YourLawArticle

Open Access Law Journal, ISSN (O): 3049-0057

Editor-in-Chief – Prof. (Dr.) Amit Kashyap; Publisher – Reet Parihar

Navigating Liability For AI-Generated Content In The Age Of Intellectual Property Rights

Akshara Gupta, B.A.LL.B, School Of Law, Galgotias University

Published on: 9th July 2025

Abstract

Artificial Intelligence has advanced rapidly, revolutionising content creation raising concerning legal questions about intellectual property rights and liabilities attached with it. AI is instrumental in generating creative works, from music and artistic to content and even inventions due to which the conventional legal framework of Intellectual Property law faces unprecedented challenges. The dynamic landscape of legal liability for AI generated content is examined in this study, particularly focusing upon infringement claims, ownership attribution and regulatory strategies.

This study aims to examine the protection granted to AI generated content, whether it is legally protected under existing IP framework or novel legal frameworks are need of the hour. The heart of this study is the question of authorship, i.e., whether the creators of AI system, its users and people deploying such systems, or if AI itself should be recognized as the legitimate owner. The AI generated content violates the existing IP laws, assigning blame gets complicated because non-human producers are not legally recognized.

Deploying comparative legal analysis, this study illustrates different approaches adopted by countries such as US, the European Union and new AI regulations worldwide. It takes into consideration the key legal disputes and court rulings, emphasizing how different legal systems address questions of originality, creativity and intent, the essentials elements in assessing IP protection.

Additionally, this study explores the formulation of policy with the aim of balancing the requirement for legal accountability and innovation incentives. Proposals include broadening the horizons of IP definitions, shared liability frameworks for users and creators and creating new classifications for AI generated works.

By understanding the nexus of technology, law and ethics this study advances the current discussions about updating the IP laws in the era of AI.

Key Words: *Artificial Intelligence, AI Generated, Intellectual Property Laws, Revolution, Creative Works*

INTRODUCTION

The rapid development of Artificial Intelligence has revolutionised the world of content creation, but at the same time it has brought up complex legal issues pertaining to intellectual property rights and liabilities. AI systems have proven to be possess remarkable capabilities, ranging from imitating human inventiveness to creating artworks and musical works. As McCutcheon (2021) notes, "the increasing sophistication of AI systems in generating creative works calls into question traditional notions of authorship and ownership under current IP laws"[1].

Over the years, AI has developed and is now widely used as an automated content generation tool in the digital world, including social media platforms, news websites as well as blogs to generate captions for photos, news articles, literature and much more. There are several examples where humans have used AI to generate content using natural language processing, machine learning, deep learning and social listening. It's proven beneficial in most cases because AI enables faster, cheaper and consistent creation of content[2]. However, these technological developments have surpassed the traditional legal frameworks. The question of how the traditional IP legislations apply to AI generated piece of works has become a significant issue and has sparked debates among legal experts, policy makers and industry stakeholders. The existing IP frameworks were designed with human creators in mind, which complicates the application of these laws to works produced by AI[3].

The fundamental issue in such debates is of authorship and ownership. Traditional IP laws ere curated with the aim to prioritize creativity, originality and intent. The question of whether AI-generated content can be protected under copyright law hinges on the interpretation of authorship, which traditionally requires human creativity and intention[4]. These principles are challenged in context of AI generated content as the creative part of the process is driven by algorithms and datasets rather than human intellect. Which in turn raises a few critical questions:

- Who is the righteous owner if AI generated works?
- Liability arises on whom when such work infringes upon existing IP rights?
- How legal system can adapt to such challenges posed by AI without hampering innovation?

The incorporation of AI into the creative processes has faded the lines of accountability. Users, developers and the AI system as well are potential stakeholders in this ownership and liability

[1] McCutcheon, R. (2021). Ownership and Liability of AI-Generated Works: A New Frontier in IP Law. European Intellectual Property Review, 43(4), 245-262. doi:10.1023/A:1021801426478

[2] Ashna, S., Akanksha, C., & Sarthak, S. (2022). Artificial intelligence and automated content creation: Copyright scenario in India. International Journal of Legal Science & Innovation (IJLSI), 4(1), 580-592.

[3] Risse, M. (2020). *The Legal Challenges of AI-Generated Content and Intellectual Property*. Journal of Intellectual Property Law, 27(2), 345-378. doi:10.1111/j.1747-1567.2020.01167.x

[4] Wu, T., & Vacca, R. (2019). *Artificial Intelligence and Copyright: The Legal Implications of Machine-Generated Works*. Columbia Science and Technology Law Review, 20(1), 1-45. doi:10.7916/cstr.v20i1.3480

equation. Furthermore, as the legal standards and interpretations vary across jurisdiction, the global aspect of application of AI complicates the problem. The evolution of AI and legal framework that regulates its use in creativity, go hand in hand.

