International Scientific Journal of Engineering and Management (ISJEM) ISSN: 2583-6129
Volume: 04 Issue: 04 | April – 2025 DOI: 10.55041/ISJEM03055
An International Scholarly || Multidisciplinary || Open Access || Indexing in all major Database & Metadata

Navigating the Legal Landscape of AI-Created Content: Intellectual Property, Accountability, and Regulation

Roshan Khadka

Abstract: The advent of AI-generated content has raised fundamental legal and ethical concerns over intellectual property rights, accountability, as well as regulation. This paper delves into the intricate legal environment behind content created by artificial intelligence, such as copyright ownership, patentability, data protection, and responsibility. It discusses developers, users, and platforms in creating and spreading
AI-generated content, and legal uncertainty over such output's ownership or responsibility. The research examines current legal frameworks, such as the EU AI Act, as well as U.S. regulatory policies, and how they fall short in addressing generative AI technologies. By means of case studies and analysis of popular discontent—e.g., lawsuits against Stability AI and OpenAI—it emphasizes the pressing need for better legal standards. The paper also suggests possible reforms, such as mandatory licensing for training data, content labelling, recognition of co-authorship, and cooperation on regulatory standards at an international level.
Finally, it suggests a balanced regulatory strategy supporting innovation while promoting transparency, ethical accountability, as well as the protection of human rights in an era of AI-generated media.

Keywords: AI-generated content, Major AI Technologies, Copyright issues, Patents issues, the DABUS Case, Getty Images (US) Inc. v Stability AI Ltd., Authors vs. OpenAI and Microsoft

Introduction

AI-generated content is any content (text, photos, audio, or video) that is generated or largely produced by artificial intelligence algorithms. AI algorithms apply machine learning to process copious amounts of data, discover patterns, and create new, original content based on the data that has been input. Examples include:

- **Texts**: Articles, blogs, poems, or stories produced by natural language processing technologies such as GPT-3 or GPT-4.
- **Images**: Pieces of artwork or photographs produced by AI software such as DALL-E or similar generative algorithms.
- **Music**: AI-created songs or compositions trained over a range of different music genres.
- **Videos**: Manipulated or AI-generated video content, e.g., synthetic animation or deep fakes.

AI-generated content also raises legal and ethical issues of authorship, ownership, and intellectual property rights since such content is not created directly by humans.

AI-created content raises legal concerns

AI-generated content creates legal issues based on intellectual property, liability, misinformation, privacy, and bias. Legal issues include:

- **Authorship & Ownership**: As AI does not have legal personhood, it is questionable whether or not AI-generated content can be copyrighted and to whom (the developer, the user, or the company) it belongs.
- **Copyright Infringement**: AI algorithms are usually trained based on copyrighted content, and there are debates concerning whether their outputs amount to copyright infringement.
- **Defamation & Objectionable Content**: In cases where AI-generated content shares false or misleading information, there is no one to point at— the creator of the AI, the user, or the platform.
- **Deep fakes & Fraud**: AI can be used to generate false content (Deepfake videos or false news) to commit identity fraud, reputational damage, or interfere with elections.
- **Personalized Data Usage**: AI algorithms can create content based on personal data without permission, breaching data protection regulations such as GDPR.
- **Algorithmic Bias**: AI algorithms can generate biased content when trained with biased data, which will result in

discrimination in computerized decision-making.

- **Regulatory Challenges:** Legal framework lags behind AI technology development, and regulatory issues are faced by policymakers and legal professionals. Fair content policies become hard to apply.

Due to these complexities, governments and regulatory agencies around the globe are considering new AI legislation like the EU AI Act, and copyright legislation updates to solve these new issues.

Objective

The purpose of this study is to analyze the legal issues with AI-created content under international law with regard to intellectual property rights, liability, data privacy, and ethics. It seeks to:

1. Examine whether work created by AI can be copyrighted and protected under patent law.
2. Analyze how international treaties and agreements address AI-generated content.
3. Discuss the use of AI models to gather and process copyright and personal data in content creation.
4. Legal frameworks that address AI accountability.

The Rise of AI-Generated Content

The acceleration of AI-generated content is driven by increased computing power, data abundance, and better algorithms. Key milestones are:

- **Text Generation**: AI-generated chatbots and content producers like Google's Bard and OpenAI's GPT models (GPT-3 and GPT-4) have transformed writing by producing articles, reports, and even fiction. AI is increasingly applied in journalism, marketing, and customer service to generate content.

