Law and Humanities
ISSN Print: 3079-5117
ISSN Online: 3079-5125
https://doi.org/10.63313/LH.9014

Research on the Liability for Copyright Infringement of Generative Artificial Intelligence

Si Wu
Law School, Anhui University of Finance and Economics, Bengbu 233041, China

How to cite this paper: Wu, S. (2025). Research on the Liability for Copyright Infringement of Generative Artificial Intelligence. Law and Humanities, 1(2), 42–54. ISSN Print: 3079-5117; ISSN Online: 3079-5125.
https://doi.org/10.63313/LH.9014
Published: 2025-06-18

Abstract

This article based on the core framework of the legal system and taking the Copyright Law, the Civil Code and other legal norms as the cornerstone, systematically reveals the application predicaments of traditional legal systems in the context of artificial intelligence. By deeply deconstructing the ambiguous areas of the originality determination standards for works, the expansion disputes of the constitutive elements of infringement, and the technical barriers of the causal relationship proof mechanism, and combining the judgment logic of typical judicial cases at home and abroad and the theoretical debates in the academic circle, it conducts a multi-dimensional legal analysis of the legal difficulties in the context of artificial intelligence creation. The research re-examines the legal relationships related to the content generated by artificial intelligence from the aspects of the configuration of rights and obligations of the subjects and the division of liability forms, and precisely defines the legal liability boundaries of multiple subjects such as developers, users, and platform operators. At the same time, guided by the theory of interest balance, it takes into account the needs of technological innovation and the goal of copyright protection, and explores a legal regulation path that conforms to the development laws of artificial intelligence. Through the construction of a forward-looking legal theoretical framework, it provides a solution with both theoretical depth and practical value for resolving copyright infringement disputes in the context of generative artificial intelligence, and promotes the formation of a new copyright protection paradigm that adapts to the development of the digital age.

Keywords

Generative artificial intelligence; Copyright infringement; Legal liability; Interest balance; Technological governance

1. Introduction

Amid the digital technology revolution, generative artificial intelligence (AI) has seen continuous technological iterations and explosive expansion of application scenarios. However, the rapid evolution of this technology has also given rise to a series of novel legal challenges. Compared with traditional copyright infringement, such disputes exhibit new characteristics such as ambiguous subject identification,

diverse forms of infringement, and complex causal relationships, constantly testing the boundaries of the existing legal system. The current copyright legal framework, rooted in traditional human creative models, is facing unprecedented adaptability crises when confronted with the "data-driven - algorithm-generated" novel creative mechanisms of AI. From the perspective of legal concepts, core elements such as the originality standard of works and the definition of authorship encounter interpretative dilemmas in the context of AI creation; in terms of rule supply, there are significant institutional gaps in key areas such as data collection and usage norms and algorithm rights attribution; in the dimension of interest balance, the tension between the demands for technological innovation and the protection of rights holders is increasingly prominent. These deep-seated contradictions not only impede the uniformity of judicial practice but also hinder the healthy and orderly development of the AI industry. Against this backdrop, systematically studying the issue of copyright infringement liability in generative AI is not only a practical choice to respond to the urgent needs of judicial practice and fill legal gaps but also a theoretical breakthrough in exploring the construction of a dynamic balance mechanism between technological innovation and rights protection. This research not only helps clarify the boundaries of rights and obligations for all parties, providing theoretical support for judicial decisions, but also offers institutional guarantees for the sustainable development of the AI industry, facilitating a virtuous interaction between innovation incentives and rights protection.

2. Types and Causes of Copyright Infringement by Generative AI

2.1 Main Types of Infringement Risks

2.1.1 Infringement Risks in the Data Input and Training Stages

The training of generative artificial intelligence relies on massive amounts of data to build models. Developers often use technical means such as web crawlers to extract data from various websites and platforms. During this process, if copyrighted works such as literary masterpieces, artistic paintings, and classic music are included in the training set without the permission of the copyright holders, it is essentially an open violation of the right of reproduction of the works. The unauthorized data flowing into the model not only infringes upon the legitimate rights and interests of the creators but also may lead to subsequent infringement disputes in the usage stage, posing a hidden danger to the healthy development of artificial intelligence technology.

2.1.2 Infringement risks in the content generation and output stages

When AI systems generate content based on user instructions, if the output results are substantially similar to existing protected works, it may pose risks of infringing multiple rights regulated by copyright law, such as the right of reproduction, the right of communication through information networks, and the right of adaptation.