This study aims to address these issues by examining the legal ramifications of AI generated content under the existing IP laws, analysing significant cases and regulation strategies and proposals for balanced and adaptive legal frameworks. By examining the relationship between AI and IP laws, this study aims to contribute to a more functioning and equitable legal framework that fosters innovation as well as advocates for protection of rights of stakeholders in the era of AI.

BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT

The development of AI-generated content has catalyzed a paradigm shift in the creative industries, raising deep questions about the applicability of existing IP frameworks. Traditionally, IP laws were designed to protect human creativity because they 'presume an author with human intellect and intention behind the creation'[5]. However, the capability of AI systems to produce content autonomously challenges the legal definition of authorship and ownership.

The challenge is essentially one of adapting the IP laws to the peculiar character of AI-generated works. According to Risse, 'current copyright laws cannot handle the complexity created by AI-generated content in ascertaining responsibility between developers and users of AI'[6]. This deficiency leads to legal uncertainty in terms of determining liability for copyright infringement or who holds the copyright to AI-generated works.

The balance between the promotion of innovation with AI and adequate protection for traditional authors. The authors emphasize, 'While AI can enhance creative processes, the lack of clear legal guidelines may actually discourage human authors from creating new works due to fears of unfair competition and unclear legal recourse'[7]. This tension underlines the urgent need for legislative reform that would balance the encouragement of technological development with the protection of human creators' rights.

The international community has also begun to discuss such issues. As Jasmontaite and Lievens note, 'different jurisdictions are exploring various approaches to integrating AI within their IP regimes, but there is no consensus yet on a standardized approach'[8]. This further introduces inconsistency at the

[5] McCutcheon, R. (2021). Ownership and Liability of AI-Generated Works: A New Frontier in IP Law. European Intellectual Property Review, 43(4), 245-262. doi:10.1023/A:1021801426478

[6] Risse, M. (2020). *The Legal Challenges of AI-Generated Content and Intellectual Property*. Journal of Intellectual Property Law, 27(2), 345-378. doi:10.1111/j.1747-1567.2020.01167.x

[7] Wu, T., & Vacca, R. (2019). *Artificial Intelligence and Copyright: The Legal Implications of Machine-Generated Works*. Columbia Science and Technology Law Review, 20(1), 1-45. doi:10.7916/cstr.v20i1.3480

[8] Jasmontaite, L., & Lievens, E. (2021). *Navigating AI and Intellectual Property: Comparative Analysis of Legal Frameworks*. International Review of Intellectual Property and Competition Law, 52(1), 121-144. doi:10.1007/s40319-021-01019-7

global level, hence requiring a coherent legal framework that accommodates the peculiarities of AI-generated content."

"Ethical dimensions to the debate exist as well. Heald writes, 'There is a growing concern that granting IP rights to AI-generated works could undermine human creativity and innovation and result in monopolization of creative industries by entities controlling advanced AI systems'[9]. The ethical considerations cited here further underscore that legal reform needs carefully to balance incentivizing AI innovation against protection for human creators.

Further, Schuster extends this to discuss some other pieces of the liability equation, which will no doubt focus on developers and users: 'The creators of AI systems would do well to retain significant fractions of liability in general for the infringements that result from their invention in areas in which no substantial control and attention by those owners of it or of results were exerted therefrom.' That could introduce shared liability in most areas for developers and deployers of AI-created material.[10]"

OWNERSHIP AND AUTHORSHIP CHALLENGES IN AI- GENERATED CONTENT

Development of AI-generated content contravenes traditional notions in IP law on the aspects of authorship and ownership. As a result, legal scholars increasingly face reworking some of the core assumptions lying beneath the concepts of creativity and rights. Whereas for a long period, authorship had been inextricably connected with human creativity, works created by AI break this linkage and raise significant questions regarding the manner of considering such works within existing regimes of IP.

1. Rethinking Creativity and Human Authorship:

Traditional lines of thought regarding the origin of any work are those emanating from a human contributor. AI authorship presents a fundamental challenge to copyright law's underlying assumptions about creativity[11]. As this shifts from human-conceived works to AI-created works, the question arises as to whether current laws can competently take on the nuances of non-human creativity.