- **Image and Video Generation**: AI technologies such as DALL·E, MidJourney, and Stable Diffusion create hyper-realistic or artistic visuals based on text input. AI-created content and deepfake technology provide the capability to make authentic animations, voice-overs, and synthetic media, and raise creative and ethical issues.

- **Music and Audio**: AI-based music software, such as AIVA and Jukebox, generates new music, providing new avenues for content creators and artists. AI-powered voiceovers and speech synthesis are revolutionizing entertainment, advertising, and accessibility services.

- **Gaming and Virtual Worlds**: Video game character, story, and level creation are more and more dependent upon AI to generate characters, narratives, and worlds.

Reason behind the rapid growth of AI Technologies

- **Cost Savings**: AI can generate substantial volumes of content at a minuscule fraction of the cost of human labor.
- **Speed**: AI generates high-quality content in seconds, making it ideal for fast-paced industries.
- **Accessibility**: AI technologies make content easily accessible to people lacking professional expertise.
- **Innovation**: Artificial intelligence is enabling new modes of creativity like AI-generated storytelling and digital paintings.

But with the advent of AI-generated content, there are legal, ethical, and societal issues, namely copyright infringement issues, misinformation, deep fakes, and the effects on human creativity and employment. With the ongoing development of AI, striking a fine balance between innovation and appropriate use will be a prime regulatory and industrial challenge.

Major AI Technologies Involved in AI-Generated Content

AI-generated content is dependent upon a range of cutting-edge technologies, especially generative algorithms that

generate text, photographs, video, and audio. Among the leading AI technologies and models that are highly influential are:

1. Natural Language Processing (NLP) Models

Natural Language Processing models are trained to comprehend and generate text similar to humans. They are widely employed in chatbots, digital assistants, and write-on-your-behalf tools.
Examples: GPT, PaLM, Claude, etc..

2. Image Generation Models

Image-generating models generate realistic, artistic, or stylized pictures based on textual descriptions. They are extensively applied in digital artwork, design, advertising, and media production.
Examples: DALL-E, Stable Diffusion, MidJourney, and more.

3. Video and Animation Generation

Such models generate or manipulate video content by applying AI, allowing synthetic media, automatic video creation, and virtual presenters.
Examples: Runway Gen-2, Synthesia, FaceSwap, etc.

AI-generated content is fueled by a series of generative models, with each tailored to various media. Such technologies are revolutionizing industries such as journalism, entertainment, design, and education, and both pose and create new challenges in areas such as copyright, misinformation, and ethics.

Copyright issues

1. Developers

Developers have a case to claim ownership since they create and train the AI systems that generate content. Some companies provide terms within their user agreement that stipulate ownership. Developers can claim partial or total control, especially where the user merely contributes minimal input and the AI generates content by itself. Courts are not eager to grant developers ownership without established legal frameworks to back this. Some AI companies grant users output rights but maintain the right to change policies or limit specific use.

2. Users

Users tend to claim ownership because the creative prompts, direction, and ultimate say over what to use are provided by them. Users are, in many instances, considered authors if they have enough creative control.
Some sites, such as OpenAI, now give rights to the output created by their prompts under their terms of use. If you create an image with DALL·E from a full and creative prompt, you could be considered to have ownership over that output under some platform terms. Ownership rights are contingent upon exactly how much human creativity and originality are included. If AI-generated content is entirely self-directed with little human input, copyright protection will be more difficult to establish.

3. The AI Itself

Could AI be the owner of its work? **No.** Currently, only humans (or legal persons created by humans, such as corporations) can be copyright holders. The courts of the world have previously excluded AI ownership of content, reiterating that machines are not considered to be authors.

Example:

Charles, a resident of Missouri, filed a copyright in 2018 for *"A Recent Entrance to Paradise,"* a visual work he claimed was created by his AI system. The office turned him down in 2022, holding that creative works have to be created by humans to be copyrightable.

Patents issues

Patent law is meant to shield human innovation, not machine invention. As AI technologies continue to evolve with increasing complexity, a very pertinent legal issue is raised: Should AI-generated inventions be patentable and, if so, by whom? **No.** AI itself cannot be designated an inventor under current patent law. Humans are the ones who can seek and hold patents. Patent law all over the world (such as the U.S. Patent Act, European Patent Convention, and others) only defines inventors to be humans. Courts have repeatedly held that machines cannot be granted legal rights or duties.

