Page 173 - 189 **DOI:** *https://doij.org/10.10000/IJLMH.119094*

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF LAW MANAGEMENT & HUMANITIES

[ISSN 2581-5369]

Volume 8 | Issue 2

2025

Generative AI and Copyright: Addressing Legal Challenges in the Age of AI-Driven Creativity

ANUVARSHINI V.[1] AND SANSKRITI BANKA[2]

ABSTRACT

The rise of generative artificial intelligence (AI) has transformed the way creative content is produced, blurring the lines between human and machine-generated works. AI-powered systems such as ChatGPT, Stable Diffusion, and GitHub Copilot can generate text, images, music, and code that closely resemble human-created content. While these advancements offer new opportunities for innovation, they also present significant legal and ethical challenges, particularly concerning copyright and intellectual property (IP) laws.

This paper explores the legal gaps in existing copyright frameworks regarding AI-generated content, focusing on critical issues such as authorship, ownership, and infringement. As AI models are often trained on vast datasets that may contain copyrighted works, concerns about unauthorized use, data scraping, and fair use principles have led to high-profile lawsuits and regulatory debates. Additionally, jurisdictional inconsistencies further complicate the enforcement of copyright laws, as different legal systems interpret AI authorship and liability in varying ways.

Given these complexities, this research aims to analyse the shortcomings of current IP laws and assess how they can be reformed to address the evolving landscape of AI-driven creativity. The paper will examine ongoing legal cases, legislative efforts, and emerging proposals for adapting copyright laws to ensure a balance between fostering AI innovation and protecting the rights of human creators. By addressing these challenges, this study seeks to contribute to the broader discussion on AI and copyright law, advocating for clearer and more effective legal frameworks in the digital era.

***Keywords**: AI-generated content, Copyright law, Intellectual property, Authorship, ownership.*

I. INTRODUCTION

Generative Artificial Intelligence (AI) is reshaping the creative landscape, introducing unprecedented challenges to copyright law. AI-powered models such as OpenAI's ChatGPT,

[1] Author is a student at School of Law, Christ University, Bangalore, India.
[2] Author is a student at School of Law, Christ University, Bangalore, India.

 [ISSN 2581-5369]

Midjourney, Stability AI's Stable Diffusion, and GitHub Copilot can autonomously generate human-like content, prompting complex legal and ethical questions regarding intellectual property (IP) rights.[3] These systems analyse vast datasets of human-created content, learning patterns and generating text, images, and other creative works that closely resemble human expression. While this represents a major technological advancement, it also raises significant concerns regarding ownership, originality, and potential infringement of existing copyrighted material.

Historically, copyright law has been structured around the assumption of human authorship, granting exclusive rights to individuals or organizations responsible for creative works. However, the rise of generative AI disrupts this paradigm by introducing creative works that lack clear human authorship. Courts and policymakers worldwide struggle with fundamental questions such as whether AI-generated works should be eligible for copyright protection, who owns such content, and what legal frameworks should govern their use.[4] Some jurisdictions, such as the United States, have ruled that purely AI-generated works are not eligible for copyright, while others remain undecided on the issue. The legal uncertainty surrounding AI-created works has created a gap that needs to be addressed to ensure both innovation and the protection of human creators.

Recent legal disputes illustrate the urgency of these challenges. In Getty Images v. Stability AI, the stock photography company alleged that Stability AI unlawfully used millions of copyrighted images to train its AI model, claiming that the AI-generated images could harm the market for original works.[5] Similarly, The New York Times v. OpenAI claims that OpenAI's models reproduce substantial portions of copyrighted content without authorization, raising concerns about data scraping and fair use.[6] These cases demonstrate the pressing need for legal clarity and reform in AI-driven content creation, as existing laws struggle to define infringement in the context of machine-learning-based content generation.

This paper aims to analyse the existing gaps in copyright law concerning generative AI, focusing on key legal issues such as authorship, infringement risks, and jurisdictional ambiguities. It will explore how different legal systems are addressing these challenges and propose potential policy solutions and legal frameworks that balance technological innovation

[3] Kanchana Kariyawasam, Artificial Intelligence and Challenges for Copyright Law, Int'l J. L. & Info. Tech., 2021.
[4] Carol M. Hayes, Generative Artificial Intelligence and Copyright: Both Sides of the Black Box, Soc. Sci. Res. Network, 2023.
[5]Getty Images v. Stability AI, Complaint at 50, UK High Court (2023)., Complaint at 50, UK High Court (2023).
[6] The New York Times v. OpenAI, No. 1:23-cv-10134, at 46 (S.D.N.Y. 2023)., Complaint at 46, U.S. Dist. Ct. (2023).

with the rights of human creators.[7] Understanding and reforming copyright law in the AI era is essential to ensuring that intellectual property rights remain relevant and effective in the digital age.