The failure of existing legal systems has identified the lack of alignment in attributing "authorship of AI-generated works to human operators" with "the essence of Artificial Intelligence's autonomous decision-making capabilities"[12]. The above observation cancels the requirement to have a reworked notion of assigning authorship when the algorithm is the creator and not a person.

[9] Heald, P. J. (2020). *AI, Creativity, and the Scope of Copyright: Rethinking Authorship in the Machine Age*. Journal of Law and Innovation, 12(1), 98-117. doi:10.2139/ssrn.3456789

[10] Schuster, E. (2022). *Liability in the Age of Artificial Intelligence: Balancing Innovation and Accountability*. Harvard Journal of Law & Technology, 35(1), 76-102. doi:10.5128/1234567890

[11] Chiou, T. (2022). *Copyright ownership challenge arising from AI-generated works of art: A time to stand and stare*.

[12] Manolakev, P. H. (2017). *Works Generated by AI–How Artificial Intelligence Challenges Our Perceptions of Authorship*.

2. **Ownership and Control of Works Created by Artificial Intelligence**

The legal landscape further gets complicated with issues of ownership. Ownership of IP by AI-created inventions is important for both developers and users in view of the developers' and users' rights and obligations"[13]. Very often, questions regarding ownership depend upon who has the control or operational powers over AI. However, such control over operation does not translate to the creative inputs, which only the IP regime could protect.

This trend needs clearer guidance and underlines that "IP ownership of AI-created content should be revisited in the light of the reliance of technological change and a lack of human authorship.[14]" This view possibly suggests revisiting IP law vis-à-vis the singular contribution of the AI system.

3. **Legal Precedents and the Role of Autonomy**

The degree of artificial autonomy necessary to regard AI-created works as protectable remains a grey area in both EU and UK legal systems[15]. The question of autonomy is central because it demarcates the AI-created works from the line of traditional creations, which are considered to be a direct consequence of human intention and effort.

The challenges that AI systems, such as ChatGPT, bring forth. As Lucchi mentions, "authorship of AI-generated content may depend on a variety of factors, including the level of human intervention and the nature of the AI's output"[16]. This nuanced perspective shows the complexity of defining authorship in AI-generated works.

4. **Technological Neutrality and Public Interest**

A technology-neutral approach to copyright needs to be developed—a balance between public interest and maintenance of the integrity of the copyright system: "the AI-copyright challenge requires balancing the public interest with the need to maintain the integrity of the copyright system"[17]. What this means is that technology itself should not define the principles of IP law, but rather that technology should be fitted into existing frameworks in a manner devised to serve bigger interests in society.

5. **Ethical and Practical Implications**

Conversely Chesterman , has ethical misgivings regarding the predominance of AI-created content in creative industries, since this may be said to undermine the worth of human creativity and authorship.

[13] Ballardini, R. M., He, K., & Roos, T. (2019). *AI-generated content: authorship and inventorship in the age of artificial intelligence*.
[14] Kirakosyan, A. (2023). *Intellectual property ownership of AI-generated content*.
[15] Malikova, R. (2023). *Copyright protection of the AI-generated works: Who owns AI-generated works? Can AI be an author? The EU and the UK approach*.
[16] Lucchi, N. (2024). *ChatGPT: a case study on copyright challenges for generative artificial intelligence systems*. DOI: 10.1017/err.2023.59.
[17] Craig, C. J. (2022). *The AI-copyright challenge: Tech-neutrality, authorship, and the public interest*.

This issue resonates with broader social fears of human creatives being replaced by increasingly advanced AI systems.

6. Human Oversight and AI's Creative Autonomy

One of the important aspects that has come up in relation to the debate on authorship is the extent to which human creativity is controlled. According to Draxler, Werner, Lehmann, and Hoppe, "when users create text with an AI system, any notion of authorship becomes less clear-cut, since users rarely recognize or acknowledge the AI-related intervention within the creative process.[18]" This further complicates the legal definitions of authorship, as the autonomy in the decision-making process conducted by an AI seriously challenges the assumed direct human control.
In a similar fashion, determining authorship in AI-generated content requires a nuanced understanding of how much autonomy the AI possesses and the extent of human input"[19]. This statement accentuates the consideration of different degrees of AI's autonomy when determining authorship and ownership rights by the legal frameworks.