Example:

DABUS and the Debate on AI as an Inventor [1]

DABUS (Device for the Autonomous Bootstrapping of Unified Sentience) is an artificial intelligence device that created two inventions by itself. DABUS creator Dr. Stephen Thaler attempted to include the AI in patent filings in various nations (the US, the UK, Europe, Australia, and so forth). The US, UK, and European Patent Offices rejected filings because only a human can be considered an inventor. Australia initially approved, but later the decision was reversed upon appeal. Courts highlighted that patents encourage human creativity and not machine output.

This raises another question: can human operators patent AI-generated inventions? Yes, with some caveats. If a human makes a meaningful contribution to developing or applying the AI to envision the invention, he or she may be considered the inventor. The test is **human contribution**: interpreting, refining, or directing the AI output to a patentable invention. For example, a scientist can patent an invention when they use AI to assist with designing a new medicine and meaningfully direct the process.

Liability & Accountability

If someone uses AI to generate and distribute misinformation, deep fakes, or defamatory content to do so, they are usually legally and ethically accountable. Intent is a deciding factor here—unintentional abuse attracts less stringent penalties, whereas malicious intentions result in criminal prosecution. Developers are responsible for making sure that their technologies are not easily manipulable. In general, they are not responsible for user abuse, especially if they have taken due care. But if a developer is found to facilitate abuse—i.e., by stripping away safeguards or neglecting abuse complaints—they are subject to legal or regulatory action.

Platforms such as OpenAI, Meta, and Google limit the deployment of their generative technologies to be used in political or abusive content. Stability AI came under flak when its open-source software, Stable Diffusion, was employed to generate NSFW and deep fake content without appropriate safeguards.

Websites, online platforms, or video-hosting sites that carry AI-generated defamation or misinformation can be subject to secondary liability, subject to local law.

- In the United States, Section 230 of the Communications Decency Act shields platforms in general against liability for the content of users.
- In the European Union, the Digital Services Act (DSA) imposes more stringent obligations upon platforms to identify and take down harmful content..
- In India, intermediaries have to act swiftly to take down offending content upon notification or face liability.

With increasingly advanced and ubiquitous AI technologies, mutual responsibility between developers, users, and platforms, and a sound regulation framework are both necessary to prevent and limit the damage that AI-created misinformation and deep fakes can do..

Ethical Considerations in AI Decision-Making and Automated Content Generation

There are ethical considerations in AI-driven decision-making and machine-generated content that are multi-faceted. Perhaps the biggest concern is bias and discrimination. AI that is trained with historical or imbalanced data can embed existing prejudices and reinforce them, leading to unfair treatment in hiring, lending, or law enforcement. This is

closely related to the question of transparency and explainability. Many sophisticated AI algorithms are 'black boxes' and are not transparent, such that the users have no idea what rationale has been used to make a decision. This can be a source of concern in high-stakes applications, where knowing what the basis of a result is is fundamental.

Accountability and responsibility pose a significant ethical dilemma. In cases where AI results in harm or malfunctions, both the developer, the user, and the organization that deploys the system have uncertainties over accountability. This confusion derails public belief and diminishes the basis of legal redress. In addition, the widespread employment of personal data in training AI raises critical privacy and consent concerns. With a lack of appropriate controls, data of people could be harvested and exploited without them knowing, undermining their autonomy and rights.

Another important issue is that of deception and deep fakes. AI generative tools are able to generate hyper-realistic but completely fabricated content, and this content can be exploited to disseminate false information, manipulate public perception, or damage reputations. This calls into question the integrity of information in the online world. Lastly, AI-generated content, such as creative work, writing, and music, raises questions concerning creative integrity and cultural influence. As machines mimic or copy human creativity, it is hard to make a distinction between true creative expression and computer-generated output, and this has the potential to devalue culture and erode the position of creators..

The solution to these ethical issues demands commitment to fairness, transparency, responsibility, privacy, authenticity, and respect for humans' agency in the AI system design, deployment, and governance.

Data Privacy & Compliance

AI algorithms, especially large language and generative AI, are trained mainly on enormous datasets harvested from the web. Such data sets usually comprise copyrighted or personal content that fuels legitimate legal and ethical issues. Developers of AI extract books, articles, code, paintings, and users' posts from public spaces, online forums, and sites without the owner's consent or even knowledge. As much as this increased data availability improves AI's working and overall generalization, it diminishes the distinction between copyright infringement and fair use.

