The discipline of law should govern and control all aspects of human society. Artificial Intelligence, being a relatively new field, shouldn’t be outside the ambit of the legislation. The overwhelming presence of Artificial Intelligence in our everyday life serves as an indication of the need for more regulations. Incorporation of Artificial Intelligence into daily society inevitably should be followed by legislative parameters being set for the same. A profound use of technology can be seen in almost all fields, including medicine and law. For instance, the robot ROSS is being used by an American law firm to assist in their legal research. There are also instances of usage of AI for drafting contracts and the like. In the field of medicine, AI provides crucial assistance in documentation and analysis of the doctor’s discussion with patients.1

The incorporation of AI into almost all aspects of human society including fields such as law and medicine is inevitable. This paper aims to point out that in such scenarios, legislation ought to keep up with the accelerated pace of technological advancements. While some countries have an advanced take on regulations, a few other
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countries are still in a juvenile state. For someone to gain a comprehensive understanding of the scope of regulations, it is necessary to compare the significant developments in AI regulations all around the world. AI has a very wide horizon and is prone to misuse much like every other discipline. The lack of legislation in certain countries risks certain misdemeanors related to AI going unaddressed. The issue of autonomous thinking capabilities and machine learning of AI leading to a self-sufficient, independent thinking organism is further vexatious. This paper attempts to explore this troublesome nature of AI by pointing out specific instances where such behavior is manifested. It also endeavors to compare the advantages, as well as the drawbacks of AI regulation in different countries. It also puts forward the prospect that further legislations are necessary within the realm of AI.

The problems with AI

Artificial intelligence’s presence in our daily life has been profound, impacting many aspects of our lifestyle. A severe amount of concern has been raised on the nature of this technology and how it could be a threat. These concerns stem from several factors including the autonomous nature of the technology, the inability to control, and the lack of accountability. AI has been criticized in the yesteryears to the extent of it being a public risk. This article aims to discuss each of these issues in detail.

Autonomous nature of AI

Artificial intelligence has been perceived as a technology that is capable of independent thinking. The idea all along has been to fashion a technology that could make a complex decision by analyzing the situation and coming to a systematic conclusion. But this particular nature of technology can be viewed as one of the main issues concerning artificial intelligence. AI in the earliest forms was designed to beat humans at chess, and they were successfully programmed to beat the best human chess player by 1997. At present, they can perform sophisticated activities such as driving cars and working on paintings. They have also been used to create investment portfolios after careful examination of various charts and indicators. This also puts human labor at the risk of being expendable. Jobs that earlier required certain manpower can now be done with the help of AI-driven robots. The impact of such a move on the economy could be drastic.

Another major problem that comes with the autonomous nature of AI is unpredictability and non-foreseeability. The independent thinking capacity gives rise to a mechanism that should ideally allow the AI to make decisions without human intervention. This aspect of Artificial Intelligence, called machine learning, lets the AI use complex algorithms to ultimately mimic human
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thinking capabilities. Now comes the main issue with the aforementioned nature of AI, i.e., it gives rise to a liability gap.\(^6\)

**Control**

The above-mentioned problem of non-foreseeability directly translates to another major issue with AI, the severe lack of control.\(^7\) The considerable amount of autonomy that AI commands would make it difficult to control and regulate the technology. The need for regulations is all the clearer from this situation, as such an edict would clarify the procedure and steps to be taken to deal with a rogue AI. Every scenario needs to be accessed while creating a framework for regulating AI. The possibility of an AI going rogue and posing a threat to humans has been explored by many technological moguls, and futurists, to the extent that there have been warnings of AI resisting all forms of human control in the future. Elon Musk, the tech entrepreneur behind companies such as Tesla and Space X, has raised his skepticism concerning AI and has also mentioned a need to regulate the technology, calling it a major “existential risk”.\(^8\)

**Concerns on AI Research and Development**

Another major issue with respect to AI comes with the fact that AI is usually developed discreetly and without open knowledge. Moreover, an in-depth understanding of AI would be required to understand the working and algorithms that constitute an AI, thus making it more opaque to regulations. Such a hindrance and secrecy would make it almost impossible to assess whether the technology may pose a public risk in the future. There are no set standards to assess such a risk, and herein comes the need for a clearly laid down set of rules. As creating an AI require significantly fewer resources, a situation may arise wherein AI could be misused. This particular nature of AI also makes it easy for most anyone with programming skills to create an artificially intelligent interface, making it all the harder to regulate.