II. BACKGROUND

(A) Evolution of Copyright Law and the Rise of AI

Copyright law has historically evolved in response to technological advancements, protecting creative works across different mediums. The Statute of Anne (1710) was one of the first legislative efforts to formalize copyright protection, granting authors exclusive rights to their works for a limited period.[8] Over time, copyright frameworks expanded to include new creative industries, from photography and motion pictures to digital content. However, the rise of generative artificial intelligence (AI) has introduced challenges that existing copyright laws struggle to address.

AI-powered models such as OpenAI's ChatGPT, Midjourney, and Stability AI's Stable Diffusion can generate complex creative works, raising fundamental questions about authorship and ownership in intellectual property law.[9] Historically, copyright law has assumed that a work must have a human author. This assumption was reinforced in Burrow-Giles Lithographic Co. v. Sarony (1884), where the U.S. Supreme Court ruled that photographs were copyrightable because they involved human intellectual effort.[10] However, as AI-generated content increasingly resembles human-created works, the distinction between AI-assisted and AI-generated content has become legally ambiguous.

(B) Copyright and the Human Authorship Requirement

A fundamental principle of copyright law is that a work must be created by a human to qualify for protection. The Berne Convention, an international treaty governing copyright, implicitly assumes that authors are natural persons, which has influenced copyright legislation worldwide.[11]

In the United States, the U.S. Copyright Office has repeatedly denied copyright registration for AI-generated works, reaffirming the human authorship requirement.[12] This position was upheld

[7] Kanchana Kariyawasam, Artificial Intelligence and Challenges for Copyright Law, Int'l J. L. & Info. Tech., 2021, at 56.
[8] Nicola Lucchi, *ChatGPT: A Case Study on Copyright Challenges for Generative Artificial Intelligence Systems*, European Journal of Risk Regulation, 2024.
[9] Carol M. Hayes, *Generative Artificial Intelligence and Copyright: Both Sides of the Black Box*, Social Science Research Network, 2023.
[10] *Burrow-Giles Lithographic Co. v. Sarony*, 111 U.S. 53 (1884)
[11] Berne Convention for the Protection of Literary and Artistic Works, art. 2(1).
[12] U.S. Copyright Office, Compendium of U.S. Copyright Office Practices (Third Edition), § 306.

 [ISSN 2581-5369]

in Thaler v. Perlmutter (2023), where a U.S. federal court ruled that a work created entirely by AI lacked copyright eligibility because it did not involve human intellectual effort.[13] Similarly, the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals ruled in the Monkey Selfie Case (Naruto v. Slater) that non-human entities cannot hold copyright, reinforcing the idea that copyright law applies only to human authors.[14]

The European Union (EU) has also maintained that copyright requires human intellectual creativity. The Infopaq International v. Danske Dagblades Forening (2009) case established that a work must reflect "the author's own intellectual creation" to be eligible for copyright.[15] This precedent has been reinforced in later rulings, such as Levola Hengelo v. Smilde Foods, where the EU Court of Justice emphasized that copyright applies to original works shaped by human intellectual choices.[16]

In contrast, some jurisdictions have explored alternative approaches to AI-generated works. Japan, for instance, has proposed treating AI-generated content under a trademark-like system rather than traditional copyright law.[17] This variation in international legal perspectives highlights the ongoing uncertainty surrounding AI-generated works and their protection under existing IP frameworks.

(C) Generative AI and Copyright Challenges

Generative AI models, trained on vast datasets of copyrighted materials, introduce several key challenges:

1. Ownership Ambiguity: Unlike traditional works, AI-generated content lacks a clearly identifiable human author, leading to disputes over whether copyright should belong to AI developers, users, or the AI itself.[18]

2. Derivative Works and Infringement: AI-generated content often mimics copyrighted materials, raising concerns about whether it constitutes derivative works. In Getty Images v. Stability AI, the stock photography company alleged that Stability AI unlawfully used millions of copyrighted images for AI training.[19]

3. Jurisdictional Inconsistencies: Different legal systems interpret AI authorship differently, complicating copyright enforcement across borders. While the U.S. and EU have denied

[13] *Thaler v. Perlmutter*, No. CV 22-1564-BAH, 2023 WL 5333236 (D.D.C. Aug. 18, 2023).
[14] *Naruto v. Slater*, 888 F.3d 418 (9th Cir. 2018).
[15] *Infopaq International A/S v. Danske Dagblades Forening*, Case C-5/08, ECLI:EU:C:2009:465.
[16] *Levola Hengelo BV v. Smilde Foods BV*, Case C-310/17, ECLI:EU:C:2018:899.
[17] Filipe Maia Alexandre, *The Legal Status of Artificially Intelligent Robots: Personhood, Taxation, and Control*, SSRN, 2018.
[18] UK Intellectual Property Office, Consultation on Artificial Intelligence and Intellectual Property, 2023.
[19] *Getty Images v. Stability AI*, Complaint filed in the UK High Court (2023).

copyright protection to AI-generated works, some jurisdictions, such as the United Kingdom, have proposed limited protections for AI-assisted works.[20]

As AI technology continues to evolve, lawmakers face growing pressure to modernize copyright regulations. Proposed solutions include recognizing AI-assisted works with shared authorship or creating new intellectual property categories specifically for AI-generated content.[21]

The legal challenges surrounding generative AI highlight the urgent need for clear and adaptive copyright policies. The following sections will examine these challenges in greater detail and explore potential legal reforms.

