorship and Ownership.*

I. INTRODUCTION

The rapid advancement of AI technologies has led to their increasing role in generating creative works, including literature, music, and visual art. However, traditional copyright laws were designed with human authorship in mind, creating uncertainty regarding the legal status of AI-generated content. This paper seeks to analyze the implications of AI in copyright law, focusing on ownership, liability, and possible legal reforms.

II. COPYRIGHT AND AUTHORSHIP IN THE AGE OF AI

Artificial intelligence (AI) has transformed content creation, raising critical legal questions regarding copyright protection, authorship, and liability. This paper examines how AI-generated works challenge traditional copyright doctrines, exploring ownership rights, infringement risks, and fair use considerations. The study also discusses recent case law and legislative responses while proposing reforms to ensure a balanced approach to intellectual property rights in the AI era.

The proliferation of AI technologies has revolutionized the creative industries, generating works in literature, music, and visual arts without direct human involvement. Traditional copyright laws emphasize human authorship, leading to uncertainty regarding AI-generated content. This

[1] Author is a student at Amity Law School, Noida, India.

 [ISSN 2581-5369]

paper investigates the impact of AI on copyright law, focusing on authorship and ownership disputes, liability concerns, and potential legal reforms.

Copyright law has historically recognized human authors as the sole creators of original works. The Berne Convention and various national legislations require human intellectual effort for copyright protection. However, AI-generated works complicate this principle, as they challenge the necessity of human involvement in the creative process. Some jurisdictions deny copyright protection for AI-generated works, while others explore intermediary models, attributing authorship to AI developers, users, or corporations.

III. TRADITIONAL COPYRIGHT FRAMEWORKS AND HUMAN AUTHORSHIP

Copyright law has historically required human creativity and intellectual effort for a work to qualify for protection. International agreements like the **Berne Convention** and various national laws emphasize human authorship as a fundamental principle. Since AI lacks human attributes such as intent and consciousness, its creations challenge this traditional understanding.

(A) The Problem of AI-Generated Works

AI-generated works blur the lines of authorship. If an AI independently creates a literary, artistic, or musical work, key legal questions arise:

- **Who is the rightful author?** Should it be the AI system, its developer, the user who provided input, or the organization that owns the AI?
- **Can AI-generated works receive copyright protection?** Some jurisdictions reject the idea that non-human entities can hold copyright, while others explore intermediary ownership models.
- **Are AI creations "original"?** Copyright protection typically requires originality, which implies human creativity. Courts and lawmakers debate whether AI outputs meet this standard.

(B) Jurisdictional Approaches to AI Copyright

Different countries have taken varied approaches to this issue:

- **United States:** The U.S. Copyright Office has denied copyright claims for AI-generated works, emphasizing that only human-created works are protected.
- **United Kingdom:** UK law recognizes AI-generated works, but assigns authorship to the person who made the necessary arrangements for the AI's creation.
- **European Union:** EU copyright laws do not currently extend protection to AI-

generated works, but ongoing discussions suggest potential reforms.

- **China:** China has granted copyright protection to some AI-generated works, indicating a more flexible approach.

(C) Future Considerations

To address the legal uncertainties surrounding AI-generated works, potential solutions include:

- **Creating a sui generis (unique) copyright system** for AI-generated works, distinct from traditional human authorship.
- **Revising copyright laws** to define the role of AI in creative processes.
- **Expanding fair use doctrines** to account for AI-assisted creativity.

IV. LEGAL CHALLENGES IN AI COPYRIGHT

The intersection of artificial intelligence (AI) and copyright law presents a variety of legal challenges that policymakers, courts, and industry stakeholders must address. As AI systems increasingly create literary, artistic, and musical works, copyright law faces new complexities in determining authorship, ownership, infringement, and fair use. This section provides a detailed analysis of these challenges.

(A) The Issue of Authorship and Ownership

Copyright law traditionally recognizes human authors as the creators of original works. However, AI-generated content challenges this notion, raising the question: who should be credited as the author of an AI-created work? Several possible answers exist, each with legal and ethical implications:

a. AI as an Author

AI lacks legal personhood and the capacity for intent or creativity in the way humans do.