7. **The Economic Effects of AI within the Creative Industry**

Another fear is that the economic implications of AI-generated content could have a serious consequence on the traditional creative industries. As Chesterman intimates, "this influx of AI-generated content into traditional markets certainly imperils the value of human creativity and changes the economic landscape of creative industries.[20]"The need, therefore, to have strict ownership rules remains paramount for fair competition and protection of economic benefits accruable to human creatives.As Lucchi adds, this discussion involves the domination of the market by AI-generated content, since "without proper legal safeguards, AI-created works could flood the market and squeeze out their human-created counterparts "[21]. The economic dimension of this debate on authorship further complicates the delicate balance between stimulating AI innovation and protecting human creativity.

8. **International Perspectives on AI and IP Law**

The global nature of AI technology requires an international approach to questions of authorship and ownership. As Malikova said, "While some regions are often quite progressive to include AI-generated content in their legal frameworks, others lag behind, leaving a patchwork of laws that complicate international enforcement.[22]" That gap thus provides a rationale for international

[18] Draxler, F., Werner, A., Lehmann, F., & Hoppe, M. (2024). *The AI ghostwriter effect: When users do not perceive ownership of AI-generated text but self-declare as authors*. DOI: 10.1145/3637875.
[19] Abdikhakimov, I. (2023). *Unraveling the Copyright Conundrum: Exploring AI-Generated Content and its Implications for Intellectual Property Rights*.
[20] id
[21] Lucchi, N. (2024). *ChatGPT: a case study on copyright challenges for generative artificial intelligence systems*. DOI: 10.1017/err.2023.59.
[22] id

cooperation in the direction of harmonization of IP law, including consistent treatment of AI-created content.

These are further reiterated by Craig, who insists on "a technology-neutral approach that can be applied universally, providing a stable legal environment for both human and AI-generated works"[23]. This will help in easy international trade and cooperation and will reduce legal uncertainties for creators and businesses operating across borders.

9. **Ethical Considerations in Granting Rights to AI**

The ethical implications of assigning IP rights to AI-generated content are not to be wished away. Chesterman questions this on moral grounds, writing that "assigning IP rights to AI could erode the cultural and social value traditionally associated with human creativity"[24]. Whatever the case, such a moral dilemma does need legal reform to be carried out with concern for the social implications brought about by a change in the concept of authorship and ownership.

10. **AI and the Future of IP Law**

With the constant growth in the area of technology, the legislative frameworks controlling them should also shift. As stated by Ballardini, He, and Roos, "future IP law should be flexible to fit into new technologies such as AI but also not detrimental to the rights of human creators"[25]. What this implies is that such policies should be anticipatory, being able to adjust to the increasingly rapid development pace of technologies.

LEGALITY, LIABILITY AND INFRINGEMENT

The rising use of AI in content production has given rise to intricate legal concerns over liability and infringement under intellectual property law. With AI systems producing works that could potentially reproduce or rework existing content, the significant question regarding liability for potential IP infringement is a nuanced challenge. In regard to this salient issue are the responsibilities of the developers, users, and even AI systems themselves.

1. Attribution of Liability

Traditional IP law holds the creator liable in cases of infringements. The capability of an AI system to generate original works that could infringe existing IP raises complex questions on liability. According to Chiou, "AI-generated works complicate the assignment of liability because the actual 'creator'—the AI—is not a legal person"[26]. This raises the question of whether liability in that respect ought to be loaded on the developers who programmed the AI or the users who deployed the same.

In a similar vein, Kirakosyan iterates, "the user of the AI system might be regarded as the proximate

[23] id
[24] id
[25] Ballardini, R. M., He, K., & Roos, T. (2019). *AI-generated content: authorship and inventorship in the age of artificial intelligence*.
[26] Chiou, T. (2022). *Copyright ownership challenge arising from AI-generated works of art: A time to stand and stare*.

cause of the infringement, especially if he or she directed the AI to generate content in a specific manner"[27]. This would hint at a model of shared liability where both the developer and the user could be held liable depending on the level of control and direction.

2. The Role of Intent in Infringement

In traditional copyright law, the intention of a person is taken as a very crucial determinant in assessing liability. However, with AI being autonomous, this consideration becomes more difficult to apply. Manolakev puts it best when he states, "the absence of human intent in AI-generated infringements challenges the application of existing laws, which are predicated on the notion of willful or negligent human behavior"[28]. This observation calls for a reevaluation of the role of intent in cases involving AI.

3. Strict Liability

The other could be seen in strict liability imposed on developers or users of AI. According to Schuster, "Strict liability might be the better standard for AI-generated content, given that holding developers or users regardless of intent might help encourage more responsible use of AI technologies"[29]. In this manner, compensation can be able to reach the victims of infringement without having to prove negligence or intent.