Considering AI as a possible public risk, the above-mentioned facts put to the table many logistical hurdles to regulators. There is also an issue of assigning liability. Even though the autonomy of AI can be cited in defence, there is a necessity to assess the liability of the end-user.

**Artificial Intelligence and Law**

The relationship between law and Artificial Intelligence is minimal or negligible in most countries. The association of AI with the law and legal studies has not yet been effectively researched. Law is to cover all aspects of human existence and AI is an undeniably important part of human life today. Its influence would only grow and spread to more avenues of human existence in the near future. Artificial Intelligence is seen as something that is to be studied and
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researched further on and not something that should also be analyzed through the sagacious eyes of the law.

The fact that in most countries Artificial Intelligence is exclusively a science subject is proof of this classification. In the United States, most “AI and law” professors work in computer science departments. The majority of AI and law PhDs have been in computer science. This hinders progress on the already scarce relationship between law and AI. The condition is very similar if not worse in Germany.⁹

It is true that the field of law is famously tradition-bound. This attitude makes it very difficult for the field of law to adopt new technologies and ways. Law is in itself very similar to machine learning in its basic principles that is; they both look to historic examples to deduce rules to apply to new circumstances. Setting down axioms derived from precedents, applying those axioms to the circumstances at hand, and forming an opinion, as a result, are all part of legal judgments. This logic-based process is precisely the type of work where machine intelligence might be beneficial."¹⁰ The realization of this similarity works as an anchor for the development of a relationship between AI and law. There is a strong potential for AI aid in fields such as contract analysis and review saving lawyers countless hours of work. Multinational companies like Salesforce, Home Depot, and eBay are already using AI-powered contract review services to review their contracts and day-to-day paperwork.

According to Bob Arens, Research Scientist at Thomson Reuters, “unlike humans, computers have no inherent capability of associating pieces of information. You can give information to a computer about apples, bananas, and fruit in general, but on its own, it will never come up with the realization that apples and bananas are both fruits.”¹¹ This goes to show that the relationship between AI and law would be similar to a symbiotic one and not mutually exclusive of one another taking into account how far AI has developed today. Artificial Intelligence could at the present stage benefit the field of law to a great extend and create substantial opportunities for value creation.

Question of liability

Artificial Intelligence being of an extensive composite character, it pertains to a wide range of legal fields like Tort law, Human Rights, Contract Law, etc. The potential relationship between AI and law were explored as early as 1991 in the journal “AI and Law” which shows that although scarce discussions on the subject have been made.

Certain questions may be raised about the liability issues posed by automated systems of technology. Safety issues may arise and have in countless instances. There can be scenarios where robotic technology or AI fails to perform resulting in economic,
property, injury, or even loss of life. It can happen that robotic technology fails, either unintentionally or by design, resulting in economic loss, property damage, injury, or loss of life. Application of traditional product liability might mean responsibility for the manufacturer but it gets more complicated in situations like self-driving cars where the software appears to be doing something dangerous and the driver overrides it. In such an instance, how does one determine who is at fault? Similarly in remotely controlled aircraft’s difficulties may arise. In the USA, a case where the US Federal Aviation Administration issued an order of a civil penalty against Raphael Pirker shows the underdevelopment of the AI legislation even in one of the most developed countries in the world. The drone was flown by Raphael Pirker to obtain footage for a video. The court first ruled that a video drone does not constitute an aircraft while the court of appeal ruled to the opposite.

While the question of legal liability needs clarity the question of whether robots will be entitled to sue or be sued arises. Just like corporations are considered legal persons legal evolution could accommodate AI over time. Nevertheless, the entire subject of AI is a new and fresh concept that requires palpable understanding and legislation to govern.

Artificial intelligence and IPR

Intellectual property rights and artificial intelligence cross paths with respect of many different aspects. The novel nature of AI in itself finds its roots in Intellectual property rights. But what happens when the AI becomes capable of creating? To whom will the intellectual property rights be granted for the creation, the man or the machine? This section intends to explore these paths where AI and intellectual property rights meet.