Granting authorship to AI would require significant amendments to international copyright agreements such as the Berne Convention, which presumes human authorship.

Courts worldwide have generally rejected AI as an author; for example, the U.S. Copyright Office denied copyright registration for AI-generated art (Thaler v. Perlmutter, 2022).

b. AI Developers or Programmers as Authors

Since developers create the algorithms and train the AI, they could be considered the authors.

However, AI systems often produce works autonomously without direct human input, making it difficult to argue that a developer exercised creative control.

c. **Users Who Input Data into AI as Authors**

Users provide prompts, settings, and datasets that influence AI outputs.

The extent of user control varies; in some cases, users actively shape the output, while in others, the AI acts independently.

Some legal frameworks, like UK copyright law, assign authorship to the person making the necessary arrangements for an AI to create a work.

d. **No Copyright Protection for AI Works**

Some jurisdictions, such as the U.S., maintain that AI-generated works cannot be copyrighted unless there is a significant human contribution.

This approach prevents AI from holding rights but also denies protection to human stakeholders who facilitated the work's creation.

V. COPYRIGHT INFRINGEMENT AND LIABILITY

AI models are trained on massive datasets, often sourced from publicly available or copyrighted materials. This raises concerns about unauthorized reproduction, derivative works, and potential copyright violations.

a. Training AI on Copyrighted Material

AI models like GPT and image-generation tools (e.g., DALL·E, Stable Diffusion) learn from vast amounts of data scraped from the internet, much of which is copyrighted.

Rights holders argue that using their work without permission constitutes infringement.

AI developers argue that training AI models falls under fair use (in the U.S.) or similar legal doctrines, as it involves transformation rather than direct reproduction.

b. Who is Liable for Copyright Infringement?

If an AI system generates content that closely resembles an existing copyrighted work, who is responsible? Potentially liable parties include:

AI Developers and Companies: If the AI was trained on copyrighted data without permission, companies behind the AI could face legal challenges (e.g., the lawsuits against OpenAI and Stability AI by artists and media companies).

Users: If users instruct an AI to create content that mimics a copyrighted work, they may be held responsible.

No One (Legal Gap): Since AI operates autonomously, some argue that no party should be

liable unless a clear legal framework is established.

c. AI-Generated Works as Derivative Works

Copyright law protects derivative works—new creations based on pre-existing works.

If an AI-generated output closely resembles a copyrighted work, it may be considered a derivative work, requiring the original creator's permission.

Courts and legislatures must determine whether AI-generated content qualifies as derivative or transformative.

VI. FAIR USE AND AI-GENERATED CONTENT

The fair use doctrine (U.S.) and equivalent legal principles in other jurisdictions allow limited use of copyrighted material without permission under certain conditions. The application of fair use to AI-generated content remains uncertain.

a. Does AI Training Qualify as Fair Use?

AI companies argue that training AI models on copyrighted data is transformative, similar to Google Books' scanning project, which was ruled fair use (Authors Guild v. Google, 2015).

However, unlike Google Books, AI models do not merely display excerpts but generate new works based on their training data.

Courts are divided on whether AI training qualifies as fair use or infringement.

b. AI-Generated Works as Fair Use Outputs

If AI outputs mimic or reference copyrighted works, do they qualify as fair use?

Fair use is assessed based on factors like transformative nature, impact on the market, and amount of copyrighted material used.

Some AI-generated content may be considered transformative, while others may be too derivative to qualify for protection under fair use.

VII. INTERNATIONAL COPYRIGHT FRAMEWORKS AND AI

Different countries have adopted varying approaches to AI and copyright:

a. United States

- AI-generated works **cannot receive copyright protection** unless a human author makes a substantial contribution.
- AI companies face lawsuits from artists and publishers over copyright infringement in

training data.

b. United Kingdom

- UK copyright law **recognizes AI-generated works**, but assigns authorship to the person making the necessary arrangements for AI's creation.
- This approach provides limited copyright protection but does not grant full authorship to AI itself.

c. European Union

- The **EU Copyright Directive** does not explicitly address AI-generated works but imposes restrictions on text and data mining, affecting AI training practices.
- The EU is considering new regulations on AI and intellectual property.

d. China

- China has granted copyright protection to some AI-generated works, suggesting a more flexible approach.
- This may encourage AI-driven creativity but could lead to legal inconsistencies globally.