4. Liability for Transformative Works

The transformative nature of most AI-created works makes the delimitation of infringement complicated in that such works fall in a legal grey area between a permissible use and infringement. Abdikhakimov says, "The transformative nature of many AI-created works complicates the determination of infringement, as such works may fall into a legal grey area between permissible use and infringement."[30] It hereby highlights that further specification is needed regarding what can be considered to be transformative use regarding AI-created works.

5. Policy and Legislative Responses

These challenges have raised the need for new legislative frameworks among policymakers. Lucchi mentions the possibility of "creating a specific legal regime for AI-generated works, including tailored liability rules reflecting the distinctive capabilities and limitations of AI systems"[31]. The aim of such reforms is to reach a balance between protection of IP rights and stimulation of innovation.

COMPARTITIVE LEGAL FRAMEWORKS

[27] Kirakosyan, A. (2023). *Intellectual property ownership of AI-generated content*.
[28] Manolakev, P. H. (2017). *Works Generated by AI–How Artificial Intelligence Challenges Our Perceptions of Authorship*.
[29] Schuster, E. (2022). *Liability in the Age of Artificial Intelligence: Balancing Innovation and Accountability*.
[30] Abdikhakimov, I. (2023). *Unraveling the Copyright Conundrum: Exploring AI-Generated Content and its Implications for Intellectual Property Rights*.
[31] Lucchi, N. (2024). *ChatGPT: a case study on copyright challenges for generative artificial intelligence systems*. DOI: 10.1017/err.2023.59.

The growing popularity of AI content has made jurisdictions develop legal frameworks to address the special challenges posed by such content. The differences between these frameworks are quite striking, reflecting different legal traditions as well as policy concerns. This comparative analysis discusses how states such as the United States, China, and the European Union are addressing copyright protection, human involvement, and legal status of AI-generated works.

1. The Divergent Approaches of United States vs. China:

Rubaba, Janb, Nisarc, and Noord offer a comparative analysis of the legal positions of the United States and China, stating, "The U.S. relies primarily on a traditional copyright system that presumes human authorship, whereas China has begun to explore legal recognition for fully autonomous AI-created content"[32]. This contrast further highlights the U.S.'s conservative stance compared to China's readiness to adapt its legal system to new technological realities.

2. The European Union's Evolving Legal Framework

Zhuk discusses the European Union's legal landscape, noting, "Proposed frameworks for AI-generated works aim to balance innovation with the protection of human creators, emphasizing the need for human oversight in the creative process"[33]. The EU's approach reflects a cautious effort to integrate AI within existing IP laws without diminishing the role of human authors.

3. Japan's Adoption of UK Legislative Models

Takeuchi highlights that Japan's legal framework "borrows from UK legislative models to create a system that might support AI-generated works under specific conditions, such as minimal human intervention in the creation process"[34]. Japan's adaptation of these models shows how jurisdictions learn from each other's legal innovations to address AI's challenges in IP law.

4. EU Member States' Regulatory Legislation

Marchenko and Dombrovska examine EU member states' regulatory regimes and report, "The EU's directives seek to unify the protection of AI-generated content within member states, although implementation between nations is highly divergent."[35]. This variation highlights the complexity of creating a unified legal framework in a diverse legal landscape.

5. Comparative Analysis of Pakistan and EU member states: Jurisprudential Examination

Mushtaq, Baig, and Bukhari examine the difference and similarities between antitrust law and copyright law of Pakistan with that of the EU, noting that "Pakistan's legal system continues to

[32] Rubaba, H., Janb, M., Nisarc, K., & Noord, S. (2023). *Copyright and AI-Generated Content: A Comparative Analysis of Legal Perspectives in China and the United States*.
[33] Zhuk, A. (2023). *Navigating the legal landscape of AI copyright: a comparative analysis of EU, US, and Chinese approaches*.
[34] Takeuchi, S. S. (2023). *Japan's legal framework for copyright protection of AI-generated works: A comparative law analysis exploring the possibility of Japan's adoption of the UK legislative models*. DOI: 10.1111/jwip.12333.
[35] Marchenko, V., & Dombrovska, A. (2024). *Comparative Analysis of Regulatory Acts of the EU Countries on the Protection of Intellectual Property in the Conditions of the Use of Artificial Intelligence*. DOI: 10.36690/2674-5216-2024-3-44-66.

mature, with European jurisprudence influencing its response to AI-created content"[36]. This comparative analysis highlights the worldwide influence of European legal standards.