For instance, if the images generated by AI are highly similar to existing artworks in terms of composition structure, color application, and character image creation, they may be regarded as infringing the reproduction right of the original works. When the text works generated by AI contain a large amount of substantial reproduction of the content of existing works, it not only involves the infringement of the reproduction right, but if the infringing content is disseminated through information networks, it also constitutes a violation of the right of communication through information networks. If the adapted works generated by AI are created based on the original works without the permission of the copyright owner of the original works, it may infringe the adaptation right of the original works due to the lack of legal authorization. Such infringement not only causes damage to the intellectual property rights of creators, but may also have a negative impact on the innovation order and the balance of interests in the field of cultural creation.

2.1.3 Infringement risks in the content dissemination stage

When network users obtain generated content and disseminate the AIGC results on the internet without the permission of the copyright owner, they infringe upon the right of communication through information networks. Moreover, when users further process and adapt AIGC and then disseminate it, it not only involves the right of communication through information networks but may also cross the line and infringe upon the original author's right of adaptation. Furthermore, due to the rapid diffusion and decentralized nature of online dissemination, such infringement not only causes incalculable economic losses to copyright owners but also disrupts the healthy and orderly digital creation ecosystem, posing greater challenges to the protection of the legitimate rights and interests of original authors.

2.2 Analysis of the Causes of Infringement Risks

2.2.1 Technical reasons

Generative artificial intelligence is based on deep learning algorithms and achieves learning of language patterns, image features and other information through training on massive amounts of data. This learning process is essentially the "digestion" and "structural reorganization" of data. However, due to the complexity of the algorithm architecture and the opacity of the operational logic, it is difficult to completely avoid the situation where the generated content is substantially similar to existing works. Even if algorithm comparison technology is introduced, it can only complete the detection of similarity at the formal level and cannot accurately determine the core creativity, logical structure and other substantive content of the work, leading to the problem of technical detection failure in scenarios such as "content scraping". For example, artificial intelligence may generate content with different surface expressions but highly similar core semantics by performing operations such as vocabulary replacement and sentence structure transformation on

the sentences of prior works, thereby evading the routine detection of the algorithm.

2.2.2 Legal reasons

The current copyright law has shown obvious institutional lag in dealing with this emerging field, with a large number of legal blanks that need to be filled. From the source of data to the rights attribution of creative outcomes and the determination of responsibilities, many key links are facing a legal definition vacuum. The application of the fair use system in the context of artificial intelligence has also fallen into a predicament. Although there are views attempting to incorporate the "creation" behavior of artificial intelligence into the scope of fair use, compared with the statutory circumstances listed in Article 24 of China's Copyright Law, the operation mode of artificial intelligence has significant differences from these provisions. At the same time, from the analysis of the core constituent elements of fair use, the large-scale use of a vast number of works during the training process of artificial intelligence is highly likely to interfere with the normal market circulation of works and damage the legitimate rights and interests of copyright holders, making it difficult to meet the statutory standards of "not affecting the normal use of the work" and "not harming the legitimate interests of the right holder".

2.2.3 Individual reasons

In the rapidly evolving field of generative artificial intelligence, infringement risks are widespread throughout the behavior chains of service providers and internet users. As the core entities in technology research and development and service operation, service providers bear significant responsibilities throughout the entire process of data collection, model training, and content output. During the data collection for training, if a strict review mechanism and source traceability system are not established, unauthorized infringing data may easily be included in the training set, laying the groundwork for subsequent infringements. In the stage of content generation and dissemination, if an effective content monitoring and filtering system is lacking and infringing content is not promptly identified and blocked, it may also lead to the spread of infringing content in the cyberspace. The behaviors of internet users cannot be ignored either. Whether out of subjective intent or objective negligence, they may trigger infringement risks. Some users deliberately set specific keywords and instructions to obtain content similar to popular works, inducing artificial intelligence to generate potentially infringing works. There are also some users who, despite knowing that the generated content is infringing, still use social media platforms, content sharing websites, and other channels to spread and disseminate it. As the application scenarios of AIGC continue to expand, the infringement behaviors of service providers and internet users are intertwined, not only infringing upon the legitimate rights and interests of copyright holders but also posing a threat to the healthy and orderly digital content ecosystem.