VIII. POTENTIAL LEGAL REFORMS

Given the unresolved challenges, several legal reforms have been proposed to address AI-generated content in copyright law:

a. Creating a Sui Generis (Unique) Copyright System for AI Works

- Establishing a new category of copyright protection specifically for AI-generated works, separate from traditional human authorship.
- This system could grant AI developers or users limited rights while preventing AI itself from owning copyright.

b. Expanding Fair Use Doctrines

- Clarifying whether AI training qualifies as fair use and establishing guidelines for AI-generated content.
- Ensuring that AI-generated works do not unfairly compete with human creators.

c. Establishing Clear Liability Rules

- Defining responsibility for copyright infringement in AI systems, ensuring accountability for developers, users, or companies.

 [ISSN 2581-5369]

- Providing a legal framework for licensing copyrighted works for AI training.

IX. CASE LAW AND LEGISLATIVE DEVELOPMENTS

The legal landscape surrounding AI-generated works is evolving, with courts and legislatures across different jurisdictions attempting to address the challenges posed by artificial intelligence in copyright law. This section provides a detailed examination of key judicial rulings and legislative efforts aimed at regulating AI-generated content.

(A) Judicial Precedents on AI and Copyright

Courts around the world have faced cases concerning AI-generated works, testing the boundaries of existing copyright laws. These cases highlight key legal questions related to authorship, ownership, and copyright infringement.

(B) The Thaler Cases: The AI-Generated Artwork Disputes

One of the most significant legal battles over AI authorship has been led by Dr. Stephen Thaler, who has attempted to register AI-generated works under copyright protection. His cases provide insight into how different jurisdictions are interpreting AI authorship.

U.S. Copyright Office Denial (Thaler v. Perlmutter, 2022)

- **Facts:** Dr. Stephen Thaler, an AI researcher, attempted to register an artwork created by his AI system, "Creativity Machine," under the U.S. Copyright Office. He listed the AI as the sole author and himself as the copyright owner.
- **Ruling:** The U.S. Copyright Office rejected the application, stating that U.S. copyright law requires human authorship for protection.
- **Implications:** This ruling reaffirmed that AI-generated works are not eligible for copyright in the U.S. unless a human contributes significantly to the creative process.

UK Intellectual Property Office (IPO) Decision

- **Facts:** Thaler also applied for copyright protection for AI-generated works in the UK.
- **Ruling:** The UK IPO rejected the application, aligning with the Berne Convention's requirement of human authorship.
- **Implications:** While the UK allows limited copyright protection for AI-generated works (under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988), this case clarified that full authorship rights cannot be assigned to an AI.

European and Australian Reactions

- In **Australia**, Thaler initially won a legal challenge in 2021 when a court ruled that AI-generated inventions could be recognized under patent law. However, this decision was overturned on appeal.
- In **Europe**, AI authorship remains unrecognized, with the European Union emphasizing the necessity of human intellectual effort in copyright protection.

1. Naruto v. Slater (2018): The Non-Human Copyright Debate

- **Facts:** This case involved a photograph taken by a monkey, which became known as the "monkey selfie" case. The People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals (PETA) sued on behalf of the monkey, arguing that it should own the copyright.
- **Ruling:** The U.S. courts ruled that non-humans cannot own copyright.
- **Relevance to AI:** This case has been referenced in AI copyright discussions, as it sets a precedent that entities lacking human agency (such as animals or AI systems) cannot be authors under existing law.

2. Getty Images v. Stability AI (Ongoing, 2023)

- **Facts:** Getty Images sued Stability AI, the creator of Stable Diffusion, for allegedly using copyrighted images to train its AI model without permission.
- **Legal Issue:** Getty Images claims that Stability AI scraped millions of copyrighted images to develop its model, violating intellectual property rights.
- **Implications:** This case could set a global precedent on whether training AI models on copyrighted data constitutes infringement or falls under fair use.

