Journal of Intellectual Property Rights
Vol 28, September 2023, pp 413-421
DOI: 10.56042/jipr.v28i5.399

Emerging Technologies and IPR: A Cross-Jurisdictional Examination of AI and Patent Laws in India and the USA

Prachi Mishra[1], Virendra Singh Thakur[2†], Shubham Shandilya[3], Ashish Kumar Singhal[4] and Yugal Kishore[5]

[1]School of Law, University of Petroleum and Energy Studies, Dehradun — 248 007, India

[2]Symbiosis Law School, Pune, Symbiosis International (Deemed University) Pune — 411 014, India

[3]Melbourne Law School, Melbourne — 3053, Australia

[4]ICFAI Law School, The ICFAI University, Dehradun — 248 011, India

[5]KIIT School of Law, Bhubaneshwar — 751 024, Odisha, India

Received: 19th April 2023; revised: 13th May 2023

The rapid development of Artificial Intelligence (AI) is swiftly reaching a critical juncture, which will greatly affect a multitude of sectors such as business, healthcare, and agriculture. While the enhanced capabilities of AI offer considerable potential for beneficial outcomes, they also present a substantial obstacle to current legal structures regulating patents. This conundrum carries extensive consequences for creativity, economic growth, and the broader community.[1] In light of this, it is critical that stakeholders, including patent experts, policymakers, and academics, engage in robust dialogues to develop strategies for encouraging innovation and navigating the complex legal terrain that arises from patent law in the AI paradigm.[2] The stakes are high, and the consequences of failing to address these challenges could be dire. In light of the current context, this paper examines various facets of patent law as they relate to AI creations, encompassing patent eligibility principles, the patentability of AI in the United States and India, and the more extensive consequences of AI and patent law's convergence. The paper offers a comparative analysis of the legal structures in these two nations, illuminating the similarities and distinctions in how AI is addressed in each legal system. The paper proposes a set of suggestions for modifying legal frameworks to keep up with the swift advancements in AI technology. By concentrating on the difficulties that emerge from the interplay of AI and patent law, the paper underscores the necessity for continuous discussion and cooperation among all parties involved, ensuring that creativity flourishes in this rapidly changing and exhilarating domain.

Keyword: Artificial Intelligence, Patent Regime, Innovation, Legislative Framework, Economic Growth, Patentability of AI

In recent times, the swift progress in emerging technologies, particularly artificial intelligence (AI), has significantly influenced various sectors and societies at large. This progress has brought about numerous legal and ethical concerns, including those pertaining to intellectual property rights, specifically patent regulations.[3] Patent laws act as a fundamental driver for inspiring innovation and fostering technological advancement. Essentially, a patent is a legal exclusivity that endows its possessor with the sole authority to produce, utilize, and market an invention for a definite period, usually 20 years from the application date. This exclusive privilege encourages inventors to generate and refine novel products or methods by guaranteeing they can profit from their efforts and regain their investments.[4] Furthermore, patent laws serve a more comprehensive public interest by promoting knowledge dissemination and competition. By obliging inventors to openly reveal their inventions in patent submissions, the patent system guarantees that new concepts are exchanged and can be further developed by others in the future. This process ultimately leads to additional technological improvements and economic expansion.

Additionally, the patent framework offers a structure for settling disputes concerning ownership and violation of inventions. This allows innovators to safeguard their intellectual property and inhibits others from unjustly benefiting from their work, thus cultivating a more equitable environment for innovation and competition.[5]

AI's expanding presence in diverse sectors emphasizes the necessity to reassess current patent regulations and their applicability to AI-driven inventions. AI has the potential to transform industries such as healthcare, transportation, agriculture, and manufacturing by automating procedures and

†Corresponding author: Email: virendrathakur1909@gmail.com

enhancing efficiency. The growing adoption of AI in these fields has resulted in the development of novel and inventive products, systems, and processes that might qualify for patent safeguards. Nevertheless, the emergence of AI and other novel technologies has introduced new hurdles for patent regulations and their implementation. The distinctive characteristics of AI, which enable it to learn and progress autonomously, bring up questions about conventional patentability standards, including novelty and non-obviousness. The debate also extends to whether AI can be regarded as an inventor in its own capacity.