3. The Dilemma in Determining Copyright Infringement of Generative Artificial Intelligence

3.1 The legal lag in the determination of infringement

The current copyright law is built on the fundamental framework of "human creation", and when it comes to AI-generated content, it shows significant inadaptability. Traditional copyright law emphasizes "human creation" as the core element for the recognition of works. However, the creator of AI-generated content has a special nature. Whether it can be recognized as a work and who the copyright should belong to are not clearly stipulated in the current law. The standards for infringement determination are also ambiguous in the context of AI. "Substantial similarity" is an important element for infringement determination. In the case of AI-generated content, how to define the degree of similarity between works becomes a difficult problem. Since AI-generated content is often the result of learning and integrating a large amount of data, the similarity with the original work may not be simple copying and pasting, but rather similarities in elements and structure. The existing law does not provide clear judgment standards. Regarding the "fair use" element, there is no clear judicial interpretation on whether the use of data by AI during the learning process falls within the scope of fair use. For example, when AI learns a large number of literary works to create new stories, it is difficult to determine whether it exceeds the scope of fair use. The nature of the use of training data is also questionable. During the training of AI models, a large amount of data needs to be crawled. Whether such crawling behavior constitutes "temporary copying" is highly controversial. From a legal perspective, the definition of temporary copying is related to factors such as the storage time and usage purpose of the data. However, the storage and usage of AI training data are complex, making it difficult to make a simple determination. At the same time, it is still undetermined whether algorithm learning constitutes "transformative use". For instance, when AI generates new artistic styles by learning classic artworks, whether this learning and generation process constitutes transformative use remains a subject of different opinions in judicial practice.

3.2 Regulatory barriers resulting from technological characteristics

The black box effect of deep learning models is a major obstacle to regulating infringement. During the training and operation of AI models, the internal algorithms and parameters are complex and difficult to understand, and the process of generating content is like a "black box", which makes it extremely difficult to trace the source of infringement. When infringing content appears, it is hard to determine whether the problem lies in the infringing images in the training data or the deviation caused by the algorithm during operation. For instance, if an AI image generation platform outputs an infringing image, due to the black box effect, the platform cannot easily determine whether the issue stems from infringing images in the

training data or the incorrect processing of data by the algorithm. The problem of data pollution should also not be overlooked. Even if the source of the AI training data is legal, the model may memorize and output fragments of protected content during the learning process. This is because AI models analyze and extract features from data during training, and some features of protected content may be memorized by the model and unconsciously output when generating new content. For example, an AI language model may unconsciously quote copyrighted sentences when generating articles, and users and platforms often cannot detect this in advance. The randomness of generated content further increases the difficulty of regulation. The same prompt word input into an AI model may produce different results, either infringing or non-infringing. This uncertainty makes it difficult to prevent infringement in advance. For instance, a user may request an AI to generate an image with the same prompt word at different times, and one time the generated image may be fine, but another time it may involve infringement, which poses a huge challenge to content review and supervision.

3.3 The complexity of responsibility allocation

In AIGC infringement cases, the responsibility subjects are diverse, and the joint liability among data providers, model developers, platform operators, and end users is rather ambiguous. Data providers may be held responsible for providing data containing infringements, but it is difficult to determine their subjective fault. It is also unclear whether model developers should bear the main responsibility if they use infringing data for training. Platform operators have the obligation to review the content uploaded and generated by users, but it is challenging to fulfill this obligation completely in the face of massive amounts of content. The scope of responsibility for end users who intentionally use AI to generate infringing content also needs to be further clarified. For instance, if a user generates infringing comics using an AI drawing platform, platform operators, model developers, and data providers may all be involved in the dispute, but it is difficult to clearly define their respective responsibilities. There are also difficulties in determining direct infringement and contributory infringement. It is hard for service providers to prove the subjective state of users generating infringing content. Some platforms may fail to detect infringing content in a timely manner due to technical limitations or negligence, and whether this constitutes contributory infringement is controversial in law. At the same time, due to the cross-border operation characteristics of AIGC, training data is globally distributed, and model services may also be provided to global users, which leads to cross-border jurisdiction conflicts. The legal provisions in different countries and regions vary, and there are many difficulties in determining the applicable law and jurisdictional courts, increasing the complexity of rights protection and judicial practice.

