



THE LAWWAY WITH LAWYERS JOURNAL

Website: www.the-lawway-with-lawyers.com

VOLUME:-37 ISSUE NO:- 37 , JULY 10, 2026

ISSN (ONLINE):- 2584-1106

Email: thelawwaywithlawyers@gmail.com

Digital Number : 2025-23534643

CC BY-NC-SA

Authored By :- Hazra Hayat

COPYRIGHT PROTECTION FOR SOFTWARE AND DIGITAL CONTENT THROUGH INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY RIGHTS (IPR)

Topic: Copyright Protection for Software and Digital Content

Abstract

Software, websites, streaming platforms, e-books, online courses, photographs, music, videos, databases and mobile applications have become central to modern economic and cultural life. Their value, however, depends heavily on the ability of creators and businesses to control unauthorized copying, distribution and commercial exploitation. Copyright law is the principal legal mechanism used for that purpose. In India, the Copyright Act, 1957 treats computer programmes as literary works and grants copyright owners a bundle of exclusive rights over reproduction, distribution, adaptation, communication to the public and, in the case of computer programmes, commercial rental. The law also recognizes that digital technology requires carefully framed exceptions. Lawful possessors of software may make necessary copies, create temporary back-ups, study the functioning of a programme, and undertake acts needed for interoperability in specified circumstances. The 2012 amendments added protection for technological protection measures and rights-management information, while the 2021 amendment to the Copyright Rules simplified the

source-code deposit requirement for software registration. This assignment examines the protection of software and digital content under Indian copyright law, the special problems created by online infringement, licensing and open-source software, the role of digital rights management, important judicial principles concerning originality, and the international framework under the Berne Convention, TRIPS Agreement and WIPO Internet Treaties. It argues that copyright remains essential for the digital economy, but effective protection requires a balance between owners' rights, legitimate user freedoms, innovation, interoperability and public access.

Keywords

Copyright, Computer Software, Digital Content, Computer Programme, Digital Rights Management, Online Piracy, Source Code, Object Code, Licensing, Fair Dealing, WIPO Copyright Treaty.

Introduction

Copyright law was originally developed in a world of books, paintings, music and physical copies. Digital technology has changed the manner in which creative works are produced, copied and distributed, but it has not reduced the importance of copyright. Instead, the ease with which a perfect digital copy can be made in seconds has made protection more significant. A software programme can be copied from one computer to thousands of devices without any loss of quality. A film, song, e-book or photograph can be uploaded to the internet and reproduced across several countries almost immediately. The same technology that allows creators to reach a global audience can therefore also expose their work to rapid and inexpensive infringement.

Computer software occupies a special position in intellectual property law. A programme performs a technical function, yet copyright law protects the code as a form of literary expression. Copyright does not give a programmer ownership over a general idea, algorithm, business method or mathematical principle merely because it appears in software. It protects the particular expression of those ideas in code and other copyrightable elements. This distinction is essential because excessive protection could prevent legitimate competition and independent innovation, while insufficient protection would make commercial software development difficult to sustain.

Digital content is broader than software. It includes online articles, photographs, illustrations, videos, films, music, podcasts, e-books, course material, website text, graphic interfaces and original databases. In many digital products, several copyright works exist at the same time. A mobile application may contain source code, icons, photographs, sound recordings, text, animation and an audiovisual interface. A streaming service distributes films and sound recordings while also

relying on software and databases. Identifying the relevant copyright work is therefore the first step in understanding legal protection.

India's Copyright Act, 1957 has been amended repeatedly to respond to technological developments. Computer programmes are included within the definition of literary work, electronic storage is expressly recognized as a form of reproduction, and the law grants software owners rights that include commercial rental. At the same time, Section 52 contains specific exceptions for lawful users of computer programmes. The 2012 amendments introduced legal protection for technological measures and electronic rights-management information, making the statute more responsive to digital distribution. India also became a party to the WIPO Copyright Treaty and the WIPO Performances and Phonograms Treaty in 2018, strengthening its participation in the international digital-copyright framework.