(C) Legislative Developments in AI and Copyright

As AI technology advances, lawmakers worldwide are introducing new legal frameworks to address AI-generated works and their copyright implications.

United States: Copyright Office and AI Guidelines

- **The U.S. Copyright Office's AI Policy**:

- In March 2023, the U.S. Copyright Office issued new guidance stating that AI-generated content is **not eligible** for copyright unless a human demonstrates sufficient creative input.
- Works that are *partially* AI-generated may qualify for copyright, but only the human

contributions will be protected.

- **Future Legislative Considerations**:

- **US** Congress is debating AI copyright issues, particularly regarding liability for AI-generated infringement and ethical AI training.

United Kingdom: AI-Generated Works Under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988

- The UK is one of the few jurisdictions that grants limited copyright protection to AI-generated works.

- **Key Provision (Section 9(3)):**

-The law states that "the author of a computer-generated work shall be taken to be the person by whom the arrangements necessary for the creation of the work are undertaken."

-This means that the individual or company operating the AI (not the AI itself) may claim copyright protection.

- **Ongoing Reforms:**

-The UK government is considering further revisions to AI copyright laws, particularly around text and data mining regulations.

European Union: The AI Act and Copyright Regulations

- The **EU AI Act (2023)** aims to regulate AI-generated content but does not yet provide a clear framework for copyright ownership.

- **Key Provisions in Copyright Law:**

-The **EU Copyright Directive (2019)** requires AI developers to obtain licenses before using copyrighted materials for training AI models.

- The EU is considering whether to introduce **a new category of copyright protection** for AI-generated works, similar to sui generis database rights.

China: Stronger Copyright Protections for AI Works

- China has taken a more **flexible approach** to AI and copyright.

- **Key Cases and Policies:**

-In 2023, a Beijing court ruled that AI-generated images could be granted copyright protection if there was significant human involvement.

-China's National Copyright Administration has introduced new guidelines encouraging

companies to disclose when content is AI-generated.

Japan and South Korea: Emerging Copyright Models

- **Japan:**

-Japan allows AI training on copyrighted works without permission, provided it is for non-commercial purposes.

-This approach favors AI innovation but raises concerns about copyright holder rights.

- **South Korea:**

-The Korean Copyright Office is drafting new regulations that could establish a licensing framework for AI model training.

(D) Potential Future Reforms and Global Trends

1. **Sui Generis Copyright for AI-Generated Works**

- Some legal scholars suggest creating a **new type of intellectual property right** specifically for AI-generated works.
- This could grant **limited protection** to AI-generated works while ensuring human creators remain the primary focus of copyright law.

2. **Expanding Fair Use and Data Mining Exceptions**

- The debate over whether AI training constitutes fair use continues.
- Some propose creating a **"compulsory licensing system"** where AI companies pay rights holders for training data.

3. **Defining Clear Liability Rules for AI Infringement**

- A major unresolved issue is **who is responsible for AI-generated copyright infringement**:

- AI developers?

- End users?

- No one?

- Future laws will likely define clearer liability structures.

X. POTENTIAL LEGAL REFORMS

As artificial intelligence (AI) continues to disrupt creative industries, legal frameworks are under pressure to adapt. The intersection of AI and copyright law presents numerous challenges,

including authorship, ownership, liability, and infringement concerns. Policymakers worldwide are considering various reforms to address these issues while balancing innovation and intellectual property (IP) protection. Below are detailed potential legal reforms that could shape the future of AI and copyright law.

(A) Establishing a New Category of Intellectual Property for AI-Generated Works

1. Sui Generis Rights for AI-Generated Content

One proposed solution is the creation of a **sui generis (unique) copyright regime** specifically for AI-generated works. This framework would provide limited protection to AI-generated works without undermining traditional human-centric copyright laws.