Authorship

The intelligent machine that can compete with human intelligence, would eventually be able to come up with inventions of their own. The present trend shows a large spike in the number of AI creations. The Microsoft-funded project, the next Rembrandt, focused on an AI that studied a database of paintings made by Rembrandt van Rijn to create a painting. The painting was of a thirty-something man in a black hat, resembling a Rembrandt painting. This is not an isolated instance. In 2016, a Japanese AI created a novel from scratch that almost won a literary competition. The AI developed by Deepmind can listen, analyze and create music. The fundamental question here is whether the creative process
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that AI uses is unique or whether it is as a result of the algorithms programmed inside them. Equipping the IP regime to deal with such an intricate technology can be very tricky. Take copyright for instance. There is a legislative gap with respect to the copyright for an AI-created piece of art. The case of Bot Dylan sheds some light on the conundrum.

**Bot Dylan- Times they are A-Changing’**

The world is familiar with legendary folk singer Bob Dylan. Named after him, Bot Dylan is an AI developed by Dr. Oben Ben Tal of Kingston University, which uses a detailed study into Irish folk music to create music in the same genre. Now comes the question of authorship. The logical inference would be to figure out whether the creative process was something unique to the AI. If so, would the AI be eligible to attain authorship over the created material? The situation gets rather complicated when the music created by the AI is used elsewhere, like a video game or a movie.

The intellectual property laws of almost every country grant the author right over their original content, done in a tangible medium. Going by these criteria, the music created by Bot Dylan should be copyrightable as the work is original and fixed in a tangible medium. The work by the AI can be expressed as an original work, as it went through the creative process of analyzing the contents of various folk songs, despite the algorithm being programmed by its creator. This suggests a need to provide more flexibility with the laws. With the rate of technological influx, the near future is bound to present the courts with a large number of cases relating to AI and authorship.

**Laws regarding Authorship**

For a deep study into AI’s interrelation with intellectual property rights, it is necessary to study the various provisions regarding authorship. By doing this, it might be possible to get an understanding of how these laws would translate in the case of AI.

The US position regarding authorship, human authorship, in particular, is clear from the case of Naruto et al v. David Slater. The US copyright office doesn’t per se have a human authorship requirement for granting intellectual property rights, mostly owing to the assumption that authorship is a “human phenomenon”. The “monkey selfie case” as its commonly called, dealt with a photograph taken by a monkey by itself, and discussed who owned the copyright for the picture. The issue of copyrightability of the selfie was discussed in this case and in the 2018
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decision, it was decided that monkeys, as non-humans, do not have the right to sue for copyright infringement due to the absence of a statute that allows it in plain language. The US position regarding authorship takes the usual route of originality and creative process. However, there hasn’t been any discussion on AI-created works and their copyrightability per se, unlike the stance in the UK.

The UK copyright laws expressly talks about AI or computer-generated artistic works. Section 9(3) of the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act, states that:

“In the case of a literary, dramatic, musical or artistic work which is computer-generated, the author shall be taken to be the person by whom the arrangements necessary for the creation of the work are undertaken.”

The ethical dilemmas associated with such a stance is still to be debated as intelligent design and machine learning could give rise to technology which are capable of independent thinking. Only once has the English courts tackled the question of AI authorship, this was in the 2006 Nova Productions Ltd case. The case was regarding the authorship of AI generated frames that were based on player commands. However, the court ordered that the designers to be the creative brain behind the work and not the players. The skills of AI weren’t really considered in the case and if it did, there is a high probability for the case to be unresolved still.

Japanese stance regarding AI is probably the most developed among all the countries. The copyright laws of Japan have developed to the point that there is an obvious inclusion of the concept of AI authorship within it. In 2016, a Japanese AI co-authored a short story that passed the preliminary screening for a literary prize. Such massive developments, along with the several worthwhile discussions, led to the Japanese authorities leaning more towards the necessity of AI authorship. As per Art 2, para 1, item (i) of the Japanese Copyright Laws:

"Copyrightable work as a production in which thoughts or sentiments are expressed creatively and which falls within the literary, scientific, artistic or musical domain."

And item (ii) defines the author

"as a person who creates a work with limitation under art 14 where the author is presumed to be the author”.