Another key concern is that AI systems can clone or closely emulate foundational works in their outputs and thereby infringe upon copyright law. A good example is a generative AI that has been trained with copyrighted music or drawings and creates content that is quite similar to the style of a particular artist, raising questions of unauthorized duplication. In a few instances, allegedly full works have been incorporated without appropriate licensing in the training process, which has led to lawsuits and public outcry against leading AI companies.

Moreover, use of personal or confidential information—private emails, healthcare data, or not-yet-published materials—is also problematic with respect to privacy breaches and protection. People wouldn't even be aware that their information was part of training data sets, compromising trust and breaching privacy legislation like the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) in the EU or equivalent legislation elsewhere.

In response to these issues, increasing calls are made to be more transparent when supplying datasets, provide creators with the right to opt out, and use licensed or synthetic data to train the models. Legal systems are adapting to define what constitutes infringement and under what conditions current copyright legislation is to be applied to content created by AI. Until more nuanced standards become established, the use of copyrighted and personal data to train is a contentious and unresolved issue within AI.

There are two notable instances where AI firms came under attack and faced legal action for supposedly utilizing creators' content without permission to train their models:

1. Getty Images (US) Inc. v Stability AI Ltd. [2]

Case: Getty Images, a leading global stock photo agency, filed lawsuits against Stability AI, the company behind the AI image generator Stable Diffusion, in both the United States and the United Kingdom.

Allegation:

Getty Images accused Stability AI of using millions of copyrighted photos from its database without permission to train its generative model. Some of the AI-generated images even appeared to contain remnants of Getty's watermark, suggesting that the content had been directly scraped from their site.

Public Backlash:
The case ignited widespread debate around copyright infringement in the AI world. Photographers, illustrators, and designers voiced their concerns, arguing that their creative work was being exploited to build tools that might one day replace them. Many called for stronger consent protocols and fair compensation for the use of their content in AI training.

2. Authors vs. OpenAI and Microsoft [3]

Case: A coalition of prominent authors, including George R.R. Martin, John Grisham, and Jodi Picoult, launched lawsuits against OpenAI and Meta.
Allegation:
Backed by the Authors Guild, the lawsuits claimed that these companies used pirated or scraped versions of their books to train language models like GPT and LLaMA, all without the author's knowledge or consent. The complaints pointed out that the models could replicate text or mimic writing styles, potentially infringing on the authors' copyright protections.
Public Backlash:
The legal action sparked a wider discussion in the literary world about ethical AI practices. Writers called for more transparency in data usage, clearer opt-out options, and systems that could provide royalties for authors whose work is used in training. The lawsuits captured national media attention and brought the focus back to the growing tension between creative ownership and AI development.
These cases highlight a growing tension between technological advancement and creator rights, underscoring the urgent need for legal clarity and ethical safeguards in how AI models are trained.
Liability & Accountability

As AI systems take on a bigger role in generating text, images, music, and video, the need for transparency and explainability has become more critical than ever. These two principles are key to building trust, ensuring accountability, and promoting fairness in how AI-generated content is created and used.
Transparency is about allowing developers and users to understand how an AI model works—how it's trained, what data it relies on, and how it makes decisions. In the context of AI content creation tools, this means openly stating whether content was generated by AI, which model was used (like GPT or DALL·E), and the general nature of the training data. Without this clarity, people might mistakenly assume that AI-generated content was made by a human, which can affect things like news credibility, academic honesty, or even consumer trust.
Explainability, on the other hand, focuses on understanding why the AI produced a certain result or made a particular decision. AI models, especially those based on deep learning, often function as "black boxes," where it's difficult to trace the reasoning behind their outputs. This lack of insight can be risky in high-stakes areas like legal documents, journalism, or medical reporting. If an AI-generated report includes misinformation or bias, it's crucial to understand what prompted it and how the model reached that outcome.
A lack of transparency and explainability brings real ethical concerns, such as misinformation, unclear authorship, and reinforcing harmful stereotypes. In response, both developers and regulators are pushing for new measures, like labeling AI-generated content, using watermarks, publishing model documentation (like model cards), and building tools that help explain how AI systems work.
In short, transparency and explainability go beyond being technical necessities—they are ethical and social obligations. They help ensure that AI-generated content remains accountable, trustworthy, and aligned with human values, especially in areas where accuracy, fairness, and responsibility are critical.