3.4 The governance challenge of balancing rights and interests

There is a significant tension between innovation incentives and rights protection. Over-regulating AIGC may restrict technological development and hinder innovation; while turning a blind eye to infringement will seriously damage the creative ecosystem and dampen the enthusiasm of creators. For instance, strictly limiting AI's learning and borrowing from existing works may affect the development of AI in the field of artistic creation; but without such restrictions, the rights of creators cannot be guaranteed. The traditional "authorization before use" licensing mechanism is difficult to cope with the massive data demands of machine learning in the AIGC era. AI training requires a large amount of data as support, and obtaining authorization one by one is not only time-consuming and labor-intensive, but also almost impossible in practice. This leads AI enterprises to often be in a dilemma in data usage, either facing infringement risks or restricting technological development due to the inability to obtain sufficient data. There is also a lack of a fair solution for the distribution of interests among copyright holders, AI enterprises, and the public. How to distribute the economic value generated by AI-generated content among these three parties has no unified standard or mechanism. Copyright holders hope to receive reasonable compensation, AI enterprises need to invest a lot of resources in research and development, and the public also expects to enjoy the convenience brought by AI at a low cost. Balancing the interests of the three parties has become an urgent problem to be solved.

3.5 The practical predicament at the implementation level

During the enforcement process, the lagging monitoring technology has seriously affected the effectiveness of copyright protection. The existing copyright identification systems are mainly designed for traditional works and are difficult to effectively capture derivative infringements generated by AI. AI-generated content often undergoes deformation, recombination, and other processing of the original works, making the infringement more concealed. The current technology is difficult to quickly and accurately identify these infringing contents. Right holders are facing the predicament of disproportionately high costs for rights protection. In terms of evidence collection, due to the complexity of AI infringement, right holders find it difficult to obtain sufficient evidence to prove the existence of infringement; in the certification stage, it is also very difficult to determine the source of the infringing content and the infringing entity; in the claim process, there is a lack of clear standards for calculating infringement losses, which leads to the situation where even if the right holder wins the lawsuit, they may not be able to obtain reasonable compensation. All these factors make right holders often hesitate when facing AIGC infringement. At the same time, the absence of industry standards also exacerbates the enforcement predicament. In key areas such as the compliance management of training data and content labeling, there are no operational norms. Enterprises have no clear guidance on how to ensure the legality of training data and how to accu-

rately label AI-generated content to indicate the source and copyright information, which further increases the difficulty of regulating AIGC infringement.

4. The Improvement Path of the Liability System for Copyright Infringement by Generative Artificial Intelligence

4.1 Legislative Level

4.1.1 Revise the Copyright Law to Clarify the Copyrightability Standards for AI-generated Content

The current Copyright Law builds its rights system around "human creation", leaving a legal gap when it comes to the copyright ownership and protection of AI-generated content. From a legal theory perspective, a work must meet two major criteria: "originality" and "reproducibility". For AI-generated content, it should be made clear that its copyrightability needs to meet specific conditions, such as the inclusion of human creative intervention in the AI's operational logic, or the AI-generated content reaching a certain intellectual creation height in expression and having the same artistic and scientific value as human creations.

4.1.2 Establishing the "fair use" boundary for AI training data and distinguishing between commercial and non-commercial uses

AI training relies on massive data input. Unauthorized use of copyrighted data can easily constitute infringement. According to the "fair use" system in copyright law, the reasonable scope of AI training data usage must be clearly defined. For non-commercial purposes such as academic research and technological development, data usage restrictions can be appropriately relaxed, but the "transformative use" standard must be met, meaning that the purpose and effect of using the data should be essentially different from the original work, without affecting the normal use of the original work or unreasonably harming the legitimate rights and interests of the rights holder. However, for commercial AI training, data usage should be strictly restricted, and explicit authorization from the rights holder must be obtained to prevent data abuse from disrupting the copyright market order.

4.1.3 Establish a mandatory AI content labeling system, requiring the disclosure of the AI attributes of the generated content.

To safeguard the rights of copyright holders and the public's right to know, a mandatory identification system for AI-generated content should be established. From a legal perspective, this helps clarify the source of the work, prevent the public from misunderstanding AI-generated content, and also facilitates copyright tracing and infringement determination. AI content generators and disseminators are required to mark the content as AI-generated in a prominent way when it is released, including information such as the generation tool and generation time. For violations of the identification obligation, corresponding administrative penalties should be set,

such as fines and orders to correct. Through mandatory identification, the risk of copyright infringement can be reduced, the moral rights of copyright holders, such as the right of authorship, can be protected, and it also provides convenience for subsequent copyright management and dispute resolution.