Moreover, matters pertaining to ownership and infringement of AI-driven inventions are becoming increasingly intricate. As AI is utilized in collaborative and international research and development, determining the rightful owner of an invention or assigning responsibility for patent violations can be unclear. These challenges necessitate a re-examination of the existing legal structures governing patents and their applicability to AI-related inventions.[6]It is crucial to ensure that patent laws remains in sync with technological advancements, offering sufficient protection to inventors and innovators in the AI domain.

A nuanced approach to AI-related patent laws is needed, one that balances the interests of various stakeholders, such as inventors, investors, and the public. This approach would foster innovation while also providing clarity and certainty in the patent system, ultimately supporting the growth of the AI industry.

In light of the above discussion, this paper aims to deliver a thorough examination of the existing legal environment concerning AI-related patent laws in India and the United States. Furthermore, it will critically analyze the challenges and opportunities stemming from the application of patent laws to AI, encompassing the intricate matters of patentability, ownership, and infringement. The paper will draw on recent case law and legislative advancements in both jurisdictions to gauge the effects of these transformations on the protection and enforcement of AI-related inventions, as well as assess the strengths and weaknesses of the current patent systems in India and the United States in the face of AI-related challenges.

Finally, the paper will provide valuable perspectives on the future of AI-related patent laws in these jurisdictions. The paper will advocate for achieving equilibrium between the interests of inventors, investors, and the public by developing a refined legal framework that encourages innovation while also addressing AI's ethical and societal consequences. This will add to the ongoing discourse at the crossroads of AI and patent law and inform decision-makers and stakeholders about the potential future trajectories of this rapidly progressing domain.

Patenting AI: Challenges and Opportunities

AI has rapidly expanded as a field, with numerous breakthroughs occurring in recent times. As AI-driven inventions continue to grow, they give rise to various legal matters concerning patentability, ownership, and infringement. These legal intricacies call for an examination of the diverse issues to ensure that innovators are safeguarded and legal conflicts are effectively resolved.

A primary challenge in patenting AI-related inventions involves satisfying the patentability criteria. An invention must meet specific standards, such as novelty, non-obviousness, and utility, to be patentable. However, ascertaining whether an AI-related invention fulfils these standards can be problematic due to the nature of AI technologies. One of the foremost challenges associated with the patentability of AI inventions is the non-obviousness requirement.[7] AI technologies frequently analyze extensive data sets and devise new solutions to intricate problems. In some instances, solutions created by AI systems might seem evident to those knowledgeable in the field, complicating the fulfilment of the non-obviousness criterion. Furthermore, AI systems often depend on pre-existing data, making it challenging to prove the novelty of the invention. For instance, if an AI system is trained on existing data sets to recognize patterns or generate solutions, demonstrating the invention's novelty can be difficult, as it is founded on prior data. To tackle these issues, there have been suggestions to amend patent laws. Some experts, for example, have proposed redefining the non-obviousness requirement to accommodate AI's role in the invention process. Additionally, there have been appeals to recognize AI systems as inventors, necessitating a substantial revision of current patent laws.[8]

Furthermore, the matter of AI-related inventions' ownership is a complicated issue that has attracted considerable focus in recent times. This complexity arises because AI technologies can generate new solutions and products, often with minimal human involvement. Consequently, questions emerge about the

ownership of intellectual property rights linked to these inventions. One of the main challenges concerning the ownership of AI-related inventions is identifying the creator of the invention. In conventional patent law, the inventor or creator is usually the person who devised the idea or invention. However, pinpointing the creator can be difficult with AI systems.

In some cases, the individual or organization responsible for developing or programming the AI system may claim ownership of any inventions created by the system. This approach, however, overlooks the AI system's contributions, which might have played a crucial part in the invention process. Additionally, scenarios may arise where a third party owns the data used to train an AI system. In such cases, determining the intellectual property rights' ownership related to the resulting inventions can be challenging. To tackle these issues, proposals have emerged to reform intellectual property laws pertaining to AI. Some experts, for example, have recommended creating a new legal framework acknowledging both human and AI creators' contributions in the invention process. Others have suggested granting AI systems a form of legal personality, enabling them to own intellectual property.