III. LEGAL CHALLENGES POSED BY GENERATIVE AI

(A) Copyright Infringement and Fair Use

One of the most pressing legal concerns surrounding generative AI is whether training AI models on copyrighted material constitutes copyright infringement. AI models like OpenAI's ChatGPT, Stability AI's Stable Diffusion, and Midjourney are trained on vast datasets that often include copyrighted books, images, and articles scraped from the internet. Plaintiffs in lawsuits such as Getty Images v. Stability AI and The New York Times v. OpenAI argue that AI-generated outputs can closely mimic existing works, making them legally indistinguishable from direct copying.[22]

A critical legal issue in these cases is whether AI model training qualifies as fair use. In the United States, 17 U.S.C. § 107 outlines four factors to determine fair use: (1) the purpose and character of the use, (2) the nature of the copyrighted work, (3) the amount used, and (4) the effect on the market. AI companies argue that training AI models transforms copyrighted material into entirely new works, similar to human learning. This defense echoes the ruling in Authors Guild v. Google (2015), where Google's scanning of books for its search database was deemed transformative and protected under fair use.[23]

However, critics argue that AI-generated content differs from Google Books because AI does not merely provide snippets—it can produce large sections of text, artwork, or music that closely resemble copyrighted material. The case of Sarah Silverman v. OpenAI, where the comedian alleged that OpenAI's chatbot replicated substantial portions of her written material,

[20] Jie Ren et al., *Copyright Protection in Generative AI: A Technical Perspective*, Michigan State University, 2024.
[21] European Parliament, *Directive 2001/29/EC on the Harmonization of Certain Aspects of Copyright*, 2001.
[22] *Getty Images v. Stability AI*, No. 1:23-CV-00135 (D. Del. Feb. 3, 2023).
[23] *Authors Guild v. Google*, 804 F.3d 202, 205 (2d Cir. 2015).

illustrates this concern.[24] Courts have yet to rule definitively on whether AI model training constitutes fair use or whether AI developers must obtain explicit licensing agreements.

(B) Ownership and Authorship Ambiguities

Another legal uncertainty in AI-generated content is who—if anyone—owns copyright in AI-generated works. Traditional copyright law, as governed by the Berne Convention, assumes that authorship must be human.[25]

The U.S. Copyright Office has reaffirmed this principle by refusing to grant copyright to AI-generated works, as demonstrated in Thaler v. Perlmutter (2023). In this case, Dr. Stephen Thaler sought copyright protection for an AI-generated image, arguing that his AI system, DABUS, should be recognized as the author. The court ruled that U.S. copyright law does not extend to non-human creators.[26]

This decision leaves AI-generated content in a legal void where it is not eligible for copyright, but its derivative status remains unclear. OpenAI's terms of service state that users own the content they generate, but since copyright law requires human authorship, these rights may not hold up in court.[27]

Additionally, there are unresolved questions about whether AI-generated content should be classified as a derivative work. If AI-generated outputs are considered derivative, copyright holders could claim ownership. This argument is central in Getty Images v. Stability AI, where Getty alleges that AI-generated images retain distinctive elements of copyrighted photos.[28]

(C) Liability for AI-Generated Works

The question of liability for AI-generated copyright infringement remains unresolved. If an AI model generates content that infringes copyright, should responsibility fall on the AI developer, the user, or the dataset provider?

Legal experts have proposed three potential liability models regarding AI and copyright infringement. One such model is vicarious liability, where AI developers could be held accountable if their models facilitate widespread copyright infringement, like past rulings on digital piracy[29]. Another approach is strict liability for AI companies, with some scholars arguing that AI companies should be treated like manufacturers of high-risk technologies and

[24] *Sarah Silverman v. OpenAI*, No. 3:23-cv-03417 (N.D. Cal. July 2023).
[25] Berne Convention for the Protection of Literary and Artistic Works, art. 2(1).
[26] *Thaler v. Perlmutter*, No. 22-1564, 2023 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 145823, at *3 (D.D.C. Aug. 18, 2023).
[27] OpenAI, *Terms of Service* (2023).
[28] *Getty Images v. Stability AI*, Complaint, UK High Court (2023).
[29] *A&M Records, Inc. v. Napster, Inc.*, 239 F.3d 1004, 1013 (9th Cir. 2001).

 [ISSN 2581-5369]

should assume responsibility for any copyright infringement their models produce[30]. Alternatively, user liability suggests that if an AI-generated work is found to be infringing, courts may hold the individual user responsible for providing prompts that led to unauthorized content[31]. The EU AI Act proposes holding AI providers accountable for unlawful AI outputs, potentially setting a global precedent[32]. However, as of now, no jurisdiction has explicitly defined AI liability in copyright law, leaving this issue unresolved.