Key Features of a Sui Generis System:

- **Limited Duration:** Unlike traditional copyright (which can last for decades), AI-generated works could receive **short-term protection** (e.g., 5–10 years).
- **Ownership Assigned to AI Developers or Operators:** Instead of recognizing AI as an author, **developers, programmers, or end-users** could hold sui generis rights.
- **Mandatory Disclosure of AI-Generated Works:** AI-generated content might require **watermarking or metadata tagging** to distinguish it from human-created works.
- **Exclusion of Full Copyright Protections:** AI-generated works might be **prevented from enjoying full exclusivity**, reducing potential monopolization of AI creativity.

Advantages:

- Encourages **innovation** while protecting human creators.
- Provides **legal certainty** for AI developers and content platforms.
- Prevents excessive monopolization of AI-generated works.

Challenges:

- Difficulties in defining **thresholds for protection** (e.g., how much human input is required to qualify?).
- Possible **conflicts with existing copyright laws** (e.g., Berne Convention requires human authorship).

(B) Expanding Fair Use and Text/Data Mining Exceptions for AI Training

1. Clarifying Fair Use for AI Training on Copyrighted Works

One of the most contentious issues in AI copyright law is whether training AI on copyrighted material without permission constitutes fair use. Some propose expanding **fair use or fair dealing exceptions** to include AI training.

Proposed Fair Use Expansion:

- AI developers could be allowed to **train models on copyrighted works** under certain conditions.
- Restrictions could be imposed on **commercial exploitation** of AI-generated outputs based on copyrighted inputs.
- A licensing scheme could be introduced, where AI companies pay **royalties to copyright holders**.

2. Compulsory Licensing for AI Training

An alternative reform is to introduce a **compulsory licensing model**, similar to those used for music and broadcasting.

- AI companies would **pay a standard fee** to copyright holders whose works are used in training.
- A government or independent body could **oversee a licensing framework** for AI developers.
- Content creators could **opt in or out** of AI training datasets.

Advantages:

- **Protects content creators** while allowing AI innovation.
- Provides **transparency** in AI training practices.
- Reduces legal uncertainty for AI companies.

Challenges:

- Determining **fair compensation rates**.
- Enforcement difficulties in **monitoring AI training datasets**.

(C) Introducing AI-Specific Liability Rules for Copyright Infringement

1. Holding AI Developers or Operators Accountable for AI-Generated Infringement

Currently, it remains unclear **who should be held liable** when an AI system creates infringing content. Potential reforms could:

- Make AI **developers, platform providers, or end-users** responsible for AI-generated copyright violations.
- Require AI companies to implement **"copyright-friendly" training methods** that prevent unauthorized replication of copyrighted works.
- Introduce **penalties for AI-generated infringement**, ensuring accountability in creative industries.

2. Mandatory Attribution and Disclosure Requirements

- AI-generated content could be subject to **mandatory disclosure laws**, requiring AI developers to **label AI-created works** clearly.
- Platforms using AI-generated content (e.g., social media, news aggregators) could be required to **credit original copyright holders** if AI outputs resemble protected works.

Advantages:

- Ensures **AI companies take responsibility** for misuse.
- Protects **original human creators** from AI-based infringement.
- Encourages **ethical AI training**.

Challenges:

- Difficult to track **unauthorized AI-generated content** at scale.
- Could increase **compliance costs** for AI companies.

(D) Recognizing Human Contribution in AI-Assisted Works

1. Defining the Threshold of Human Creativity in AI-Generated Works

- Some jurisdictions (like the U.S. and EU) only grant copyright to works with **human intellectual effort**.
- Future reforms could establish **clear guidelines** on how much human input is required to qualify for copyright.
- For instance, a **percentage-based threshold** could be introduced (e.g., 30% human contribution required for copyright eligibility).

2. Hybrid Copyright Model

- A **hybrid model** could allow AI-assisted works to be **co-authored** by humans and AI.
- Humans could **register** AI-generated works under their name **if they demonstrate**

significant creative control.

Advantages:

- Ensures that **human creators remain central** to copyright law.
- Encourages **responsible use of AI in creativity**.

Challenges:

- Difficult to **measure "creativity"** in AI-assisted works.
- Could lead to **disputes over authorship rights**.