Furthermore, infringement of AI-related inventions is a complicated matter that occurs when a third party utilizes, sells, or produces an invention without the patent owner's consent. As AI's usage in various fields grows, the likelihood of infringing AI-related patents has also risen. The following points discuss some complexities associated with AI-related invention infringement.[7]

A primary challenge regarding AI-related patents is determining the patent protection's extent. AI-related inventions may comprise hardware, software, and data, which are often hard to distinguish from one another. Consequently, determining the patent protection scope and identifying the invention's protected aspects can be challenging.

Another difficulty is ascertaining whether the use of an AI-related invention amounts to infringement. For instance, if an AI system is trained with data protected by a patent, it may be tough to decide whether the resulting output infringes on the patent. Likewise, if an AI system is employed to create a new product or process, determining whether the resulting invention violates existing patents can be challenging.[9]

Another concern is the possibility of accidental infringement. AI systems may be programmed to execute specific tasks that unintentionally infringe on existing patents. In such cases, the patent owner may have a valid infringement claim, even if the infringement was unintentional.

Furthermore, identifying the responsible party for infringement can be difficult concerning AI-related inventions. For instance, if an AI system is employed to carry out a task that violates a patent, determining whether the responsibility belongs to the AI system's owner, user, or developer can be challenging.

To tackle these issues, proposals have emerged to create new legal frameworks that take into account the distinct aspects of AI-related inventions. For instance, some experts have recommended establishing a patent pooling system, where multiple patent owners can share their patents to minimize infringement risks. Others have suggested utilizing AI to detect potential patent infringement and enhance patent litigation efficiency.

Unpacking the Ethical and Societal Implications of AI Patent Laws

The ethical and societal implications of AI concerning patent laws are diverse and intricate. On one side, AI holds the potential to transform numerous industries and enhance people's lives in countless ways. However, concerns exist regarding the possible adverse consequences of AI, including job loss, increased inequality, and the potential misuse of AI for harmful purposes.[10]

One ethical issue related to AI and patent laws is the potential for AI to intensify existing inequalities. For instance, if patents on AI-related inventions are monopolized by a few influential corporations or individuals, it could result in increased inequality and restrict access to AI benefits for those who cannot afford it. There are also concerns that AI could perpetuate bias and discrimination, such as using biased datasets or algorithms that disproportionately affect certain groups.

Another ethical concern involves the potential for AI to automate tasks formerly performed by humans, leading to job losses and economic disruption. While AI can enhance efficiency and productivity, there are worries that it could lead to widespread unemployment and worsen existing economic disparities. Additionally, concerns exist about the potential misuse of AI for malicious purposes, like developing autonomous weapons or engaging in privacy-violating surveillance.

The societal implications of AI regarding patent laws are also substantial. For instance, there are concerns about AI's potential use for intellectual property theft and its impact on innovation and creativity. Moreover, worries exist about AI's potential malicious uses, such as generating deep fake videos or conducting cyberattacks.[11]

Given these ethical and societal implications, it is crucial for policymakers and legal experts to thoroughly consider AI's implications in the context of patent laws. This involves creating new legal frameworks that address the unique challenges posed by AI-related inventions and considering the potential ethical and societal ramifications of such inventions. It is also vital to engage in public discussions about AI's role in society and ensure AI benefits are distributed fairly and equitably. In the end, a careful examination of the ethical and societal implications of AI concerning patent laws is essential to ensure that AI serves the greater good of society.

Exploring Patent Laws and AI: Case Studies from India and the USAIndia

India has become a significant player in the artificial intelligence (AI) domain in recent years, due to a rapidly expanding tech industry and a government that emphasizes AI-related technology development. However, as with any emerging technology, there are considerable challenges and opportunities in applying patent laws to AI-related inventions in India. A few case studies that demonstrate some of these challenges and opportunities:

Tata Consultancy Services (TCS) AI Patent Dispute[12]

In 2018, TCS faced a lawsuit by US-based tech firm Seven Networks over a patent concerning mobile messaging technology, which Seven Networks claimed TCS had infringed. TCS argued that the patent was invalid, stating that it resulted from apparent and non-novel application of AI algorithms. This case underlines the challenges of patentability and infringement concerning AI-related inventions and the need to ensure that patent laws stay updated with rapidly advancing technologies.