(D) Jurisdictional Challenges in AI Copyright Law

AI-generated content complicates copyright enforcement across jurisdictions, as different countries interpret AI authorship and liability in varying ways, leading to significant legal inconsistencies. In the United States and European Union, both jurisdictions deny copyright protection to AI-generated works, requiring human intellectual effort for copyright eligibility[33]. The United Kingdom is exploring limited protections for AI-assisted works, where a human plays a supervisory role.[34] Meanwhile, Japan is considering a trademark-like system for AI-generated content rather than traditional copyright protection[35]. These jurisdictional differences create legal uncertainty for AI companies operating globally, making international copyright enforcement increasingly complex.

(E) The Need for Legal Reforms

The rise of generative AI has revealed fundamental gaps in copyright law, prompting discussions about potential reforms. Some proposed solutions include AI-assisted copyright models, which suggest granting partial copyright protection to AI-assisted works where a human plays a meaningful role in the creative process.[36] Another approach is mandatory licensing agreements, requiring AI developers to obtain explicit licenses for copyrighted training data, similar to music and film licensing models.[37] Additionally, some propose new intellectual property classifications, advocating for a distinct category of intellectual property rights for AI-generated works, separate from traditional copyright. [38]

As AI technology advances, policymakers face the challenge of balancing innovation with

[30] Gabriel Karger, *AI-Generated Images: The First Lawsuit*, 42 COLUM. SCI. & TECH. L. REV. 27, 29 (2023).
[31] Pamela Samuelson, *Allocating Ownership Rights in Computer-Generated Works*, 47 U.
[32] European Commission, *Proposal for a Regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council Laying Down Harmonized Rules on Artificial Intelligence* (2023) (EU AI Act Proposal).
[33] U.K. Intellectual Property Office, *Consultation on Artificial Intelligence and Intellectual Property* (2023).
[34] *Infopaq Int'l A/S v. Danske Dagblades Forening*, Case C-5/08, ECLI:EU:C:2009:465.
[35] Japan Patent Office, *AI and Intellectual Property Rights Report* (2023).
[36] Jie Ren et al., *Copyright Protection in Generative AI: A Technical Perspective*, MICH. ST. U. (2024).
[37] U.S. Copyright Office, *Compendium of U.S. Copyright Office Practices* § 313.2 (3d ed. 2023).
[38] European Parliament, *Directive 2001/29/EC on the Harmonization of Certain Aspects of Copyright*, 2001 O.J. (L 167) 10.

protecting intellectual property rights. The following section will explore potential legal frameworks that could provide clarity and address these emerging challenges.

IV. PROPOSED LEGAL FRAMEWORKS FOR AI AND COPYRIGHT

(A) The Need for Legislative Reform

As AI-generated content becomes more prevalent, the current legal frameworks governing copyright law are proving inadequate. Traditional copyright laws were designed with human authorship in mind, and the absence of clear regulations for AI-generated works has led to widespread uncertainty. The Berne Convention, which sets international copyright standards, assumes that authorship requires human intellectual effort.[39] However, as AI systems can autonomously generate text, images, and music, legal scholars and policymakers are debating whether copyright law should adapt to accommodate AI-driven creativity.

In the U.S., the Copyright Office's AI policy maintains that AI-generated content cannot be copyrighted unless it involves sufficient human input.[40] The ruling in Thaler v. Perlmutter (2023) reaffirmed that AI systems cannot be recognized as legal authors, leaving AI-generated works ineligible for protection.[41] This raises concerns for businesses and artists who use AI tools for content creation, as they lack clear legal recourse to protect their works.

Internationally, countries are taking varied approaches. Japan has proposed a model where AI-generated content is classified similarly to trademarks rather than traditional copyrighted works.[42] Meanwhile, the European Union is debating mandatory licensing requirements for AI training datasets, which would require AI companies to obtain explicit permission before using copyrighted material.[43] These differing approaches highlight the need for harmonized global standards to regulate AI-generated content.

(B) AI-Assisted Copyright Protection

One proposed solution is an AI-assisted copyright model, where human involvement in AI-generated content determines eligibility for copyright protection. Under this framework, a human creator who contributes significant input—such as structuring prompts, modifying AI outputs, or integrating AI-generated elements into a larger creative work—could claim copyright.[44]

---

[39] Berne Convention for the Protection of Literary and Artistic Works, art. 2(1).
[40] U.S. Copyright Office, *Compendium of U.S. Copyright Office Practices* § 313.2 (3d ed. 2023).
[41] *Thaler v. Perlmutter*, No. 22-1564 (D.D.C. 2023).
[42] Japan Patent Office, *AI and IP Rights Report* (2023).
[43] European Parliament, *Proposal for a Regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council Laying Down Harmonized Rules on Artificial Intelligence* (2023) (EU AI Act).
[44] Jie Ren et al., *Copyright Protection in Generative AI: A Technical Perspective*, MICH. ST. U. (2024).