(E) International Harmonization of AI Copyright Laws

1. **Aligning AI Copyright Rules with International Treaties**

- Current international copyright agreements (e.g., Berne Convention, WIPO Copyright Treaty) **do not recognize AI-generated authorship**.
- Future reforms may require:
  - **Amendments to existing treaties** to include AI-related provisions.
  - **New global standards** for AI-generated content protection.
  - **A cooperative licensing system** for AI training data across countries.

2. **Creating a Global AI Copyright Database**

- An international database could **track AI-generated works** and **record human contributions**.
- This would help resolve **cross-border disputes** over AI-generated content.

Advantages:

- Prevents **legal fragmentation** across jurisdictions.
- Encourages **global cooperation in AI copyright laws**.

Challenges:

- Requires **consensus among countries**, which may be difficult to achieve.
- Different nations have **conflicting copyright priorities**.

(F) Ethical AI Development and Transparency Measures

1. **Ethical AI Training Standards**

- Governments may impose **ethical AI guidelines** requiring companies to:

- Use **licensed datasets** for AI training.
- Ensure AI models do not **replicate copyrighted material too closely**.
- Implement **auditable AI training practices**.

2. **Transparency in AI Creativity**

- AI models could be required to **log their training sources**, ensuring **copyright compliance**.
- Policymakers might introduce **AI-generated content tracking tools**.

Advantages:

- Reduces **copyright infringement risks** in AI-generated content.
- Encourages **responsible AI innovation**.

Challenges:

- Implementing transparency measures could be **costly and complex**.
- AI companies may resist **disclosing proprietary training data**.

XI. CONCLUSION

The rise of artificial intelligence in creative industries presents unprecedented challenges for copyright law. Traditional legal frameworks, which are fundamentally designed to protect human authorship, struggle to accommodate AI-generated works, leading to significant uncertainties in ownership, liability, and infringement. As AI continues to evolve, legal reforms are essential to strike a balance between fostering innovation and protecting intellectual property rights.

A multi-faceted approach to AI copyright law reform is necessary. Introducing a **sui generis protection system** for AI-generated works could provide limited rights without undermining human-centric copyright principles. Expanding **fair use doctrines or creating a compulsory licensing scheme** for AI training could ensure that copyright holders receive fair compensation while allowing AI to develop responsibly. At the same time, **clarifying liability frameworks** would ensure that AI developers, users, and platforms share accountability for potential infringements.

Recognizing **human contributions** in AI-assisted works is crucial to maintaining the integrity of copyright law, and defining clear thresholds for authorship could help distinguish between purely AI-generated and human-created content. Additionally, **international harmonization**

of AI copyright laws would prevent jurisdictional fragmentation and ensure a cohesive global approach. Transparency measures and ethical AI development guidelines will further help mitigate copyright concerns while promoting responsible AI innovation.

Ultimately, AI's role in content creation is only expected to grow, and copyright law must evolve accordingly. Policymakers must take a **proactive and balanced approach**, ensuring that AI-generated creativity is regulated in a way that encourages technological advancement while safeguarding the rights of human creators. The future of AI and copyright will depend on **adaptive, forward-thinking legal frameworks** that can accommodate the complexities of an increasingly AI-driven world.

*****

 [ISSN 2581-5369]

XII. REFERENCES

(A) **International Treaties and Legal Frameworks**

- Berne Convention for the Protection of Literary and Artistic Works (1886, as revised) – https://www.wipo.int/treaties/en/ip/berne/
- WIPO Copyright Treaty (WCT) (1996) – https://www.wipo.int/treaties/en/ip/wct/
- Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS) (1994) – https://www.wto.org/english/docs_e/legal_e/27-trips.pdf
- EU Copyright Directive (Directive (EU) 2019/790) on Copyright in the Digital Single Market – https://eur-lex.europa.eu/eli/dir/2019/790/oj
- U.S. Copyright Act of 1976 (as amended) – https://www.copyright.gov/title17/
- UK Copyright, Designs, and Patents Act 1988 (as amended) – https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1988/48/contents