Existing Regulatory Frameworks and Their Gaps

Governments and international organizations are beginning to put regulations in place to govern the development and use of AI, especially as it becomes more influential in areas like content creation, privacy,

intellectual property, and automated decision-making. Still, these regulatory efforts are a work in progress and currently leave several important issues unresolved..

1. Existing Frameworks

- **European Union – EU AI Act (2024):** The EU's AI Act is the first comprehensive legislation in the world focused entirely on regulating AI. It categorizes AI systems based on risk levels—unacceptable, high, limited, and minimal. High-risk systems (like those used in healthcare, hiring, or law enforcement) are subject to strict standards for transparency, data quality, and human oversight.

- **United States – Sectoral and Executive Approaches:** The U.S. doesn't have a single, unified AI law. Instead, regulation is scattered across sectors such as healthcare, finance, and consumer rights. The AI Bill of Rights (2022) and the 2023 Executive Order on AI are non-binding but promote guiding principles like fairness and transparency. The NIST AI Risk Management Framework offers voluntary best practices..

- **China:** China takes a highly controlled approach, requiring all AI-generated content to be labeled and banning anything that might threaten national security or social stability. The focus is especially strong on cracking down on misinformation and deep fakes.

- **Other Efforts:** Other initiatives include the OECD AI Principles, Canada's Artificial Intelligence and Data Act (AIDA), and the UK's pro-innovation regulatory strategy—all emphasizing ethical innovation, human oversight, and responsible use of data.

2. Gaps and Challenges in Regulation

- **Intellectual Property Uncertainty:** Current copyright and patent laws don't clearly define whether AI-generated works can be protected or who legally owns them. It's also unclear whether training AI on copyrighted material is permissible under existing law.

- **Lack of Enforcement Mechanisms:** Many regulations, particularly in the U.S. and the UK, are voluntary or non-binding. Even the EU AI Act, though binding, still lacks concrete enforcement mechanisms for some areas, including generative content.

- **Inadequate Coverage of Generative AI:** Most existing laws were designed with decision-making AI in mind, not generative models that create text, images, or videos. As a result, issues like deep fakes, plagiarism, and stylistic mimicry are often left unregulated.

- **Cross-Border Jurisdiction:** AI development and use cross national boundaries, but global regulatory coordination is weak. This inconsistency allows companies to relocate to less-regulated areas, creating what's known as "regulatory arbitrage."

- **Transparency and Explainability Gaps:** Few laws explicitly require AI-generated content to be labeled, and explainability requirements are rare, especially for complex black-box models where decisions can't be easily unpacked.

While meaningful progress has been made toward establishing legal guardrails for AI, critical gaps remain, particularly in the areas of generative content, intellectual property, cross-border governance, and transparency. Bridging these gaps will require globally coordinated strategies, adaptive legal tools, and ongoing collaboration among governments, developers, and civil society.

Potential Legal Reforms for Governing AI-Generated Content

1. **Clear Copyright Ownership Frameworks**

A key legal challenge in the realm of AI-generated content is determining ownership. Current copyright laws only recognize human authors, leaving AI-created works in a gray zone. Legal reforms could redefine this by assigning rights to either the AI user or developer, or adopting a co-authorship model when there's substantial human guidance. Such clarity would establish ownership, ensure accountability, and help prevent unauthorized use or commercial exploitation of AI-generated creations..

2. **Licensing Requirements for Training Data**

AI systems rely on massive datasets, often including copyrighted content scraped from the internet without permission. This raises issues around fair use and intellectual property rights. Reforms should introduce mandatory licensing for training data, ensuring creators are paid and that their works are not used without consent. Developers could also be required to disclose training datasets, giving creators the option to opt out, creating more transparency and fairness in AI training practices.s.

3. **Mandatory AI Disclosure and Labelling**

As AI-generated content becomes harder to tell apart from human-made material, the risk of misinformation grows. Legal mandates for clear labeling or watermarking of AI content—whether it's a news article, social post, or image—would help maintain public trust. This is especially critical in areas like politics or public communication. Implementing tools that trace the digital origin of content would also support a more transparent media environment.

4. **Establishing AI Accountability and Liability**

When AI-generated content causes harm—be it misinformation, defamation, or copyright infringement—it's unclear who's to blame. Legal reforms should establish liability frameworks that assign responsibility to AI developers, platform owners, or users. In some cases, AI tools could be treated as products under existing liability laws, enabling victims to seek compensation. Developers of high-risk models should also be required to perform risk assessments and audits before deployment.