Indian Government's AI Patent Policy[13]

In 2020, the Indian government unveiled a draft national AI strategy containing provisions for an AI patent policy. The policy suggests a series of actions to encourage the growth and commercialization of AI-related technologies, including creating an AI patent pool and instituting a regulatory framework for AI patent licensing. This case demonstrates the potential benefits of governments actively promoting the development and regulation of emerging technologies.

Use of AI in Agriculture[14]

India is among the world's largest producers of agricultural products, and AI usage in agriculture could considerably enhance efficiency and productivity. However, concerns exist about the potential for AI-related patents to restrict technology access for small-scale farmers and concentrate power in the hands of large corporations. This case emphasizes the necessity for a balanced approach to patent laws concerning AI-related technologies, considering the specific needs and challenges of various sectors.

These case studies showcase the intricate and diverse nature of applying patent laws to AI-related inventions in India. While significant challenges and risks accompany these technologies, there are also opportunities for innovation and expansion, as long as patent laws are thoughtfully designed and implemented to promote fairness and inclusivity.

USA

Numerous notable cases in the United States exemplify the challenges and opportunities associated with applying patent laws to AI-related inventions. One such case is the dispute between the inventor Stephen Thaler and the US Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO)[15]concerning whether an AI system called "DABUS" could be designated as the inventor on a patent. Thaler contended that DABUS, which had autonomously generated two new inventions, should be recognized as the inventor, while the USPTO argued that only humans can be listed as inventors on a patent. This case brings attention to the matter of determining the inventor of an AI-created invention and the issue of AI ownership. Furthermore, it poses questions about the adequacy of current patent laws in addressing AI-produced inventions and whether updates are needed to accommodate technological advancements.

Another case that offers insight into the challenges of applying patent laws to AI-related inventions is the dispute between Waymo (Google's self-driving car unit) and Uber[16]over alleged misappropriation of trade secrets tied to self-driving vehicle technology. This

case emphasizes the issue of patent infringement concerning AI-related inventions and the difficulties of safeguarding intellectual property in a rapidly changing technological environment.

These cases demonstrate the intricate legal matters that emerge when applying patent laws to AI-related inventions in the United States and highlight the necessity for thoughtful evaluation of ethical and societal implications in the creation and regulation of AI technology.

Artificial Intelligence and Patent Laws: Navigating the Legal Landscape

Patent Regimes

India and the United States each possess distinct legal systems that govern patents, leading to differing approaches to AI-related patent laws.

In India, patents are granted for inventions that are innovative, non-obvious, and suitable for industrial use. The Indian Patent Act of 1970 provides the legal framework for patent protection in India. The Act outlines the criteria for invention eligibility and sets the processes for filing, examination, and granting patents. Furthermore, the Act safeguards specific categories of inventions, such as computer programs and software, as long as they fulfil the patentability requirements. Nevertheless, the patentability of AI-related inventions remains a debated topic in India, with some arguing that the existing patent system may not be sufficiently prepared to address AI's unique characteristics.[17]

In the United States, patents are granted for any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof. The U.S. Patent Act of 1952 establishes the legal framework for patent protection in the United States. The Act lays out the criteria for patent eligibility, including novelty, non-obviousness, and usefulness. Over the years, the U.S. Supreme Court has issued several decisions clarifying the application of these criteria to various types of inventions, including software and business methods. Additionally, the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office has provided guidelines specifically targeting the patentability of AI-related inventions.

Despite their differing legal systems, both India and the United States acknowledge the significance of patent protection in spurring innovation and technological progress. Consequently, both nations have taken measures to enhance their patent systems to address the challenges emerging technologies like AI present. In India, recent legislative amendments, such as the 2020 update to the Patents Rules, aim to simplify the patent application process and offer increased clarity and transparency.[18] In the United States, the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office has implemented guidelines and launched pilot programs to tackle the unique challenges AI-related inventions pose.[19] However, the emergence of AI and other novel technologies necessitates ongoing assessment and refinement of these legal frameworks to ensure they continue to incentivize innovation while addressing the challenges associated with AI-related inventions.