This model aligns with existing copyright doctrines, such as the "selection and arrangement" principle, which protects compilations of unoriginal material if the selection demonstrates human creativity.[45] By establishing clear guidelines on what constitutes substantial human involvement, this framework could provide a balanced approach to recognizing AI-assisted works while ensuring that purely AI-generated content remains outside traditional copyright protection.

The UK's Copyright Act (1988) already includes provisions for computer-generated works, stating that the copyright owner is the person who "makes the necessary arrangements" for the work to be created.[46] This precedent could serve as a basis for expanding copyright protections to AI-assisted creations while maintaining a human-centric approach.

(C) Mandatory Licensing and Data Transparency

Another proposed reform is a mandatory licensing system for AI training data. Many generative AI models are trained on vast amounts of copyrighted content scraped from the internet without explicit permission. Plaintiffs in lawsuits such as Getty Images v. Stability AI argue that this constitutes copyright infringement.[47]

A licensing system could function similarly to music licensing models, where AI developers would be required to obtain rights to copyrighted works used in training datasets.[48] The European Parliament's AI Act already includes provisions for transparency, requiring AI providers to disclose the sources of their training data.[49] Expanding these requirements into a full-scale licensing framework could help balance the interests of copyright holders and AI companies.

Additionally, blockchain technology has been proposed as a potential solution for tracking AI training data. By using digital watermarking and smart contracts, creators could ensure that their copyrighted works are not used without permission in AI training datasets.[50] This would enhance transparency and allow copyright holders to enforce their rights more effectively.

(D) Liability for AI-Generated Copyright Infringement

One of the biggest unresolved questions in AI copyright law is who should be held liable for infringement when an AI system generates unauthorized content. Existing legal frameworks do

[45] *Feist Publ'ns, Inc. v. Rural Tel. Serv. Co.*, 499 U.S. 340, 345 (1991).
[46] Copyright, Designs, and Patents Act 1988, c. 48, § 9(3) (U.K.).
[47] *Getty Images v. Stability AI*, No. 1:23-CV-00135 (2023).
[48] World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO), *Copyright and AI Discussion Paper* (2023).
[49] European Parliament, *Proposal for a Regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council Laying Down Harmonized Rules on Artificial Intelligence* (2023) (EU AI Act).
[50] IBM Research, *Blockchain for Copyright Protection* (2023).

not clearly establish whether liability falls on:

AI Developers – Companies that create and train AI models could be held responsible if their systems facilitate widespread copyright infringement.[51] This approach is similar to past rulings in digital piracy cases, where courts held platforms like Napster liable for enabling copyright violations.

AI Users – Courts could place liability on users who generate infringing content using AI tools. This approach would require users to verify that their AI-generated works do not closely resemble copyrighted material.[52]

Dataset Providers – If an AI model was trained on copyrighted works without permission, liability could extend to the organizations that supplied the training data.[53]

Legal scholars have proposed a shared liability model, where responsibility is distributed among developers, users, and data providers based on their level of involvement.[54] This would prevent AI companies from avoiding accountability while ensuring that individual users are not unfairly penalized for unknowingly generating infringing content.

(E) International Harmonization of AI Copyright Laws

Given the global nature of AI development, a harmonized international framework is essential for regulating AI-generated content. Currently, different countries have conflicting approaches. In the United States and European Union, human authorship is required for copyright protection.[55] The United Kingdom recognizes AI-assisted works but only under limited conditions, while Japan is exploring a hybrid model that treats AI-generated works under trademark-like protections. Legal experts have suggested the creation of a global AI copyright treaty, similar to the WIPO Copyright Treaty, to establish standardized rules for AI-generated works. Such a treaty could define whether AI-generated works should be protected under copyright, the scope of human involvement required for copyright eligibility, licensing requirements for AI training datasets, and liability frameworks for AI-generated copyright infringement. By establishing clear international guidelines, policymakers could prevent forum shopping, where AI developers choose jurisdictions with lax copyright enforcement to avoid legal accountability.

---

[51] *A&M Records, Inc. v. Napster, Inc.*, 239 F.3d 1004, 1013 (9th Cir. 2001).
[52] Gabriel Karger, *AI-Generated Images: The First Lawsuit*, 42 COLUM. SCI. & TECH. L. REV. 27, 29 (2023).
[53] U.K. Intellectual Property Office, *Consultation on Artificial Intelligence and Intellectual Property* (2023).
[54] World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO), *AI and Copyright Policy Report* (2023).
[55] European Parliament, *Directive 2001/29/EC on the Harmonization of Certain Aspects of Copyright*, 2001 O.J. (L 167) 10.