This assignment studies how these rules operate in relation to software and digital content. It first explains the nature of copyright in the digital environment, then examines the Indian statutory framework, software-specific exceptions, registration, licensing, digital rights management, infringement and remedies. It also considers international obligations, judicial principles and new challenges created by cloud computing, online platforms and artificial intelligence.

2. Understanding Copyright in the Digital Environment

2.1 Copyright Protects Expression, Not the Underlying Idea

The basic principle of copyright is that protection is given to original expression rather than to an idea in the abstract. This distinction is especially important in technology. Two programmers may independently create software that performs the same task. Copyright does not normally prevent the second programmer from implementing the same general function through independently written code. What the law prevents is unauthorized copying of protectable expression, such as substantial portions of source code, object code or other original material.

The distinction also protects competition. If copyright granted a monopoly over every idea represented in a programme, the first developer of a common function could prevent others from building compatible or competing systems. For that reason, copyright is different from patent law. Patents may protect qualifying inventions and technical solutions after examination, whereas copyright arises automatically in original expression and does not require novelty in the patent sense.

2.2 Software as a Literary Work

Section 2(ffc) of the Copyright Act defines a computer programme as a set of instructions expressed in words, codes, schemes or another form, including a machine-readable medium, that is capable of causing a computer to perform a task or achieve a result. Section 2(o) places computer programmes within the category of literary works. This classification may appear unusual because computer code is functional, but it reflects the international approach adopted under the TRIPS Agreement, which requires computer programmes in source or object code to be protected as literary works.

Source code is the human-readable form in which programmers normally write and maintain software. Object code or machine code is the form processed by the computer after compilation or interpretation. Copyright protection is not limited to one programming language or one level of code. What matters is the original expression embodied in the programme.

2.3 Meaning of Digital Content

Digital content includes works created, stored or distributed in electronic form. A digital format does not create a new category of copyright by itself. Instead, the law asks what kind of work is involved. An e-book is generally a literary work; a digital photograph is an artistic work; a song may involve a musical work, lyrics and a sound recording; an online video may involve a cinematograph film, music, script and artistic elements. A website may contain multiple works belonging to different copyright categories. This layered nature of digital products makes licensing and ownership arrangements particularly important.

3. Why Software and Digital Content Require Copyright Protection

3.1 Economic Incentive and Investment

Software and digital media often require substantial investment before the first commercial copy is sold. Developers spend time designing architecture, writing and testing code, fixing security problems and maintaining updates. Publishers, filmmakers, musicians and online educators similarly invest in production, editing, design, equipment and distribution. Because digital copies can be made at extremely low marginal cost, unauthorized copying can permit an infringer to compete without bearing the original development expenses. Copyright helps correct this imbalance by allowing creators and rights holders to license, sell and commercially exploit their work for a limited period.

3.2 Attribution, Integrity and Professional Reputation

Protection is not purely economic. Software developers and digital creators also have an interest in being associated with their work and in preventing misleading alteration or unauthorized presentation. In collaborative projects, accurate attribution helps establish professional reputation. In digital media, an altered photograph, edited video or modified article may circulate more widely than the original. Although the precise legal remedies depend on the category of work and the rights involved, copyright and related moral-right principles contribute to preserving the relationship between an author and the work.

3.3 Supporting Legitimate Digital Markets

Copyright also supports lawful distribution models. Commercial software may be licensed per user or device; streaming services may obtain territorial licences for films and music; e-book platforms may restrict copying through contractual and technological measures. These models cannot function effectively if every digital copy may be redistributed without authorization. At the same time, a workable copyright system must preserve legitimate uses such as interoperability, research, criticism, education and accessibility. The challenge is therefore not maximum control, but a balanced system of rights and exceptions.

4. Indian Copyright Framework for Software and Digital Works

4.1 Works Protected under the Copyright Act, 1957

Section 13 of the Copyright Act provides copyright protection for original literary, dramatic, musical and artistic works, as well as cinematograph films and sound recordings. Digital creation does not remove a work from these categories. A novel remains a literary work when distributed as an e-book; a photograph remains an artistic work when stored as a JPEG file; and a film remains a cinematograph film when streamed rather than supplied on a physical disc.