Applicability of Patent laws to AI-related inventions

The question of whether AI-related inventions are patentable has sparked debate in recent years, as AI's application across numerous industries continues to grow. India and the United States each have different laws and regulations governing their patent systems, which can result in varying approaches to applying patent laws to AI-related inventions.

In India, the Patents Act of 1970, under Section 3(k), excludes computer programs and algorithms from patentability. However, the Indian Patent Office has granted patents to AI-related inventions classified as "hardware inventions," treating software as an integral component of the hardware.[20] The Indian Patent Office has approved patents for machine learning algorithms, neural networks, and natural language processing techniques. In 2017, the Indian government suggested amending the Patents Act to permit patenting computer programs and other associated subject matter, including AI, aiming to align India's patent laws with global standards and encourage increased innovation and investment in the technology sector.[21]

In the United States, the patentability of AI-related inventions is evaluated by the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO) under the Patent Act's guidance. According to the Patent Act, any "new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter" is eligible for patent protection. The USPTO has issued guidelines to patent examiners for determining AI-related inventions' patentability, which include evaluating the invention's subject matter eligibility, novelty, non-obviousness, and utility.

However, applying patent laws to AI-related inventions can be challenging due to the complexity and rapid evolution of AI technology. Assessing the novelty and non-obviousness of AI-related inventions

can be difficult, and there is a risk that patents may be granted for non-innovative or non-useful inventions. Both in India and the United States, calls for reform and increased clarity on AI-related inventions' patentability have emerged. In India, aligning the Patents Act with international standards is necessary to encourage greater innovation and investment in the technology sector. In the United States, the need for clearer guidelines and standards regarding AI-related inventions' patentability is crucial to ensure that patents are granted only for genuinely innovative and useful inventions. Table 1 depicts the Comparison of AI-Patent regimes in India and USA.

Adapting to the Future of AI Patent Laws: An Analysis of Recent Changes in India and USA

The rapid advancements in Artificial Intelligence (AI) have posed significant challenges to existing patent regulations and raised new concerns about the patentability, ownership, and violation of AI-related innovations. As a result, several nations, including India and the United States, have revised their legal systems to address these matters.[22]

In India, the Patents (Amendment) Rules, 2020[23], have introduced new clauses to streamline the patent application process for AI-related innovations. These rules state that creations involving AI or machine learning techniques can be submitted as patent applications if they meet the requirements of originality, inventiveness, and practical industrial use. Moreover, the rules require applicants to reveal the specifics of the AI or machine learning methods used in the creation.

The Indian Patent Office has also issued guidelines for examining computer-related inventions, which cover AI-related innovations. These guidelines provide a structure for assessing the patentability of such inventions based on their technical contributions, originality, inventiveness, and industrial relevance.[24]

Table 1 — Comparison of AI-Patent regimes in India and USA

Aspect	India	United States
Patent Eligibility	Patent eligibility of AI inventions is determined by the Indian Patent Act, which does not specifically mention AI. However, AI inventions are considered to fall under the category of computer-related inventions (CRIs) and are subject to the same criteria for patent eligibility as other CRIs.	In the United States, AI inventions are eligible for patent protection, provided they meet the criteria of novelty, non-obviousness, and utility.
Inventorship	In India, the Indian Patent Act defines an inventor as the person who contributes to the conception of an invention. However, the Act does not provide guidance on inventorship in the context of AI.	In the United States, inventorship is determined by identifying the person or persons who contributed to the conception of the invention. If an AI system is solely responsible for the conception of an invention, it cannot be considered an inventor under current U.S. patent law.
Ownership	In India, ownership of a patent belongs to the inventor or their employer, unless there is an agreement to the contrary.	In the United States, ownership of a patent generally belongs to the inventor or inventors. However, if the invention was made by an employee in the course of their employment, the employer may have ownership rights.
Examination Guidelines	The Indian Patent Office has issued examination guidelines for patent applications related to AI and machine learning, providing some clarity on the patentability criteria for these inventions.	The United States Patent and Trademark Office has not issued specific examination guidelines for AI-related inventions. However, the USPTO has issued guidance on patent eligibility for computer-implemented inventions, which may be relevant to AI-related inventions.
Case Law	There is relatively little case law in India related to the patentability of AI inventions.	The United States has a more extensive body of case law related to the patentability of computer-implemented inventions, which may provide guidance on the patentability of AI-related inventions.
Legislative Changes	India recently amended its Patent Rules to allow for expedited examination of patent applications related to inventions in the field of electronics and information technology, including AI.	In the United States, there have been no recent legislative changes specifically related to the patentability of AI inventions. However, there have been proposals for legislative changes to address inventorship and ownership issues related to AI inventions.