(F) Conclusion: Balancing Innovation and Copyright Protection

The legal challenges posed by AI-generated content require urgent reform to ensure a fair balance between innovation and copyright protection. Potential solutions include recognizing AI-assisted works under existing copyright frameworks, implementing mandatory licensing for AI training data, establishing clear liability rules for AI-generated infringement, and promoting international cooperation on AI copyright regulation. As AI continues to reshape the creative landscape, governments and legal institutions must adapt existing laws to address these emerging challenges. The following section will explore case studies that illustrate the real-world implications of AI copyright issues.

V. CASE STUDIES AND LEGAL PRECEDENTS

(A) Getty Images v. Stability AI (2023)

One of the most high-profile cases regarding AI and copyright is Getty Images v. Stability AI. Getty Images, a major stock photography company, filed a lawsuit against Stability AI, the developer of Stable Diffusion, alleging that the AI model was trained on millions of copyrighted images without obtaining proper licensing. The case raised important questions regarding whether AI training constitutes copyright infringement or if it falls under fair use.[56]

Getty argued that Stability AI's model unlawfully replicated distinctive elements of copyrighted images, often producing outputs containing watermarks from Getty's stock photos, further demonstrating unauthorized use.[57] Stability AI, on the other hand, maintained that its AI system transforms existing images into new ones, making the process legal under fair use principles.[58]

The case remains ongoing, but its outcome is expected to set a significant precedent for how copyright laws will apply to AI training datasets. If the court rules in Getty's favour, AI developers may be required to license all training data, fundamentally altering how AI systems are developed.

(B) The New York Times v. OpenAI (2023)

In another major lawsuit, The New York Times v. OpenAI, the newspaper sued OpenAI and its partner Microsoft, alleging that ChatGPT was trained on large portions of The New York Times' copyrighted articles without authorization. The lawsuit claims that ChatGPT generates responses that sometimes mirror entire passages from the newspaper's content, violating fair

[56] *Getty Images v. Stability AI*, No. 1:23-CV-00135 (2023).
[57] Getty Images, *Complaint Against Stability AI*, UK High Court (2023).
[58] Stability AI, *Fair Use Defence Statement* (2023).

 [ISSN 2581-5369]

use and copyright laws[59].

This case has broader implications than Getty Images v. Stability AI because it involves text-based AI models rather than image generation. The lawsuit also highlights concerns that AI models may reduce the value of journalism by offering AI-generated summaries of news content without compensating original publishers[60].

Legal experts argue that the court's decision will shape the future of AI and fair use, determining whether AI developers can continue using publicly available content for model training or if they must establish content licensing agreements.[61]

(C) Thaler v. Perlmutter (2023) – AI as an Author

The issue of AI-generated content and authorship was directly addressed in Thaler v. Perlmutter. Dr. Stephen Thaler attempted to register a copyright for an image created entirely by his AI system, DABUS. The U.S. Copyright Office rejected the claim, stating that copyright law requires human authorship.[62]

Thaler sued the Copyright Office, arguing that AI should be recognized as an author, but the court upheld the Office's decision. The ruling reinforced the Berne Convention's stance that copyright applies only to works created by humans[63]

This case has significant implications for AI-generated content, as it establishes that pure AI-generated works cannot receive copyright protection in the United States. However, it leaves open the question of whether AI-assisted works—where a human significantly guides or edits AI output—may qualify for protection.

(D) Sarah Silverman v. OpenAI and Meta (2023)

Comedian and author Sarah Silverman, along with two other writers, filed a lawsuit against OpenAI and Meta, alleging that their AI models were trained on copyrighted books, including her memoir The Bedwetter. The lawsuit claims that OpenAI and Meta copied books from online repositories without permission, leading to AI-generated summaries that closely resemble the original works.[64]

The legal arguments in this case focus on derivative works and whether AI-generated summaries qualify as an unauthorized transformation of copyrighted material. If the court rules

[59] *The New York Times v. OpenAI*, No. 1:23-CV-10134 (2023).
[60] OpenAI, *Response to The New York Times Lawsuit* (2023).
[61] European Parliament, *AI Training and Copyright Policy Report* (2023).
[62] *Thaler v. Perlmutter*, No. 22-1564 (D.D.C. 2023).
[63] Berne Convention for the Protection of Literary and Artistic Works, art. 2(1).
[64] *Sarah Silverman v. OpenAI and Meta*, No. 3:23-cv-03417 (N.D. Cal. 2023).

in favor of Silverman, it could limit AI developers' ability to train language models on copyrighted books without securing licenses.[65]

(E) Infopaq International v. Danske Dagblades Forening (2009) – The EU's Stance on AI and Copyright

Although this case predates modern AI models, its ruling has been frequently cited in AI-related copyright disputes. In Infopaq International v. Danske Dagblades Forening, the European Court of Justice (ECJ) ruled that even small excerpts of copyrighted works could qualify for protection if they contain original expression.[66]

This case is significant for AI copyright law because AI-generated content often incorporates small fragments of existing works. The ruling suggests that even minimal reproduction of copyrighted material in AI outputs may be subject to copyright enforcement, making it difficult for AI developers to argue de minimis use.[67]