Computer programmes are expressly included in literary works. Computer databases may also receive copyright protection where the selection or arrangement satisfies the requirement of originality. The Supreme Court's decision in *Eastern Book Company v. D.B. Modak* is important in this context because it rejected a purely mechanical 'sweat of the brow' approach. Mere effort is not enough where the claimed work lacks the necessary creative contribution; there must be skill and judgment with at least a minimal degree of creativity in the protectable selection, coordination or arrangement.

4.2 Exclusive Rights under Section 14

Section 14 describes copyright as a bundle of exclusive rights. For literary works, these include reproduction in any material form, including electronic storage; issuing copies; public performance or communication to the public; translation; adaptation; and specified acts in relation to adaptations. For computer programmes, the owner also has the right to sell or give on commercial rental, or offer for sale or commercial rental, copies of the programme, subject to the statutory proviso concerning programmes that are not the essential object of the rental.

These rights apply directly to common digital activities. Uploading an unauthorized copy to a website may involve reproduction and communication to the public. Installing unlicensed software on multiple computers may involve reproduction. Selling devices preloaded with unauthorized programmes may involve reproduction, distribution and commercial exploitation. Converting or modifying code can raise questions of adaptation as well as reproduction where protected expression has been taken.

4.3 Authorship, Ownership and Employment

In software development, authorship and ownership are not always the same. A programmer may write the code, while contractual or employment rules determine who owns the economic rights. Companies therefore rely heavily on employment agreements, commissioned-work clauses, assignments and licences to establish ownership clearly. In collaborative development, records showing who created particular modules, whether third-party libraries were used and what licences apply are valuable evidence. Ambiguous ownership can become a serious commercial problem during investment, acquisition or product licensing.

4.4 Registration: Useful Evidence, Not the Source of Copyright

Indian copyright protection is automatic. Registration is not a condition for copyright to exist. The Copyright Office states that copyright comes into existence when an eligible work is created, although registration and entries in the Register can serve as *prima facie* evidence in disputes concerning ownership. For software companies, registration may therefore be useful as part of an evidence strategy even though the underlying right does not depend on it.

The Copyright Rules were amended in 2021 in relation to software registration. Rule 70(5) now requires at least the first ten and last ten pages of source code, or the entire source code where it is less than twenty pages, without blocked-out or redacted portions. This replaced the earlier requirement referring to source and object code. The change reduced the volume of confidential code that applicants were required to submit while preserving an identifiable deposit of the work.

5. Copyright Protection for Computer Software

5.1 What Elements of Software Can Be Protected?

The clearest subject of protection is the programme code itself. Direct copying of source code, or reproduction of substantial protected expression in another form, may infringe copyright. Object code is also protected as an expression of the programme. Documentation, manuals, help files, original icons, artwork and sound used in software may separately qualify for protection under the relevant copyright categories.

Copyright protection is nevertheless limited. It does not grant exclusive ownership over an algorithm as an abstract idea, a general programming language, a mathematical formula or a functional objective. Where there are only a very small number of ways to express a functional requirement, copyright analysis must avoid using protection of expression to create an indirect monopoly over the underlying idea. In practice, software disputes therefore often require a careful comparison between copied expression and unprotected functionality.

5.2 Software Licensing

Most software is distributed under a licence rather than sold with unrestricted rights. A licence can define the number of permitted users, devices, installations, geographical territories and purposes. Enterprise software licences may restrict reverse engineering or redistribution subject to applicable law. Subscription models may provide access for a fixed term rather than a permanent copy. Because copyright gives the owner exclusive rights, licences operate as permissions specifying which uses are authorized.

Open-source software is also based on copyright. The phrase 'open source' does not mean that the work has no copyright. Instead, the copyright owner grants broad permissions on stated licence conditions. Some licences require preservation of notices; others require distribution of corresponding source code or licensing of derivative works under the same terms. A business that incorporates open-source components without reviewing their licences may create compliance problems even if it never intended to infringe copyright.

5.3 Statutory Exceptions for Lawful Possessors

Section 52 recognizes that ordinary use of software requires acts that would technically involve copying. A lawful possessor may make copies or adaptations necessary to use the programme for the purpose for which it was supplied and may make temporary back-up copies as protection against

loss, destruction or damage. These provisions prevent copyright from making routine and expected use of legitimately acquired software unlawful.