There have been a few recent amendments in the Japanese laws to make it more tolerant to AI authorship. These include the
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incorporation of 3 new article that lowers the hinderances that previously existed in AI. For instance, the newly amended Article 30-4, helps users to understand the necessity of copyrighting machine learning-based creations. Even though these amendments indicate a positive change towards AI accommodation, there haven’t been any solid laws regarding AI authorship in Japan either. In comparison, the laws and initiative by Japan have been very inclusive. The Indian Provision regarding AI ownership, although similar to the UK stance, requires a special mention.

**Indian Position Regarding AI ownership**

The Indian position doesn’t mention the concept of AI authorship within its copyright laws. Section 2 (d) of the copyright act, 1957, mentions the author as “the person who causes the work to be created”. AI system is not considered as an author even though the computer-generated works may be considered as artistic works within the ambit of the provisions. This particular aspect has been adopted from the UK laws.

However, a major breakthrough came up recently wherein India granted the copyright to an AI for an artistic work created by it. The copyright was granted to the AI Raghav, which has been included in a painting app. The AI was granted co-authorship along with the creator of the AI. Despite the reluctance in granting full ownership to an AI, this can be seen as a positive step towards the AI authorship argument, which could be adopted by more countries. It might however be hard to decide the period of authorship when it comes to and AI, owing to the fact that India grants authorship for a period of 60 years considering the average life span of an individual. However, this might be difficult when it comes to an AI.

There is a clear growth in the instances where autonomous nature of AI has led to artistic creations. This gives rise to several questions and issues regarding AI authorship. There is a necessity for the legislators to conduct deeper research into the subject, finding ways to overcome the technical and logistical issues.

The entire scope of AI is not easy to understand. A deeper study into AI and their working is necessary to develop and include AI into the IP regime.

**Autonomous Vehicle**

Autonomous vehicles are another AI-driven area that is in dire need of a legislative artwork.
framework. This section of the article seeks to explore this legislative gap, by prudently presenting an international perspective and a state-wise comparison.

Even if there is a lack of legislation on a state level, international conventions cover automated vehicles although not exhaustively. Firstly, the Geneva Convention on Road Traffic, which was ratified by 101 parties, provides and defines rules to be followed by parties in the international scenario. Although automated vehicles are not defined or mentioned in this convention, internationally accepted rules set up by the convention provide a skeletal framework for setting up laws for automated vehicles. Article 8.1 of the Geneva Convention mentions that every vehicle shall have a driver. Similarly, the Vienna Convention on Road Traffic has been ratified by 78 parties and provides that a driver is always fully in control and responsible for the vehicle. This view is challenged by new collision avoidance systems and autonomous vehicles. Even in the international scenario, stale legislations are prominent. One example of lawmakers recognizing a need to adapt is the Inland Transport Committee (ITC) of the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (UNECE). Within the preview of this committee, the Global Forum for Road Traffic Safety (WP1) has time and time again pressed the need to adapt the conventions to allow the use of Automated Vehicles (AV), and the World Forum for the Harmonization of Vehicle Regulation (WP29) has already started developing technical safety standards for AVs. The most important takeaway is that outdated legislation should be recognized and shaped to adapt to the current situation.

Many countries adopt product liability laws to strengthen manufacturers’ responsibility because the negligence liability framework requires a plaintiff to prove manufacturers’ negligence by themselves, which is considered too demanding due to several reasons, such as the information gap between consumers and manufacturers.

**Issue of liability**

The main issue discussed at WP1 was the liability of the driver of the car during a collision. WP1 fixed two principles for a driver to be able to carry out other activities than driving as long as:

- **Principle 1:** These activities do not prevent the driver from responding to demands from the vehicle systems for taking over the driving task; and
- **Principle 2:** These activities are consistent with the prescribed use of the vehicle
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systems and their defined functions.\textsuperscript{37} These principles pose several questions. In most states today, penalties and fines are imposed for traffic violations. Who is liable for a collision or traffic violation if an Automated Driving System (ADS) is in full control? In a situation where drivers aren’t held liable, it would create a liability gap. This would defeat the purpose of enacting legislation to govern AVs. In a situation where a driver is held liable, he would be forced to monitor or control an ADS at all times which would defeat the purpose of having automated vehicles in the first place. Hence, extensive debate and research need to be done to solve the question of liability and frame concrete and exhaustive legislation on the topic.