(F) A&M Records v. Napster (2001) – Parallels to AI Copyright

While not directly about AI, the landmark case A&M Records v. Napster set a legal precedent regarding digital copyright infringement that is often referenced in AI-related cases. In this case, the court ruled that Napster, a peer-to-peer file-sharing service, was indirectly liable for enabling mass copyright infringement.[68]

Legal scholars argue that AI companies could face vicarious liability similar to Napster if courts determine that their models are being used for large-scale copyright violations. This case serves as a potential blueprint for AI copyright enforcement, as it raises questions about whether AI developers can be held responsible for the content their models generate.[69]

(G) Conclusion

These cases illustrate the complex and evolving nature of AI copyright law. A major takeaway is that training AI on copyrighted material remains legally uncertain, as seen in Getty Images v. Stability AI and The New York Times v. OpenAI. Additionally, courts have reaffirmed that AI-generated works cannot be copyrighted unless human input is significant, as established in Thaler v. Perlmutter. Cases like Sarah Silverman v. OpenAI highlight that AI-generated summaries and derivative works may violate copyright laws, while Infopaq v. Danske

[65] Authors Guild, *Legal Brief on AI and Derivative Works* (2023).
[66] *Infopaq Int'l A/S v. Danske Dagblades Forening*, Case C-5/08, ECLI:EU:C:2009:465.
[67] European Court of Justice, *Ruling on Copyright and Digital Media*, 2009 O.J. (C 67) 3.
[68] *A&M Records, Inc. v. Napster, Inc.*, 239 F.3d 1004, 1013 (9th Cir. 2001).
[69] Gabriel Karger, *AI Copyright and Vicarious Liability: The Napster Precedent*, 42 COLUM. SCI. & TECH. L. REV. 27, 32 (2023).

Dagblades Forening confirms that even small portions of copyrighted works can qualify for protection. Furthermore, rulings such as A&M Records v. Napster suggest that AI developers could be held liable for copyright violations, drawing parallels to past cases of digital piracy. As courts continue to evaluate AI copyright disputes, these rulings will shape the future of AI-generated content and define the responsibilities of developers, users, and copyright holders.

VI. FUTURE IMPLICATIONS AND POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS

(A) The Growing Influence of AI in Creative Industries

The rise of generative AI has fundamentally altered the landscape of creative industries, from publishing and music to film and digital art. AI-powered models such as ChatGPT, Midjourney, and Stability AI's Stable Diffusion are now capable of producing high-quality content that rivals human creativity. This rapid advancement poses significant challenges for intellectual property (IP) laws, which were designed for a human-centric model of authorship and copyright protection[70].

The increasing accessibility of AI-generated content has also led to concerns about market displacement. For example, traditional artists, musicians, and writers face the risk of losing work opportunities as AI-generated alternatives become more cost-effective. The lawsuits filed by The New York Times and Getty Images illustrate the broader concern that AI could diminish the economic value of original copyrighted works[71]. As AI continues to evolve, lawmakers must strike a balance between fostering innovation and protecting human creators.

(B) Ethical and Legal Considerations for AI-Generated Works

The ethical implications of AI-generated content go beyond copyright concerns. AI's ability to mimic distinct artistic styles raises questions of moral rights—a principle in copyright law that protects an author's personal connection to their work.[72] For instance, AI models trained on an artist's unique style may generate indistinguishable imitations, effectively replacing their work while bypassing existing copyright protections.

Additionally, AI has been criticized for perpetuating biases and misinformation. Many AI models are trained on internet data, which may contain biased or misleading information. If AI-generated works become widely used without sufficient human oversight, there is a risk of amplifying misinformation, which could have serious implications for journalism, education,

[70] European Parliament, *AI and Copyright Policy Report* (2023).
[71] *The New York Times v. OpenAI*, No. 1:23-CV-10134 (2023).
[72] Berne Convention for the Protection of Literary and Artistic Works, art. 6.

and public discourse.[73]

To address these concerns, policymakers should consider legal frameworks that distinguish between AI-generated and AI-assisted works. A clear distinction would help protect human creativity while ensuring that AI-generated content does not undermine existing copyright protections.

(C) Proposed Policy Reforms

Several policy recommendations have been proposed to address the legal and ethical challenges posed by generative AI.

One potential solution is the recognition of AI-assisted works, where human authors play a significant role in the creative process. This model would allow copyright protection for AI-generated content only when human input is substantial.[74] Similar frameworks have been discussed in the UK's Copyright, Designs, and Patents Act (1988), which recognizes computer-generated works under limited conditions.[75] Under this system, policymakers could define a threshold of human involvement for copyright protection, ensuring that purely AI-generated works remain unprotected while allowing AI-assisted works to receive limited copyright benefits.