The law also permits acts necessary to obtain information essential for interoperability of an independently created computer programme with other programmes where such information is not otherwise readily available. In addition, a lawful user may observe, study or test the functioning of a programme in order to determine the ideas and principles underlying elements of the programme while carrying out acts necessary for the functions for which it was supplied. Section 52 further recognizes copying or adaptation from a personally and legally obtained copy for non-commercial personal use.

These software-specific exceptions demonstrate the balance built into copyright law. A rights holder can prevent piracy, but cannot necessarily use copyright to block every form of analysis, back-up or independently developed interoperability.

6. Copyright in Websites, Databases and Other Digital Content

6.1 Websites and Mobile Applications

A website is not a single legal object. Its text may be protected as literary work, photographs and graphics as artistic works, videos as cinematograph films, music as musical works or sound recordings, and the underlying code as a computer programme. The overall selection and arrangement may also raise questions of originality. The Copyright Office has similarly recognized that websites may contain different elements falling within several classes of works under Section 13.

Mobile applications present the same layered structure. The programme code may be protected as software, while original images, text and audiovisual material can receive separate protection. Ownership must therefore be checked element by element, particularly when freelancers, stock-content providers or third-party libraries are involved. A company may own its source code but only hold a limited licence to photographs or music incorporated in the product.

6.2 Databases and Compilations

Digital businesses often depend on databases. Copyright does not generally give ownership over facts themselves. Protection may arise in an original selection or arrangement of data. This is particularly important for directories, curated collections and editorial databases. The originality standard prevents a person from claiming exclusive rights merely because considerable labour was spent gathering information, while still protecting sufficiently creative organization or presentation.

6.3 E-books, Music, Films, Photographs and Online Courses

Digital distribution does not weaken the underlying copyright. Scanning a book and uploading the file, copying a paid online course, distributing pirated music files or reposting protected photographs can involve reproduction and communication to the public. Streaming can also involve rights in the underlying film, sound recording, music and script. Rights clearance becomes especially important where a platform provides user-generated content, because a single upload may contain several works owned by different persons.

Educational material illustrates the need for balance. Teachers, researchers and students may benefit from statutory exceptions, but the existence of an educational purpose does not automatically make every digital copy lawful. The scope of the relevant exception, the amount used and the nature of the act must be considered under the statute.

7. Digital Rights Management and Technological Protection Measures

Digital rights management, commonly called DRM, refers to technological systems used to control access, copying or distribution of digital works. Examples include encryption, access tokens, device limits, copy controls, subscription authentication and watermarking. DRM can reduce casual piracy and support different licensing models, but technology alone cannot prevent every unauthorized use.

The Copyright (Amendment) Act, 2012 introduced Sections 65A and 65B. Section 65A addresses circumvention of effective technological measures applied for protecting rights under the Act where circumvention is done with the intention of infringing those rights. The provision also contains exceptions for specified lawful purposes, including encryption research, lawful investigation, authorized security testing and national-security measures. Section 65B protects electronic rights-management information by penalizing unauthorized removal or alteration, as well as specified distribution or communication of copies where a person knows that such information has been removed or altered without authority.

These provisions matter for software activation systems, subscription platforms, digital publishing and streaming services. They recognize that in a networked environment, copyright protection often depends on both law and technology. At the same time, Section 65A does not treat every act of circumvention as automatically criminal; the statutory intention requirement and listed exceptions are important safeguards.

8. Infringement, Remedies and Enforcement

8.1 When Infringement Occurs

Section 51 states the principal circumstances in which copyright is infringed. Broadly, infringement occurs when a person, without authorization, does an act that falls within the exclusive rights of the copyright owner, or deals commercially with infringing copies in specified ways. In the software context this can include unauthorized installation, copying, distribution or sale. In digital-content disputes it may involve unlawful uploads, downloads, streaming, reposting or commercial circulation of protected works.