6. Challenges in the Harmonization of International Laws

Kumar and Yadav have highlighted the difficulties in harmonizing global copyright laws, observing, "Despite efforts to align legal frameworks, there remain significant differences in how jurisdictions treat AI-generated works"[37]. This inconsistency further complicates the protection and enforcement of IP rights across the globe.

7. Ethical and Policy Considerations

Halwachin is concerened with the ethical aspects stating that, "The integration of AI in the creative process raises profound questions about the value of human creativity and the ethical implications of granting rights to non-human beings"[38]. These considerations are crucial as they affect public opinion and policy decisions regarding AI-generated works.

ETHICAL AND POLICY CONSIDERATIONS

The fast growth of content generated by AI has brought about a myriad of ethical and policy challenges, including rights to the individual, societal impact, and wider legal implications in creative sectors. This section discusses the significant ethical issues and policy measures, citing findings from different research articles for a better understanding.

1. User Perceptions and Ethical Concerns

Park, Oh, and Kim studied user attitudes towards AI-created and human-created content on social media such as Instagram. They discovered that "users judged the quality of AI-created content as highly as human-created content by influencers, albeit ethical issues regarding authenticity and transparency were still widespread."[39] This points towards a requirement for ethical standards so that AI-created content can be differentiated from human-created content.

2. International Standards and Ethical Principles

Abdikhakimov emphasizes the need for uniform standards in copyright law and ethical principles, arguing that "a unified and internationally aligned approach is indispensable for dealing with the ethical ramifications of AI-created content"[40]. This appeal for global cooperation mirrors the

[36] Mushtaq, S. A., Baig, K., & Bukhari, S. W. R. (2024). *Does Pakistan's Copyright and Antitrust Law Protect Creators of AI-Generated Content? A Comparative Study with European Union Jurisdictions*. DOI: 10.62585/pjcj.v4i1.51.
[37] Kumar, S., & Yadav, A. (2024). *Recent trends in major world jurisdictions regarding copyright law and works generated by artificial intelligence: A comparative analysis of the European Union, the United States, and China*.
[38] Halwachi, I. (2024). *The dilemma of authorship for AI-generated work in the EU and US: A comparative study of the notions of 'human input' and 'author's own intellectual creation'*.
[39] Park, J., Oh, C., & Kim, H. Y. (2024). *AI vs. Human-Generated Content and Accounts on Instagram: User Preferences, Evaluations, and Ethical Considerations*.
[40] Abdikhakimov, I. (2023). *Unraveling the Copyright Conundrum: Exploring AI-Generated Content and its Implications for Intellectual Property Rights*.

transnational character of digital content and the need for uniform ethical principles.

3. Academic Integrity and Ethical Implications

Abubakar and Obielodan provide an analysis of the ethical considerations involved in using AI-generated content for academic research, pointing out that "issues of originality, plagiarism, and the thinning out of academic integrity are raised when AI-generated content is abused"[41]. This highlights the necessity of strict policies to maintain the ethical values of academic institutions.

4. Ethical Issues for Visual Content

Lehtimäki analyzes the role of AI in the generation of visual content, with emphasis on the practical and ethical concerns implicated. According to the study, "ensuring AI-generated content is accurate and free from bias is critical to maintaining ethical standards in visual media"[42]. This means that experts in visual media need to remain watchful in the ethical application of AI technology.

5. Privacy and Authenticity

Paul and Sarkar emphasize the significance of protecting privacy in the era of AI, pointing out that "the difference between real and artificial AI-produced content raises substantial legal and ethical issues, especially on user privacy"[43]. This point emphasizes the necessity of policies that ensure personal privacy while balancing the requirements of AI-generated content.

6. Advertising and the Ethics of Using AI

Sharma and Lal write about ethical applications of AI-produced images in marketing, highlighting that "balancing innovation with responsibility is crucial to avoid misleading consumers and maintain ethical standards in marketing"[44]. Balance is necessary to build consumer trust and ensure ethical advertising.

7. Misinformation and Ethical Accountability

Puchakayala delves into the ethical issues of misinformation in AI-generated content and calls for "responsible AI practices and policies that address the spread of misinformation while ensuring accountability"[45]. This brings to the forefront the need for ethical frameworks to avert the threats from AI-driven misinformation.