In the United States, the Supreme Court's ruling in *Alice Corp.* v *CLS Bank International* (2014)[25]has had a considerable impact on the patentability of software and AI-related innovations. The Court ruled that abstract concepts, natural occurrences, and laws of nature cannot be patented, and the implementation of these principles must be aimed at a distinct technological process or application.

Subsequent to the Alice decision, the US Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO) issued guidance on the patentability of AI-related innovations, emphasizing that the innovation must target a specific technological application rather than just an abstract concept or algorithm. The USPTO also published a memorandum on the examination of patent applications for AI-related innovations, providing guidelines for examiners to assess the patentability of such inventions.[26]

These amendments to patent laws have important implications for the defence and enforcement of AI-related innovations in India and the United States. For example, with clearer guidance on the patentability of AI-related innovations, creators and businesses can better understand their legal rights and implement necessary actions to protect their intellectual property. Furthermore, these changes could encourage increased investment and growth in the AI sector by providing enhanced certainty and stability for patent protection.[27]

However, there may be potential consequences for the future of patent regulations relating to AI. For instance, as AI technology progresses, new challenges and questions might arise in determining the patentability of AI-related innovations. Moreover, ethical and societal issues linked to the ownership and use of AI-related innovations may need to be addressed.

In conclusion, the recent updates to patent regulations in India and the United States hold significant implications for the protection and enforcement of AI-related innovations and the future of patent regulations pertaining to AI. As AI technology continues to develop, it will be essential for lawmakers and patent experts to adjust and improve patent regulations to ensure proper protection and promote innovation while also addressing ethical and social concerns.

Conclusion

AI is swiftly advancing and revolutionizing various sectors. As AI becomes more crucial, there is an increasing demand for robust patent laws to safeguard and encourage innovation in this domain. While the United States leads AI development, other countries like India are making substantial progress in this field. As such, it is vital to investigate the potential future directions for AI-related patent laws in India, using a comparative analysis with the United States.

The United States has a mature and evolving legal system that consistently adapts to the requirements of emerging technologies such as AI. The US Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO) has released guidelines for AI-related innovations, specifying that the same patentability criteria apply to AI-related inventions as any other invention. Additionally, the USPTO has provided guidance on examining patent applications related to AI, including machine learning (ML) and natural language processing (NLP) technologies.

India has also made considerable advancements in AI, supported by various government initiatives promoting AI research and development. However, the Indian patent system has been criticized for its slow and inefficient nature. Concerns have also been raised about the ambiguity in the patentability criteria for AI-related inventions, which can result in inconsistencies in patent approvals.

To address these issues, India can draw inspiration from the United States' best practices in AI-related patent laws. The Indian Patent Office (IPO) can issue guidelines on examining patent applications related to AI, akin to those provided by the USPTO. The IPO could also contemplate establishing a specialized team of examiners with AI expertise to ensure consistency in the evaluation of AI-related patent applications.

Furthermore, India can consider utilizing AI in the patent examination process. AI can support patent examiners in performing prior art searches and assessing patent claims. This can help decrease the backlog of patent applications and ensure prompt and efficient examination of AI-related patent applications.

Adjusting to the future of AI patent laws in India will necessitate adopting best practices from the United States. By implementing guidelines for AI-related inventions, developing a team of expert examiners, and incorporating AI into the patent examination process, India can ensure the effective and consistent evaluation of AI-related patent applications. This will not only foster innovation in the AI field but also offer ample protection to inventors and stimulate economic growth.