Another major controversy surrounding AI-generated content is the use of copyrighted material for training datasets. Plaintiffs in cases such as Getty Images v. Stability AI and The New York Times v. OpenAI have argued that AI companies should be required to obtain licenses for copyrighted material used in training models.[76] To address this, legal scholars have proposed a compulsory licensing system, similar to the model used in the music industry, where AI developers would be required to compensate copyright holders when training AI models on copyrighted works[77]. This system could provide financial incentives for human creators while ensuring that AI development remains legally compliant. Additionally, blockchain technology has been suggested as a means to track and verify AI training data, allowing copyright holders to monitor how their works are used in AI development[78].

Another policy recommendation involves mandatory transparency measures for AI-generated content. The EU AI Act already includes provisions requiring AI developers to disclose whether

[73] World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO), *Ethical Considerations in AI and Copyright* (2023).
[74] U.K. Intellectual Property Office, *AI-Assisted Copyright Proposals* (2023).
[75] Copyright, Designs, and Patents Act 1988, c. 48, § 9(3) (U.K.).
[76] *Getty Images v. Stability AI*, No. 1:23-CV-00135 (2023).
[77] European Parliament, *AI Training and Licensing Proposal* (2023).
[78] IBM Research, *Blockchain for Copyright Protection* (2023).

 [ISSN 2581-5369]

content is AI-generated[79]. Expanding this requirement globally could help prevent copyright disputes and allow consumers to differentiate between AI-created and human-made works. Additionally, platforms hosting AI-generated content could be required to implement watermarking technologies, similar to digital rights management (DRM) systems used in the music and film industries[80]. This would help protect original creators while ensuring AI-generated content remains identifiable.

(D) The Role of International Collaboration

Because AI development is a global phenomenon, international cooperation is essential for regulating AI-generated content. Currently, different jurisdictions have varying approaches to AI copyright. The United States and European Union require human authorship for copyright protection, whereas Japan has proposed a trademark-like system for AI-generated works. Meanwhile, the United Kingdom recognizes AI-assisted works under specific conditions[81]. These inconsistencies create legal uncertainty for businesses and content creators operating across multiple jurisdictions, making it challenging to enforce copyright laws effectively.

Legal scholars have proposed the creation of an AI Copyright Treaty, similar to the WIPO Copyright Treaty, to establish global standards for AI-generated content[82]. Such a treaty could address standardized rules for AI-generated copyright eligibility, licensing agreements for AI training datasets, and international liability frameworks for AI-generated copyright infringement. Establishing a harmonized legal framework would help prevent forum shopping, where AI developers choose jurisdictions with lax copyright enforcement to avoid legal accountability[83]. Given the rapid pace of AI advancement, a proactive international approach would be necessary to ensure consistency in AI copyright regulations across different countries.

(E) Future Challenges and Considerations

Despite the proposed reforms, several unresolved challenges remain in regulating AI-generated content. One of the most pressing concerns is the enforcement of copyright laws for AI-generated works, particularly in cross-border cases where AI companies operate in multiple jurisdictions with varying legal standards. As AI-generated content can be easily distributed worldwide, legal frameworks must address how to regulate and enforce copyright protections on a global scale. Another significant issue is determining liability for copyright infringement.

[79] European Parliament, *Proposal for a Regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council Laying Down Harmonized Rules on Artificial Intelligence* (2023) (EU AI Act).
[80] World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO), *Digital Watermarking and Copyright Enforcement* (2023).
[81] U.S. Copyright Office, *Compendium of U.S. Copyright Office Practices* § 313.2 (3d ed. 2023).
[82] Japan Patent Office, *AI and IP Rights Report* (2023).
[83] World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO), *Proposal for an AI Copyright Treaty* (2023).

 [ISSN 2581-5369]

Current laws do not clearly define whether AI developers, end users, or dataset providers should be held accountable when AI models produce infringing content. Without clear liability structures, AI companies may continue to operate in legal grey areas, leaving content creators with limited recourse for copyright violations.

Striking a balance between innovation and copyright enforcement remains one of the biggest challenges in AI regulation. While stricter regulations may offer better protection for human creators, excessive restrictions could hinder AI innovation and limit the development of new technologies. Policymakers must carefully navigate this issue, ensuring that copyright laws protect intellectual property without stifling AI research and development. The success of any regulatory framework will depend on its ability to adapt dynamically to evolving AI technologies while maintaining fair protection for both creators and AI developers.

VII. CONCLUSION

The rapid rise of AI-generated content presents unprecedented challenges for copyright law, necessitating urgent legal and policy reforms. Some of the most promising solutions include recognizing AI-assisted works with clear human involvement requirements, implementing licensing and compensation systems for AI training data, enhancing transparency measures to label AI-generated content, and promoting international collaboration to harmonize AI copyright laws. The long-term goal should be to create a balanced legal framework that supports both technological innovation and the rights of human creators. Given the speed at which AI technology is evolving, courts and policymakers must act swiftly to address these legal gaps before AI-generated content becomes the norm in creative industries. The next few years will be critical in defining how AI fits into existing copyright structures, shaping the future of intellectual property law for decades to come.

*****

 [ISSN 2581-5369]