4.2. Responsibility Determination

4.2.1 Establish the "Technology Neutrality + Fault Liability" Principle and Distinguish the Responsibilities of Developers, Operators, and Users

In the determination of AIGC infringement liability, the "technology neutrality" principle should be adhered to, avoiding excessive restrictions on technological development. However, the "fault liability" principle should also be combined to clearly define the responsibility boundaries of different subjects. For AI developers, if they are aware or should be aware that the data used in algorithm design and model training is infringing, or fail to take reasonable measures to prevent infringement, they should bear corresponding responsibilities. For operators, if they fail to conduct reasonable reviews of AI-generated content on the platform and do not promptly handle obvious infringement, they should also bear fault liability. And for users, if they intentionally use AI to generate and disseminate infringing content, they should also bear legal responsibilities. By clearly defining the rights, obligations, and responsibility scopes of each subject, a complete responsibility chain can be established to ensure that infringement is effectively regulated.

4.2.2 Implement the Platform's Active Filtering Obligation for Obvious Infringement

When infringement is obvious, network service providers have the obligation to proactively take measures to prevent the expansion of infringement. In the AIGC field, for AI-generated content on the platform that obviously infringes on others' copyrights, such as directly copying or imitating others' works, the platform should promptly discover and take necessary measures such as deletion, blocking, or disconnecting links. If the platform fails to fulfill its active filtering obligation, it should bear joint liability for the expanded damage. At the same time, to avoid the platform's excessive review affecting innovation, the scope and judgment criteria of the "red flag standard" should be clearly defined, such as based on public common sense and industry practices, to ensure that the platform finds a balance between maintaining copyright order and promoting technological development.

4.2.3 Establish the "Safe Harbor" Rule and Encourage Platforms to Establish Copyright Protection Mechanisms

The "safe harbor" rule aims to provide liability exemption for qualified network service providers and encourage them to actively establish copyright protection mechanisms. For AIGC platforms that have taken reasonable copyright protection

measures, such as establishing infringement complaint handling mechanisms and conducting preliminary reviews of user-uploaded content, they can be exempted from joint liability for users' infringement under certain legal conditions. This rule helps reduce the legal risks of platforms and encourages them to invest more resources in copyright management, such as using technical means to detect and filter AI-generated content for copyright. At the same time, the specific conditions and procedures for platforms to enjoy "safe harbor" protection should be clearly defined to prevent platforms from abusing the rule to evade responsibility.

4.3. Execution Mechanism

4.3.1 Establishing an AI Copyright Registration and Certification System

A complete copyright registration and certification system is an important means to protect copyright. For AI-generated content, a dedicated registration and certification system should be established, clearly defining the registration process, required materials, and legal effect. AI content creators or rights holders can submit their works to the registration authority, which will review the creation process and rights ownership of the works. After approval, a registration certificate will be issued. The registration certificate can serve as preliminary evidence of ownership and reduce the burden of proof for rights holders in infringement disputes. At the same time, blockchain and other technologies can be utilized to ensure the immutability and traceability of registration information, enhancing the credibility and efficiency of the registration process and providing strong support for copyright transactions and infringement rights protection.

4.3.2 Developing Professional AI Infringement Identification Technologies and Institutions

AI-generated content infringement has characteristics such as technical complexity and strong concealment, requiring professional identification technologies and institutions to provide support. Encourage research institutions and enterprises to conduct research on AI infringement identification technologies, develop intelligent detection tools, and accurately determine whether AI-generated content constitutes infringement through technologies such as image recognition, text comparison, and algorithm analysis. At the same time, cultivate professional AI infringement identification institutions, formulate unified identification standards and norms, and ensure the scientificity and fairness of identification results. In infringement disputes, the identification reports issued by identification institutions can serve as important evidence, providing professional basis for judicial judgments and improving the accuracy and efficiency of infringement determination.

4.3.3 Improving Electronic Evidence Rules to Adapt to the Characteristics of AI Infringement Cases

In AI infringement cases, electronic evidence plays a significant role. It is necessary to improve the rules for collecting, fixing, reviewing, and recognizing electronic evidence to adapt to the characteristics of AI infringement cases. Clearly define the legal standards for electronic evidence, standardize the processes for extracting, storing, and transmitting electronic data, and ensure the authenticity and integrity of electronic evidence. Introduce technical means such as blockchain evidence storage and trusted timestamps to enhance the credibility of electronic evidence. At the same time, strengthen cooperation between judicial authorities and electronic evidence storage and verification institutions, establish an electronic evidence sharing platform, enable rapid retrieval and verification of evidence, improve litigation efficiency, and reduce the cost of rights protection.