Thus, there are several recommendations that the Indian Patent Regime can implement to adapt to the future of AI patent laws and cultivate a conducive environment for AI innovation and growth:

(i) Patentability criteria clarity: The Indian government should offer clear guidelines and

criteria for the patentability of AI-related inventions, reducing ambiguity and providing certainty for inventors and companies seeking patent protection.

(ii) Enhance patent examiners' expertise: India should develop a group of patent examiners proficient in AI technologies, ensuring that patents are examined and granted efficiently and promptly.

(iii) Promote industry-academia collaboration: India should foster cooperation between industry and academia to stimulate innovation in AI-related fields, helping to create AI-related inventions eligible for patent protection and aiding in resolving complex patent disputes.

(iv) Establish a strong legal framework: India should devise a comprehensive legal framework, including specific provisions for AI-related patents, ensuring that AI inventions are protected and enforced effectively and promptly.

(v) Raise IP awareness among start-ups and SMEs: The Indian government should increase intellectual property awareness among start-ups and SMEs, boosting the number of AI-related patents filed in India and providing a competitive advantage to Indian companies in the global market.

(vi) Exploring International Cooperation and Harmonization of Patent Laws: Given the global reach and impact of AI technologies, it is essential to explore the role of international cooperation in the realm of patent law. We suggest future studies to focus on the possibilities of harmonizing patent laws across various jurisdictions. By doing so, we can gain a more comprehensive understanding of the challenges and prospective solutions concerning AI and patent law. International dialogue and negotiation could pave the way for unified policies that account for the unique attributes of AI, thereby fostering innovation while protecting intellectual property rights on a global scale.

(vii) Inclusion of Alternative Intellectual Property Protection Mechanisms: In addition to patent laws, considering other intellectual property protection mechanisms like trade secrets is crucial to fully understand the options available for AI-related inventions. Future research could delve into how these alternative mechanisms are being leveraged in the AI domain, their advantages and disadvantages, and their interplay with patent laws. An expanded view of the intellectual property landscape will not only equip innovators with a more diverse set of tools for protecting their creations but also contribute to a more nuanced discourse on intellectual property rights in the era of rapid technological advancement.

As AI continues to revolutionize various industries, the necessity for effective patent laws to safeguard and incentivize innovation in this domain grows more critical. Although the United States leads AI development, India is also making substantial progress. However, the Indian patent system must address concerns regarding clarity, efficiency, and consistency in examining AI-related patent applications. By adopting best practices from the United States, such as providing guidelines for AI-related inventions, forming a team of expert examiners, and integrating AI into the patent examination process, India can foster a favourable environment for AI innovation and growth. These efforts will not only stimulate economic growth but also offer adequate protection to inventors and ensure India remains competitive in the global market.

References

1 Susan V S, Artificial Intelligence and Corporate Social Responsibility: Employees' key role in driving responsible Artificial Intelligence at Big Tech, *SSRN Electronic Journal,* (2021), DOI:10.2139/ssrn.3873097.

2 Guang Y, Qinghao Y & Jun X, Unbox the black-box for the medical explainable AI *via* multi-modal and multi-centre data fusion: A mini-review, two showcases and beyond, *Information Fusion,* 77 (2022) 29-52.

3 Burk D L & Lemley M A, The Patent Crisis and How the Courts Can Solve It, *University of Chicago Press*, 2009.

4 Arrow K J, *Economic Welfare and the Allocation of Resources for Invention*, In The Rate and Direction of Inventive Activity: Economic and Social Factors, Princeton University Press, 1962, 609-626.

5 Gallini N T, The Economics of Patents: Lessons from Recent U.S. Patent Reform. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 16 (2) (2002) 131-154.

6 Menell P S, An analytic framework for assessing the impact of AI and robots on Patent Law, *Berkeley Technology Law Journal*, 36 (1) (2021) 1-41.

7 Yanisky-Ravid S & Jin R, Summoning a new Artificial Intelligence Patent Model: In the Age of Pandemic, *SSRN,* June 30 (2020) 3619069, doi: 10.2139/ssrn.3619069. PMID: 32714121; PMCID: PMC7366817.