5. **Data Privacy Protections and Consent Mechanisms**

AI models are often trained on personal data, like emails, social media posts, or other private records, without users' explicit consent. This creates serious privacy concerns. Reforms should build on existing laws like GDPR by including rules specific to AI. Individuals should have the right to know whether their data was used and to request its removal. A "right to be forgotten" in AI would help preserve autonomy and rebuild trust in how AI systems manage sensitive data.

6. **Global Regulatory Cooperation**

AI systems function globally, but legal regulation remains localized, creating inconsistency and loopholes. Developers can move operations to regions with looser regulations, undermining stricter laws elsewhere. To tackle this, international cooperation is crucial. Legal frameworks should support global AI standards through organizations like the OECD, UNESCO, or WIPO. Such efforts can harmonize rules and create cross-border mechanisms to address violations.

7. **Ethical Oversight and Human-in-the-Loop Requirements**

To ensure responsible content generation, legal structures should enforce ethical reviews and human supervision in AI workflows. In sensitive fields like healthcare, journalism, law, or education, human review of AI outputs should be required. Ethics boards or regulatory "sandboxes" could help test AI tools in controlled environments before full deployment. These mechanisms would reduce harm and embed transparency, safety, and accountability throughout the AI development process. A human-in-the-loop approach also reinforces human judgment in critical decision-making.

Effective AI content regulation must strike a balance—protecting rights and upholding public trust while encouraging innovation. These reforms will be essential to ensure legal clarity, human dignity, and the ethical evolution of AI in the digital age.

Summary of Key Findings

The rapid development of AI-generated content has brought significant legal and ethical concerns across a wide range of industries. As advanced tools like GPT, DALL·E, and Stable Diffusion grow more capable, legal systems are struggling to keep up with questions about authorship, liability, data usage, and content authenticity.

One of the most pressing challenges is the unclear status of copyright ownership for AI-generated works. Since current copyright laws only recognize human creators, there's growing confusion about whether rights belong to the developer, the user, or no one at all. Similarly, the use of copyrighted or personal data to train AI models is often done without permission has triggered public outcry and legal scrutiny, with many calling for stricter licensing and consent requirements.

There are also rising concerns around accountability, especially when AI-generated content spreads misinformation, deep fakes, or defamation. Existing laws don't yet provide clear guidance on who's responsible. And while policies like the EU AI Act and the U.S. AI Bill of Rights represent steps forward, they fall short when it comes to enforcement, particularly in the realm of generative content.

Another major issue is the lack of transparency and explainability in AI systems. Without insight into how these tools generate content, public trust is at risk. As a result, both consumers and regulators are increasingly demanding that AI-generated material be clearly labeled and auditable.

To address these problems, a range of legal reforms have been proposed. These include updating copyright laws to allow for human-AI co-authorship, requiring developers to disclose training datasets, enforcing mandatory content labeling, and promoting international collaboration on AI regulation. Additional safeguards like human oversight for high-risk applications and stronger data privacy protections aim to ensure ethical AI deployment.

In summary, the rise of AI-generated content introduces complex legal and ethical challenges. Tackling these issues will require clearer laws, global cooperation, and strong ethical frameworks. Getting it right is essential to ensuring AI can be a force for creativity, fairness, and accountability in society.

References

[1] Saravanan A* & Deva Prasad M+, "AI as an Inventor Debate under the Patent Law: A Post-DABUS Comparative Analysis" Available at: *https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=5053108*

[2] Navigating representative actions: takeaways from Getty Images v Stability AI [Online article]: Available at: *https://www.herbertsmithfreehills.com/notes/ip/2025-01/navigating-representative-actions-takeaways-from-gett y-images-v-stability-ai*

[3] Maria Alexandra Mărginean, "Copyright Infringement & AI: A Case Study of Authors Guild v. OpenAI and Microsoft" Available at: https://www.4ipcouncil.com/application/files/7517/2189/4919/Copyright_Infringement_and_AI___A_Case_Study_of_Authors_Guild_v._OpenAI_and_Microsoft.pdf

[4] Haolong Wen, 'Legal and Ethical Implications of AI-Generated Content in Intellectual Property Law' Available at: http://166.62.7.99/assets/default/article/2024/12/26/article_1735205161.pdf