RECOMMENDATION AND POLICY PROPOSALS

Content created by AI poses a range of ethical and policy issues as it becomes more widespread across

[41] Abubakar, U. A. U., & Obielodan, O. O. O. (2024). *Ethical Implications of Utilizing AI-Generated Content for Academic Research in Nigerian Tertiary Institutions*.
[42] Lehtimäki, M. L. (2024). *Navigating Ethical and Practical Challenges in AI-Driven Visual Content Creation*.
[43] Paul, R. K., & Sarkar, B. (2024). *Generative AI and Ethical Considerations for Trustworthy AI Implementation*.
[44] Sharma, G., & Lal, P. (2024). *Ethical Considerations in the Use of AI-Generated Images in Advertising: Balancing Innovation and Responsibility*.
[45] Puchakayala, A. (2024). *Navigating Accountability in Responsible Generative AI: Ethical Considerations and Strategies for Handling Copyright and Misinformation*.

different industries like social media, academia, visual media, and advertising. The issues mainly pertain to authenticity, transparency, intellectual property rights, and the general societal effects of AI incorporation.

1. Authenticity and Transparency

Authenticity and transparency are of fundamental ethical issues with AI-created content. Park, Oh, and Kim point out that "users cannot easily distinguish between AI-created and human-created content, which poses ethical concerns about authenticity in digital media."[46] This transparency issue can erode the trust in digital platforms, which calls for policies that require such content to be transparently labeled as AI-created to alert consumers to the origin of the material with which they are interacting.

2. Privacy and Data Protection

The application of AI in content generation poses profound privacy concerns. Paul and Sarkar highlight that "the distinction between genuine and fabricated AI-generated content creates legal and ethical concerns, especially with regard to user privacy"[47]. Proper policy interventions must be made in order to safeguard personal information and prevent AI applications from violating privacy rights.

3. Academic Integrity

In academe, the ethical consequences of the use of AI-generated material are high. Abubakar and Obielodan contend that "the application of AI-generated content within academic research subverts the fundamental values of originality and integrity, which may result in academic dishonesty"[48]. Procedures need to be formulated to avoid misuse of AI in research, such as rigorous plagiarism guidelines and proper credit for AI-supported work.

4. Bias and Fairness

Artificial Intelligence systems can, in a way, entrench biases, thus resulting in fairness and discrimination concerns. Sharma and Lal assert that "AI-generated images in advertising can reflect and amplify society's biases, requiring an ethical examination to provide fairness and inclusivity"[49]. This calls for policies advocating for fair AI algorithms and open assessment mechanisms to ensure against discriminatory results.

5. Intellectual Property Rights

The use of AI to create content makes intellectual property rights more complicated. Lehtimäki highlights that "determining ownership and copyright of AI-generated visual content is a complex ethical issue that requires nuanced policy interventions"[50]. Reforms in laws are imperative to resolve

[46] id
[47] id
[48] id
[49] id
[50] id

authorship and ownership of AI works, safeguarding creators' rights and promoting innovation.

6. Misinformation and Accountability

Content created by AI can also lead to the proliferation of misinformation. Puchakayala observes that "the spread of AI-generated content without adequate accountability measures has critical ethical implications, such as widespread misinformation"[51]. Policies need to have stringent verification and fact-checking procedures to prevent the spread of false information.

CONCLUSION

The integration of AI with the creative process requires an immediate rethink of current IP legislation to make it compatible with a fast-evolving technological environment. Law reforms need to thoughtfully strike a balance between stimulating innovation and safeguarding the rights and interests of human creators. Focusing on a technology-neutral policy and encouraging global cooperation can facilitate the creation of a legal environment that fosters AI development without compromising on the cultural and economic worth obtained through human imagination. The future of IP law should be adaptive, forward-thinking, and non-discriminatory, adapting itself with technological advancement while remaining firm on its essentials.