Not every similarity proves infringement. Copyright requires copying of protected expression, not simply independent creation of similar ideas. Evidence may include source-code comparisons, access logs, repository history, file metadata, licence records and expert analysis. Digital systems often leave extensive evidence, but such evidence must be preserved carefully and linked to the relevant act of copying.

8.2 Civil and Criminal Remedies

Civil remedies can include injunctions, damages, accounts of profits and delivery-up or other relief in relation to infringing copies. Interim injunctions are particularly important in digital cases because unlawful distribution can spread rapidly. Courts may also issue orders directed at online intermediaries or access points where appropriate under the applicable legal framework.

The Copyright Act also contains criminal provisions for specified acts of knowing infringement, as well as offences connected with technological protection measures and rights-management information. Criminal enforcement is especially relevant to organized piracy, counterfeiting and commercial distribution. Nevertheless, enforcement policy must distinguish deliberate commercial piracy from legitimate disputes over licences, fair use-type exceptions or ownership.

8.3 Practical Protection Measures for Creators and Businesses

- Maintain dated source-code repositories and version histories showing who created particular modules and when.
- Use written employment, assignment and contractor agreements that clearly address copyright ownership and permitted reuse.
- Keep a software bill of materials or other record of third-party and open-source components together with their licence obligations.
- Use copyright notices, access controls, watermarking and rights-management information where suitable, while avoiding claims broader than the law permits.

- Preserve logs and evidence promptly when infringement is discovered and use proportionate notice, licensing or legal enforcement measures.

9. International Legal Framework

9.1 Berne Convention

The Berne Convention provides the foundation of international copyright protection. Its principle of national treatment requires member countries generally to provide authors from other member states with protection comparable to that available to their own nationals. The convention also established the broader principle that copyright protection should not depend on formalities in member states for covered works. This international framework is important because digital works can be accessed across borders immediately after publication.

9.2 TRIPS Agreement

The WTO Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights, or TRIPS, directly addresses computer programmes. Article 10.1 requires computer programmes, whether in source or object code, to be protected as literary works under the Berne Convention. Article 10.2 also deals with compilations of data where the selection or arrangement constitutes an intellectual creation.

TRIPS further confirms in Article 9.2 that copyright protection extends to expressions and not to ideas, procedures, methods of operation or mathematical concepts as such. This principle is particularly important in software because functional and creative elements frequently exist together.

9.3 WIPO Internet Treaties

The WIPO Copyright Treaty and the WIPO Performances and Phonograms Treaty are often called the WIPO Internet Treaties. They were designed to update international copyright rules for the digital environment, including issues of online communication and technological protection. India deposited its instruments of accession to both treaties on 25 September 2018, and they entered into force for India on 25 December 2018.

Participation in these treaties is significant for India's software, entertainment and digital-content industries because online exploitation routinely crosses national borders. International harmonization does not remove differences between domestic laws, but it creates a common minimum framework for important aspects of digital copyright.

10. Important Indian Judicial Principles

10.1 Eastern Book Company v. D.B. Modak

The Supreme Court's decision in *Eastern Book Company v. D.B. Modak* is central to the Indian concept of originality, especially for compilations and digital databases. The dispute involved copy-edited Supreme Court judgments and editorial additions published in law reports and electronic products. The Court rejected the idea that mere labour and investment automatically create copyright. At the same time, it did not require patent-like novelty. The protectable work must reflect skill and judgment together with a minimal degree of creativity.

For digital businesses, this principle means that collecting large quantities of public or factual data does not necessarily produce a copyright monopoly over the underlying information. Originality may instead lie in the selection, coordination, arrangement, annotations or other creative presentation.

10.2 Microsoft Corporation v. Yogesh Papat

The Delhi High Court decision in *Microsoft Corporation v. Yogesh Papat* is frequently discussed in relation to software piracy. The allegation concerned unlicensed Microsoft software being loaded onto computers sold by the defendants. The case illustrates a straightforward but commercially important principle: purchasing or possessing a computer does not authorize the seller or user to reproduce proprietary software beyond the scope of the applicable licence. Unauthorized pre-installation can amount to infringement where protected programmes are copied without permission.

11. Emerging Challenges in the Digital Environment

11.1 Online Piracy and Cross-Border Enforcement

Pirated files can be hosted in one country, indexed in another and downloaded globally. A rights holder may therefore face jurisdictional, identification and enforcement difficulties even where infringement is clear. Repeat domains, anonymous hosting and rapid re-uploading reduce the effectiveness of purely reactive takedown strategies. Better platform cooperation and efficient judicial procedures are required, but enforcement measures must also respect lawful content and due process.

11.2 Cloud Computing and Software as a Service

Traditional copyright rules often assumed that a user received a copy of software. Cloud computing changes this model. In software-as-a-service systems, the programme may remain on the

provider's servers while customers interact through a browser or application. Copyright still protects the code, but contracts, access controls, trade secrets and cybersecurity become increasingly important because many disputes concern unauthorized access, data extraction or breach of licence conditions rather than distribution of a conventional software copy.

11.3 Artificial Intelligence and Machine-Generated Content

Artificial intelligence raises difficult questions for both inputs and outputs. Training systems may involve very large quantities of digital material, while generated text, images, audio and code raise questions concerning authorship, originality and similarity to existing works. Indian law contains a provision concerning the author of computer-generated literary, dramatic, musical or artistic works, but modern generative AI introduces factual situations that were not contemplated when earlier statutory language was drafted.

For software developers, AI coding tools also create compliance issues. Generated code may reproduce recognizable material from existing projects, and developers may not know the licence history of an output. Businesses should therefore treat AI-generated code as material requiring review rather than assuming it is automatically free from third-party rights.

11.4 Open-Source Compliance and Supply Chains

Modern applications may depend on hundreds of third-party packages. Copyright compliance is therefore a supply-chain issue. Organizations need processes for identifying licences, preserving notices, satisfying source-disclosure obligations where applicable and responding to security or ownership concerns. The most effective copyright policy is often preventive: it establishes compliance before a product is distributed rather than attempting to fix licensing problems after release.

11.5 Balancing Access and Control

Digital copyright law must continue to balance protection with access. Excessively broad technological restrictions can interfere with legitimate research, accessibility, repair, security testing and interoperability. Weak protection, on the other hand, can undermine creators and lawful digital markets. Sections 52 and 65A show that Indian law already recognizes this tension by combining rights with specific exceptions. Future reform should preserve that balanced structure.

12. Recommendations and the Way Forward

- Improve copyright literacy among software developers, students, start-ups and digital creators so that they understand both ownership rights and licence obligations.

- Encourage companies to maintain reliable authorship records, source-code histories, written assignments and third-party software inventories from the beginning of product development.
- Promote proportionate technological protection measures that deter infringement without preventing lawful uses specifically recognized by the Copyright Act.
- Strengthen rapid but accountable mechanisms for addressing large-scale online piracy, while ensuring that lawful speech and legitimate user content are not removed merely because of unsupported claims.
- Encourage open-source compliance programmes, including review of licence obligations before software is incorporated into commercial products.
- Update professional and institutional guidance on artificial intelligence, generated code and digital authorship as judicial and administrative practice develops.
- Increase awareness that copyright registration is evidentiary rather than constitutive, while making online registration procedures clear and secure for creators who choose to register.
- Continue international cooperation through WIPO and WTO frameworks because digital copyright disputes frequently involve multiple jurisdictions.

A successful digital copyright system should not be measured only by the number of infringement cases filed. Its real effectiveness lies in whether creators can commercialize their work, users understand what is permitted, innovators can build interoperable products, and disputes can be resolved without unnecessary barriers to research, education and competition.

13. Conclusion

Software and digital content have become essential assets of the modern economy. Their most important feature from a copyright perspective is also their greatest vulnerability: they can be reproduced and distributed with extraordinary speed and accuracy. Copyright law responds by giving creators and owners exclusive rights over original expression while preserving defined exceptions for legitimate use.

Indian law provides a relatively detailed framework for software. Computer programmes are treated as literary works; electronic storage is recognized as reproduction; owners receive rights over copying, distribution, adaptation, communication and commercial rental; and Section 52 creates specific exceptions for lawful use, back-up, interoperability, study and certain personal non-commercial copying. The law also protects technological measures and electronic rights-management information through Sections 65A and 65B. Registration remains optional, although it may provide useful evidence, and the 2021 Rules reduced the source-code material required for a software registration application.