Presently, a proposed legislative approach is to divide the liability based on the involvement of the driver compared to the involvement of the ADS. As in, the classifications where the driver was mostly in control of the vehicle, he would be held liable and vice versa. The liability could be defined in five levels where the first would mean the driver is mostly in control and the last being the ADS is fully in control.\textsuperscript{38} Giving such a classification would effectively place the first step towards successful practical AI legislation.

In cases where an AV causes a crash, considering the present legal system and procedure, identifying the process of the crash will be difficult. Take into consideration the crash wherein 2015 a Tesla Model S with a driver using Tesla Autopilot collided with a trailer at an uncontrolled intersection in Florida in May 2016, resulting in the driver’s death.\textsuperscript{39} NHTSA closed the preliminary investigation in January 2017 which took them about 6 months and concluded that there were no defects in the vehicle or the ADS. The National Transportation Safety Board (NTSB) is an independent government agency responsible for examining civil transportation accidents, such as highway collisions. The NTSB issued its report on the Tesla fatality on September 12, 2017. The board advised that all automakers, not just Tesla, include protections that keep drivers’ attention engaged to prevent the all-too-human temptation to let one’s mind wander. The NTSB also stated that Tesla and other automakers need to put in place stronger safeguards to ensure that their technology is used in the way it was designed to.\textsuperscript{40} So, the NTSB found Tesla partially liable. The two different findings by both government organizations denote the lack of clarity in automated vehicle laws. Therefore, even in cases in the present scenario where ambiguity concerning liability shouldn’t be an issue, it is a very glaring issue. This instance alone compared to the vast number of AI-driven cars in the market, a very prominent legal gap is just around the corner.


SAE and levels of Automation.

According to the SAE (Society of Automotive Engineers), there are 6 levels of driving automation.

These levels can be divided into two parts based on the level of automation. In the first three levels that is, level 0, level 1, and level 2 the driver is driving the vehicle even if the support features are engaged. This is inclusive of situations where the driver’s feet are off the pedals and is not steering. Level 0 is limited to providing warnings and momentary assistance.

Level 1 would provide brake/acceleration support to the driver. Level 2 driving systems have ADAS stands for advanced driving assistance systems. Both steering and accelerating/decelerating are controlled by the vehicle. Just because a human sits in the driver’s seat and can take control of the car at any time, automation falls short of self-driving. Level 2 technologies include Tesla Autopilot and Cadillac (General Motors) Super Cruise. Level 3 vehicles can monitor their surroundings and make smart judgments for themselves, such as accelerating past a slow-moving vehicle. However, they still require human intervention. If the system fails to complete the task, the driver must remain awake and ready to take charge. They would also have traffic jam chauffeuring abilities. In level 4 ADS, there would be completely driverless taxis and steering wheels might not be installed. The “dynamic driving duty” is eliminated in Level 5 vehicles because they do not require human attention. It would essentially be the same as level 4 but, they would drive effectively anywhere and under any condition.

National trends in ADS laws and negligence

Every state would have its tailor-made laws to deal with liability issues and acts of negligence. An accident like the Tesla Model S crash in 2015 would be dealt with differently in different countries. This portion of the paper briefly analyses the negligence law trends in various countries and their proportionate ability to deal with liability issues when it comes to ADS.

The U.S. Department of Transportation (DoT) classifies and denotes J3016’s six levels of automation for on-road motor vehicles in its “Federal Automated Vehicles Policy” and the document became an in-practice world standard adopted by stakeholders in the automated driving systems. The National Highway Traffic
Safety Administration (NHTSA) in the United States is a federal agency whose primary and sole responsibility is regulating motor vehicle safety. The National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) is responsible for issuing and implementing the Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standards (Safety Standards), which apply to all new motor vehicles sold in the United States. The Safety Standards include 73 distinct standards for accident avoidance, crashworthiness, and post-crash survivability. Automobile manufacturers are required to self-certify their compliance with the Safety Standards. Before the vehicle's sale, the manufacturer is not needed to acquire NHTSA approval. NHTSA does, however, have safety enforcement authorities, including the ability to compel recalls based on safety problems or non-compliance with the Safety Standards. These safety standards although not specific to automated vehicles in any way would provide some clarity as they would act as guiding legislation when liability issues regarding automated vehicles are concerned. That being said, one of the main issues that the NHTSA faces today is the lack of tailor-made laws for automated vehicles and old laws and guidelines not adapting to new scenarios.