8 Ravid Y & Liu X, When Artificial Intelligence systems produce inventions: An alternative model for Patent Law at the 3A Era, *Cardozo Law Review*, 39 (6) (2018) 2215-2263.

9 Daria K, AI-generated inventions: Time to get the record straight, *GRUR International*, 69 (5) (2020) 443–456, https://doi.org/10.1093/grurint/ikaa061.

10 Abioye S O, Oyedele L O, Akanbi L, Ajayi A, Delgado J M D, Bilal M, Akinade O O& Ahmed A, Artificial intelligence in the construction industry: A review of present status, opportunities

and future challenges, *Journal of Building Engineering*, 44 (2021).

11 Brundage M, Avin S, Clark J, Toner H, Eckersley P, Garfinkel B & Anderson H, (2018), The malicious use of artificial intelligence: Forecasting, prevention, and mitigation, *arXiv* preprint arXiv:1802.07228.

12 Hebbar P, TCS' AI-Powered Ignio plans to touch $100 million in revenue within 2 years, 2018, https://analyticsindiamag.com/tcs-ai-powered-ignio-plans-to-touch-100-million-in-revenue-within-2-years/.

13 NITI Aayog, 2018, National Strategy for Artificial Intelligence #AIforAll.https://niti.gov.in/sites/default/files/2019-01/National Strategy-for-AI-Discussion-Paper.pdf.

14 Jha S K, Kalra M& Sridhar V, Artificial intelligence in Indian agriculture—An overview, *Current Science*, 116 (1) (2019) 36-48, https://doi.org/10.18520/cs%2Fv116%2Fi1%2F36-48.

15 U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, 2020, Decision on Petition: In re Application of Application No. 16/524,350, https://www.uspto.gov/sites/default/files/documents/16524350_22apr2020.pdf

16 Conger K & Wakabayashi D, 9 February 2018), Uber & Waymo settle trade secrets suit over driverless-car technology, *The New York Times*, https://www.nytimes.com/2018/02/09/technology/uber-waymo-lawsuit-settlement.html.

17 The Patents Act, 1970, http://ipindia.nic.in/writereaddata/Portal/IPOAct/1_31_1_patent-act-1970-11march2015.pdf.

18 Intellectual Property India, (n.d.). Patents – Amendments, http://ipindia.nic.in/ipr/patent/patents_Amendments.htm.

19 U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, 2019, Revised Patent Subject Matter Eligibility Guidance, https://www.federalregister.gov/documents/2019/01/07/2018-28282/2019-revised-patent-subject-matter-eligibility-guidance.

20 Srinivas K, Patentability of computer programmes: A comparative study of US, EU and Indian position, *Indian Journal of Intellectual Property Law*, 8 (2017) 15-37, https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=3011415.

21 Intellectual Property India, 2016, Guidelines for Examination of Computer Related Inventions (CRIs), http://www.ipindia.nic.in/writereaddata/Portal/IPOGuidelinesManuals/1_50_1_Revised__Guidelines_for_Examination_of_Computer-Related_Inventions_CRI__.pdf.

22 Crootof R, Artificial intelligence and legal disruption: A new model for analysis, *Yale Journal of Law and Technology*, 22 (2020) 1-63.

23 Government of India, The Patents (Amendment) Rules, 2020, Ministry of Commerce and Industry (2020).

24 Indian Patent Office, 2016, Guidelines for Examination of Computer Related Inventions, 573 U.S. 208 (2014).

25 USPTO, Examining Computer-Implemented Functional Claim Limitations for Compliance with 35 U.S.C. 112, United States Patent and Trademark Office, 2020.

26 Millien R& Laurie R, A survey of emerging patent issues in artificial intelligence and machine learning, *les Nouvelles - Journal of the Licensing Executives Society*, 51 (4) (2016) 197-204.

27 Searle K & Waliczek T M, The future of artificial intelligence in the legal profession: The changing legal market, ethical implications, and the proliferation of AI, *Journal of the Legal Profession*, 43 (1) (2019) 97-121.