The same framework extends across the broader digital environment. Websites, e-books, music, films, photographs, databases, online courses and mobile applications may contain several overlapping copyrighted works. Effective management therefore depends not only on statutory rights but also on clear contracts, licensing systems, open-source compliance, evidence preservation and appropriate technological controls.

International instruments reinforce this framework. TRIPS expressly protects computer programmes in source and object code as literary works, while the WIPO Internet Treaties address digital distribution and technological measures. India's accession to those treaties in 2018 reflects the reality that software and online media operate in a global market.

Future challenges will involve cloud services, artificial intelligence, platform distribution and increasingly complex software supply chains. Copyright law should continue to evolve, but reform should preserve its central balance. Creators need meaningful protection against piracy and unauthorized commercial exploitation; users and developers need room for interoperability, research and legitimate access. A balanced copyright system can protect digital creativity without turning functional ideas and technological progress into private monopolies.

References

- The Copyright Act, 1957 (India), §§ 2(ffc), 2(o), 13, 14, 51, 52, 55, 65A & 65B.
- The Copyright Rules, 2013, as amended by the Copyright (Amendment) Rules, 2021, r. 70(5).
- Copyright Office, Government of India, *Frequently Asked Questions*, including guidance on automatic protection, software and website registration (updated 2026).
- Radha Ranjan and Jivantika Gulati “Catalytic Role of Artificial Intelligence in Ameliorating Criminal Justice System: A Critical Analysis,” in *Empowerment and Equality: Navigating Human Rights Law in a Complex World*, Institute of Legal Education, Tamil Nadu, India, 2023, pp. 47–54.
- Copyright Office, Government of India, *Exceptions to Infringement under Copyright Act, 1957*, § 52 Guidance (8 June 2026).
- World Trade Organization, *Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS)*, arts. 9 & 10.
- World Intellectual Property Organization, *WIPO Copyright Treaty*, 1996.

- World Intellectual Property Organization, *WIPO Performances and Phonograms Treaty*, 1996.
- Berne Convention for the Protection of Literary and Artistic Works, Paris Act, 1971.
- *Eastern Book Company & Ors. v. D.B. Modak & Anr.*, (2008) 1 SCC 1.
- *Microsoft Corporation v. Mr. Yogesh Papat & Anr.*, CS (OS) No. 103 of 2003 (Delhi High Court, decided 22 February 2005).
- Radha Ranjan, Arpita Goswami, Julius Irudayasamy, K. Lokeswar Reddy & M.V. Rathnamma, “Improving EFL Students’ Reading Skills Using Graph Attention Networks and Intelligence-Based Tasks,” *2025 3rd International Conference on Integrated Circuits and Communication Systems (ICICACS)*, IEEE, 2025, pp. 1–6.
- Copyright Office, Government of India, *Practice and Procedure Manual for Literary Works*, discussion on computer programmes and computer databases.
- Radha Ranjan, Amaresh Patel & Jayini Bhaumik, “Regulating Artificial Intelligence in Legal Practice: An Accountability Framework,” in *Blockchain and AI in Business*, Gyanavi Publishers & Distributors, New Delhi, 2024, p. 131.
- World Intellectual Property Organization, *WIPO Internet Treaties*, including materials concerning India's accession to the WIPO Copyright Treaty and WIPO Performances and Phonograms Treaty.
- Deependra Nath Pathak, Ankit Kumar, Kriti Srivastava, Radha Ranjan, Kirandeep Kaur & Ramanjeet Singh, “Improving E-Commerce Fraud Detection: A GAN and Reinforcement Learning Approach Integrated with Personality Analysis for Secure Digital Economy,” *2025 International Conference on Visual Analytics and Data Visualization (ICVADV)*, IEEE, 2025, pp. 201–206.
- Jivantika Gulati & Radha Ranjan, “Investigating the Relevance and Effects of Performing Rights in Intellectual Property Rights,” *Bhairavi Sangeet Sodh Patrika*, Vol. 27, 2022, pp. 281–289.