4.4. Supporting Measures

4.4.1 Promoting the Establishment of an Industry Data Authorization Cooperation Mechanism

To address the copyright issues of AI training data, it is necessary to promote the establishment of an industry data authorization cooperation mechanism. Encourage copyright holders and AI enterprises to achieve legal sharing and use of data through negotiation and signing authorization agreements. Support industry associations and other organizations in formulating standard contracts and transaction rules for data authorization, standardizing data authorization behavior and safeguarding the rights and interests of both parties. At the same time, explore the establishment of a data trading platform to provide data trading services for copyright holders and AI enterprises, promoting the rational allocation and effective utilization of data resources. Through the industry data authorization cooperation mechanism, it is possible to meet the data demands of AI technology development while protecting the legitimate rights and interests of copyright holders, achieving a positive interaction between innovation and protection.

4.4.2 Establishing a Rapid Dispute Resolution Channel for AI Copyright Disputes

AI copyright disputes are characterized by a large number and strong time sensitivity. Establishing a rapid dispute resolution channel helps to promptly resolve disputes and reduce the cost of rights protection for the parties involved. In the judicial field, a specialized AI copyright dispute tribunal or collegial panel can be established, staffed with professional judges familiar with AI technology and copyright law, to improve the efficiency and quality of trials. At the same time, improve non-litigation dispute resolution mechanisms such as arbitration and mediation, and encourage the parties to quickly resolve disputes through arbitration and mediation. Establish an online dispute resolution platform for AI copyright disputes to enable online case filing, trial, and enforcement, enhancing the convenience and transparency of dis-

pute resolution.

4.4.3 Strengthening Cross-border Law Enforcement Cooperation to Address Global Infringement Issues

AIGC infringement often has a transnational nature, and strengthening cross-border law enforcement cooperation is key to addressing global infringement issues. Actively participate in the formulation of international copyright protection rules and promote the establishment of unified international standards for AI copyright protection. Strengthen cooperation with law enforcement agencies in other countries and regions, establish mechanisms for information sharing, case investigation assistance, and joint law enforcement, and enhance the crackdown on cross-border infringement. At the same time, improve China's foreign-related intellectual property judicial system, clarify jurisdiction and legal application issues in foreign-related AI copyright disputes, safeguard the legitimate rights and interests of Chinese rights holders in the international arena, and maintain the global copyright order.

5. Conclusion

The rapid development of generative artificial intelligence is reshaping the traditional copyright protection system, and its infringement liability determination faces multi-dimensional challenges in terms of technology, law and ethics. It is urgent to establish a dynamic balance mechanism that takes into account the protection of copyright holders' rights and interests, the incentive for technological innovation and the public interest. Currently, it is necessary to clarify through legislation the dual responsibility subject status of AIGC service providers and network users, and establish a differentiated liability system mainly based on no-fault liability and supplemented by fault liability. Among them, stricter no-fault liability should be applied to service providers to strengthen technical control, while fault liability should be applied to users to reflect fairness. At the same time, it is necessary to improve the diversified dispute resolution mechanism including administrative mediation, arbitration and litigation, explore the establishment of a specialized dispute resolution platform jointly participated by industry associations, technical experts and legal professionals, and build a multi-level risk-sharing mechanism, including promoting the industry liability insurance system to disperse innovation risks, developing copyright collective management organizations to reduce the cost of rights protection, and establishing a collaborative governance framework that connects technical standards with legal rules. In the face of the continuous evolution of deep learning, multi-modal generation and other technologies, it is necessary to establish a dynamic adjustment mechanism for legal rules, and respond to new legal issues in a timely manner through regular assessment, expert argumentation and public hearings, ultimately building a system that is both stable and adaptable, achieving a positive interaction between intellectual property protection and technological innova-

tion, providing a solid legal guarantee for the high-quality development of the digital economy, and promoting social knowledge sharing and cultural prosperity. This systematic project requires the collaborative participation of multiple stakeholders including legislative bodies, judicial bodies, industry organizations and technology developers, maintaining legal certainty while reserving necessary space for technological development, and responding to the new copyright protection paradigm brought by AIGC through continuous institutional innovation.

References

[1] Zhi L .Copyright Infringement Risks and Responses of Generative Artificial Intelligence[J].Science of Law Journal,2025,4(3).

[2] Yinfei C .Liability Principles for Copyright Infringement of Generative Artificial Intelligence[J].The Frontiers of Society, Science and Technology,2025,7(1).

[3] Xue J ,Zhang K .Copyright infringement in content generated by AI: an empirical analysis based on typical cases of China and the United States[J].Applied Mathematics and Nonlinear Sciences,2025,10(1).

[4] Peng G, