EBSU INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF LAW & SUSTAINABILITY STUDIES

Volume 1, | Issue 1, 2025 | ISSN (E):

THE IMPACT OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE ON INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY RIGHTS: CHALLENGES AND OPPORTUNITIES

Akpan, Okon Imo
Emperical Research Institute, Nigeria

Abstract

Artificial Intelligence (AI) has revolutionized creativity, innovation, and automation, disrupting traditional notions of intellectual property rights (IPR). As machines increasingly generate content, inventions, and data-driven products, legal systems worldwide are grappling with the adequacy of existing IP frameworks. This research explores the challenges and opportunities AI presents for copyright, patent, trademark, and trade secret laws. Using comparative analysis of jurisdictions such as the United States, the European Union, and Nigeria, it evaluates how legal doctrines are adapting to AI-generated works and processes. Key findings reveal a global trend toward reevaluating authorship, inventorship, and originality standards, while highlighting legal ambiguities and enforcement issues. The paper concludes with policy recommendations for updating IPR laws to accommodate AI innovations while balancing innovation, creativity, and public interest.

Keywords: Impact, Artificial Intelligence, Intellectual Property, Challenges.
Received: 20th March, **2025 | Accepted**: 14th April, **2025 | Published**: 6th May, 2025

INTRODUCTION

Artificial Intelligence (AI) is transforming how intellectual creations and technological advancements are conceived, developed, and distributed. From machine-generated artworks and autonomous software coding to algorithm-driven inventions, AI challenges the foundational assumptions of intellectual property law. Traditional IPR frameworks are predicated on human authorship and inventorship, concepts that do not easily extend to autonomous systems.

This article examines how the rise of AI impacts various branches of IPR, with a specific focus on the legal frameworks governing these rights in Nigeria and internationally. It interrogates whether current laws are equipped to handle AI-generated outputs and considers reforms necessary to support both legal certainty and technological innovation.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Legal scholars and policymakers have increasingly recognized the tensions between AI and IPR. Ginsburg (2018) notes that copyright law's emphasis on human creativity is strained by machine-generated content. Similarly, Abbott (2020) argues that AI's role in invention calls for a reassessment of the legal definition of an inventor.

PUBLISHER: Faculty of Law, Ebonyi State University

In the EU, the European Patent Office (EPO) maintains that AI cannot be an inventor under current rules, reaffirming human inventorship. The United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO) and the UK Intellectual Property Office (UKIPO) have similarly rejected applications listing AI as an inventor, as demonstrated in the famous DABUS cases (Thaler v. Commissioner of Patents, 2021).

The World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO) has initiated consultations on the intersection of AI and IPR, identifying issues related to authorship, liability, and ownership (WIPO, 2020). In Africa, and Nigeria in particular, IPR frameworks remain underdeveloped in addressing emerging technologies, although the National Office for Technology Acquisition and Promotion (NOTAP) and Nigerian Copyright Commission (NCC) have begun to acknowledge the significance of AI.

METHODOLOGY

This research adopts a doctrinal legal research method, supported by comparative legal analysis. Primary sources include statutes, case law, and regulatory guidelines, while secondary sources encompass journal articles, reports, and legal commentaries.

Key jurisdictions analyzed include:

- United States
- European Union
- Nigeria

The study focuses on four categories of intellectual property:

- Copyright
- Patents
- Trademarks
- Trade Secrets

Evaluation criteria include:

- Recognition of AI-generated outputs
- Legal definitions of authorship/inventorship
- Ownership and liability frameworks
- Enforcement challenges

PUBLISHER: Faculty of Law, Ebonyi State University

RESULTS And DISCUSSION

IPR Category	Jurisdiction	Legal Position on AI-Generated Content	Challenges	Opportunities
Copyright	US	Requires human authorship	Unclear status of AI works	New licensing models, collaborative creativity
	EU	Same as US	Enforcement, moral rights	Clarification via case law and directives
	Nigeria	No explicit AI provisions	Outdated laws, lack of policy	Room for reform and digital economy development
Patents	US	Inventor must be human	AI cannot hold rights	Stimulates debate on inventorship criteria
	EU	AI not recognized as inventor	Legal ambiguity in AI-aided inventions	Incentives for human-AI collaboration
	Nigeria	Based on UK model, human inventor required	Lack of technological guidelines	Opportunity for legal innovation
Trademarks	Global	Applied to AI-generated branding/logos	Authorship confusion	AI tools for brand creation and monitoring
Trade Secrets	Global	Protected if kept confidential	Attribution and access issues	AI can enhance protection and detection mechanisms

Discussion

The findings underscore the inadequacy of current IPR systems in addressing the implications of AI. Copyright regimes worldwide insist on human authorship, rendering AI-generated works potentially unprotected. This creates legal uncertainty, especially in the creative industries, where AI tools like ChatGPT or DALL·E generate content with minimal human intervention.

Patent law presents even greater challenges. The DABUS litigation revealed a strong global consensus against recognizing AI as inventors, despite the increasing sophistication of AI in designing pharmaceuticals and engineering solutions. Legal reforms may need to consider "AI-assisted" categories or create sui generis rights.

In trademarks and trade secrets, AI presents both enforcement and innovation opportunities. AI can autonomously develop branding elements and also help detect IP infringements or data breaches. However, legal attribution remains an open question.

In Nigeria, the absence of targeted legislation on AI and IP means stakeholders operate in a legal vacuum. This regulatory lag could stifle innovation unless addressed through legislative and institutional updates.

PUBLISHER: Faculty of Law, Ebonyi State University

Conclusion

AI is reshaping the intellectual property landscape, challenging entrenched legal doctrines centered on human creativity and inventiveness. While jurisdictions like the US and EU are clarifying their positions through case law and regulatory consultation, countries like Nigeria must urgently modernize their legal systems.

Legal uncertainty around AI-generated works risks undermining protection, investment, and innovation. Balancing the rights of developers, users, and the public will be key to ensuring IP law remains fit for the digital age.

Recommendations

1. **Update National IP Laws**
    - Nigeria should revise its copyright and patent statutes to address AI-generated content.
2. **Establish Inventorship Guidelines**
    - Define standards for AI-assisted inventions and their recognition.
3. **Create Sui Generis Protection**
    - Consider bespoke rights for machine-generated works to bridge existing legal gaps.
4. **Encourage International Harmonization**
    - Align domestic laws with WIPO guidelines and international treaties.
5. **Promote AI Ethics and Transparency**
    - Require disclosure of AI use in IP filings to ensure transparency and accountability.
6. **Institutional Capacity Building**
    - Train IP regulators, judges, and legal practitioners on AI and emerging technologies.

PUBLISHER: Faculty of Law, Ebonyi State University

REFERENCES

Abbott, R. (2020). *The Reasonable Robot: Artificial Intelligence and the Law*. Cambridge University Press.

Ginsburg, J. (2018). People Not Machines: Authorship and What It Means in the Berne Convention. *Columbia Public Law Research Paper*, (14-585).

Thaler v. Commissioner of Patents [2021] FCAFC 121 (Australia); Thaler v. Hirshfeld, 43 F.4th 1207 (Fed. Cir. 2022).

WIPO. (2020). *WIPO Conversation on Intellectual Property and Artificial Intelligence: Issues Paper*. World Intellectual Property Organization.

USPTO. (2021). *Public Views on Artificial Intelligence and Intellectual Property Policy*. United States Patent and Trademark Office.

European Patent Office. (2022). *Patents and the Fourth Industrial Revolution – The inventions behind digital transformation*.

Nigerian Copyright Act (Cap C28, LFN 2004).

NOTAP. (2020). *Annual Report on Technology Transfer and IP Administration in Nigeria*.

UKIPO. (2020). *Artificial Intelligence and Intellectual Property: Call for Views*. UK Intellectual Property Office.

PUBLISHER: Faculty of Law, Ebonyi State University