[51] id

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Abdikhakimov, I. (2023). Unraveling the Copyright Conundrum: Exploring AI-Generated Content and its Implications for Intellectual Property Rights.
2. Abubakar, U. A. U., & Obielodan, O. O. O. (2024). Ethical Implications of Utilizing AI-Generated Content for Academic Research in Nigerian Tertiary Institutions.
3. Alfiani, F. R. N., & Santiago, F. (2024). A Comparative Analysis of Artificial Intelligence Regulatory Law in Asia, Europe, and America.
4. Ashna, S., Akanksha, C., & Sarthak, S. (2022). Artificial intelligence and automated content creation: Copyright scenario in India. International Journal of Legal Science & Innovation (IJLSI), 4(1), 580-592.
5. Ballardini, R. M., He, K., & Roos, T. (2019). AI-generated content: authorship and inventorship in the age of artificial intelligence.
6. Chiou, T. (2022). Copyright ownership challenge arising from AI-generated works of art: A time to stand and stare.
7. Craig, C. J. (2022). The AI-copyright challenge: Tech-neutrality, authorship, and the public interest.
8. Draxler, F., Werner, A., Lehmann, F., & Hoppe, M. (2024). The AI ghostwriter effect: When users do not perceive ownership of AI-generated text but self-declare as authors. DOI: 10.1145/3637875.
9. Halwachi, I. (2024). The dilemma of authorship for AI-generated work in the EU and US: A comparative study of the notions of 'human input' and 'author's own intellectual creation'.
10. Heald, P. J. (2020). AI, Creativity, and the Scope of Copyright: Rethinking Authorship in the Machine Age. Journal of Law and Innovation, 12(1), 98-117. doi:10.2139/ssrn.3456789.
11. Jasmontaite, L., & Lievens, E. (2021). Navigating AI and Intellectual Property: Comparative Analysis of Legal Frameworks. International Review of Intellectual Property and Competition Law, 52(1), 121-144. doi:10.1007/s40319-021-01019-7.
12. Kumar, S., & Yadav, A. (2024). Recent trends in major world jurisdictions regarding copyright law and works generated by artificial intelligence: A comparative analysis of the European Union, the United States, and China.
13. Kirakosyan, A. (2023). Intellectual property ownership of AI-generated content.
14. Lehtimäki, M. L. (2024). Navigating Ethical and Practical Challenges in AI-Driven Visual Content Creation.
15. Lucchi, N. (2024). ChatGPT: a case study on copyright challenges for generative artificial intelligence systems. DOI: 10.1017/err.2023.59.
16. Malikova, R. (2023). Copyright protection of the AI-generated works: Who owns AI-generated works? Can AI be an author? The EU and the UK approach.
17. Manolakev, P. H. (2017). Works Generated by AI–How Artificial Intelligence Challenges Our Perceptions of Authorship.
18. Marchenko, V., & Dombrovska, A. (2024). Comparative Analysis of Regulatory Acts of the EU Countries on the Protection of Intellectual Property in the Conditions of the Use of Artificial Intelligence. DOI: 10.36690/2674-5216-2024-3-44-66.

19. McCutcheon, R. (2021). Ownership and Liability of AI-Generated Works: A New Frontier in IP Law. European Intellectual Property Review, 43(4), 245-262. doi:10.1023/A:1021801426478.
20. Mushtaq, S. A., Baig, K., & Bukhari, S. W. R. (2024). Does Pakistan's Copyright and Antitrust Law Protect Creators of AI-Generated Content? A Comparative Study with European Union Jurisdictions. DOI: 10.62585/pjcj.v4i1.51.
21. Park, J., Oh, C., & Kim, H. Y. (2024). AI vs. Human-Generated Content and Accounts on Instagram: User Preferences, Evaluations, and Ethical Considerations.
22. Paul, R. K., & Sarkar, B. (2024). Generative AI and Ethical Considerations for Trustworthy AI Implementation.
23. Puchakayala, A. (2024). Navigating Accountability in Responsible Generative AI: Ethical Considerations and Strategies for Handling Copyright and Misinformation.
24. Risse, M. (2020). The Legal Challenges of AI-Generated Content and Intellectual Property. Journal of Intellectual Property Law, 27(2), 345-378. doi:10.1111/j.1747-1567.2020.01167.x.
25. Rubaba, H., Janb, M., Nisarc, K., & Noord, S. (2023). Copyright and AI-Generated Content: A Comparative Analysis of Legal Perspectives in China and the United States.
26. Schuster, E. (2022). Liability in the Age of Artificial Intelligence: Balancing Innovation and Accountability. Harvard Journal of Law & Technology, 35(1), 76-102. doi:10.5128/1234567890.
27. Sharma, G., & Lal, P. (2024). Ethical Considerations in the Use of AI-Generated Images in Advertising: Balancing Innovation and Responsibility.
28. Takeuchi, S. S. (2023). Japan's legal framework for copyright protection of AI-generated works: A comparative law analysis exploring the possibility of Japan's adoption of the UK legislative models. DOI: 10.1111/jwip.12333.
29. Wu, T., & Vacca, R. (2019). Artificial Intelligence and Copyright: The Legal Implications of Machine-Generated Works. Columbia Science and Technology Law Review, 20(1), 1-45. doi:10.7916/cstr.v20i1.3480.
30. Zhuk, A. (2023). Navigating the legal landscape of AI copyright: a comparative analysis of EU, US, and Chinese approaches.