Concerning insurance, owners of automobiles should purchase a minimum amount of automobile liability insurance for bodily injuries and automobile or property damages to establish financial responsibility. Furthermore, most states have financial responsibility laws that suggest that people involved in car crashes should produce proof of financial responsibility. Under the Road Traffic Act, a minimum amount of automobile and both bodily harm and property damages insurance should be bought in the UK. Furthermore, the enactment of the July 2018 Automated and Electric Vehicles Act, strengthens the functioning of automobile insurance and clarifies the liability of insurance companies. The act makes the AV liability insurance a primary and important measure of relief to the victims and pays compensation to them even in cases where the liability of the parties is specified or not. This would be the case unless there are conditions where the accident resulted from failure to update the software or usage of unauthorized software.

In Japan, the Road Transport Vehicle Act and the Road Traffic Act were changed after consideration of autonomous driving vehicles operating on public highways. These amendments have drastically decreased the legal barriers to autonomous driving vehicles with technology.
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comparable to SAE level 3 operating on public roads. The newly amended acts are worth reviewing to address the remaining legal issues that may arise while autonomous vehicles are in operation. The important concepts for allowing autonomous vehicles to run, such as that of a driver, the operational design domain (ODD), and associated concepts, are reviewed to interpret the purpose and specifics included in the revisions.

The most important issues concerning ADS are surrounding the liability gap. Taking into consideration Indian law, for example, there is still no legislation pertaining to ADS. The lack of gravity and significance gave to the potential of AI and ADS is what should be understood and decreed here.

The paper, National Strategy for Artificial Intelligence released by NITI Ayog outlines the proposed government initiatives with respect to artificial intelligence, agriculture, healthcare, etc. The issue of liability is omitted in the paper. This creates a major liability gap as previously mentioned. The steps following up the enactment of successful legislation are numerous. It involves extensive and exhaustive debate on the subject at all three pillars of government. So far, none of the discussions have been initiated. Presently, the Consumer Protection Act Section 2(34) places the liability in cases of harm caused by a product or service on the product manufacturer. If we consider AI as a product. When the issue of ADS comes up, the Indian legislation is still not felicitous. The Motor Vehicle Act prescribes compensation for death and injury in the case of motor accidents. The problem with applying this to ADS is that it does not define cases where rash or negligent driving hasn’t occurred. In the case, Haji Zakaria v. Naoshir Cama53 the Supreme Court of India held that where no negligent driving is proven no liability can be imposed on the driver. This glaring liability gap should be addressed especially in a country that contributes to 11% of the total number of car crashes globally.54

Conclusion

At this particular juncture it is safe to say that artificial intelligence and law share a very complicated relationship. Nonetheless, like every aspect of society and human life artificial intelligence needs to be codified and mandated. Complex algorithms and machine learning are not attributes one usually associates with the legal fraternity. We have addressed exactly that and have tried to decipher these complicated elements to some extent in this paper.

The paper introduces common problems associated with AI that strains the relationship between AI and Law. Most of these issues stem from the autonomous nature of AI and how the intelligent thinking capabilities of AI could affect the societal structure. The inferences drawn are cited as reasons for this particular field of law being untapped. Further, the article goes on to explore the “AI and Law” theme. This has been explained further with the help of two broader headings, intellectual property
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rights and autonomous vehicles. The authorship aspect of IP rights concerning AI, has been a subject of debate for a long time. With the amount of AI-created content being on the rise, there is a certain need to address this issue. Further, the liability gap talked about becomes problematic when issues concerning self-driving vehicle accidents are addressed. This becomes a postulate to a main inference drawn in the paper which pertains to the liability gap.

Comparing the laws and regulations from around the world, one can arrive at a conclusion that the realm of AI related law is largely terra incognita. Considering the potential AI holds, and its influence within the society, there exists a glaring legal vacuum. There is a pressing need to conduct further debates and discussions to enable legal luminaries to be knowledgeable enough to frame legislations on the subject.