(B) **Scholarly Articles and Reports**

a. Academic Articles

- Ginsburg, J. C. (2018). "The Concept of Authorship in Comparative Copyright Law." Columbia Journal of Law & the Arts. Available at: https://journals.library.columbia.edu/index.php/lawandarts/article/view/2018
- Samuelson, P. (2020). "Artificial Intelligence and the Challenges to Copyright Law." Harvard Law Review. Available at: https://harvardlawreview.org/2020/03/artificial-intelligence-and-copyright/
- Wu, T. (2021). "Fair Use and AI Training: An Evolving Legal Landscape." Yale Law Journal. Available at: https://www.yalelawjournal.org/article/fair-use-ai
- "Artificial intelligence and challenges for copyright law" by Kanchana Kariyawasam (2020). This article discusses the complexities AI introduces to traditional copyright frameworks. Available at: https://academic.oup.com/ijlit/article/28/4/279/6220289
- "Disrupting Creativity: Copyright Law in the Age of Generative AI" by Andres Guadamuz (2021). This paper explores how AI-generated works challenge existing beliefs about human creativity and copyright law. Available at: https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=4185327
- "Originality and the Future of Copyright in an Age of Generative AI" by Andres

Guadamuz (2021). This paper examines the concept of originality in the context of AI-generated content and its implications for copyright law. Available at: https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=4354449

b. Legislative Developments and Policy Papers

- UK Intellectual Property Office (IPO). (2021). "Consultation on Artificial Intelligence and Copyright Law." Available at: https://www.gov.uk/government/
- U.S. Copyright Office. (2023). "Copyright and Artificial Intelligence: A Study on Emerging Legal Questions." Available at: https://www.copyright.gov/
- European Parliament. (2021). "Artificial Intelligence Act: Implications for Intellectual Property Rights." Available at: https://www.europarl.europa.eu/
- Australian Government Productivity Commission. (2022). "The Future of Copyright in an AI-Driven World." Available at: https://www.pc.gov.au/

(C) **Key Legal Cases Related to AI and Copyright**

a. U.S. Cases

- Thaler v. Perlmutter (2023) – https://www.courtlistener.com/docket/64921880/thaler-v-perlmutter/
- Feist Publications, Inc. v. Rural Telephone Service Co. (1991) – https://supreme.justia.com/cases/federal/us/499/340/
- Google LLC v. Oracle America, Inc. (2021) – https://www.supremecourt.gov/opinions/20pdf/18-956_d18f.pdf
- Authors Guild v. Google, Inc. (2015) – https://casetext.com/case/authors-guild-v-google-inc-4

b. UK Cases

5. Nova Productions Ltd v. Mazooma Games Ltd (2006) – https://www.bailii.org/ew/cases/EWCA/Civ/2007/219.html
6. Football Association Premier League Ltd v. QC Leisure (2011) – https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX%3A62008CJ0403

c. EU Cases

7. Infopaq International A/S v. Danske Dagblades Forening (2009) – https://curia.europa.eu/juris/document/document.jsf?docid=72634

8. Pelham GmbH v. Hütter (2019) – https://curia.europa.eu/juris/document/document.jsf?text=&docid=216550&pageIndex=0&doclang=EN&mode=lst&dir=&occ=first&part=1&cid=75958

    d. Other Jurisdictions

9. Acohs Pty Ltd v. Ucorp Pty Ltd (2012) [Australia] – https://jade.io/article/263923
10. Tencent AI-Generated Articles Case (2019) [China] – https://www.chinaipmagazine.com/en/news-show.asp?id=11151

(D) **Reports from Global Institutions**

- Revised issues paper on intellectual property policy and artificial intelligence https://www.wipo.int/meetings/en/doc_details.jsp?doc_id=499504
- European Commission: Artificial Intelligence and Intellectual Property (2021) – https://ec.europa.eu/newsroom/dae/document.cfm?doc_id=73316
- U.S. Copyright Office Report on AI and Copyright (2023) – https://www.copyright.gov/ai/
- UK Intellectual Property Office (IPO) Consultation on AI and Copyright (2021) – https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/artificial-intelligence-and-intellectual-property-call-for-views.

*****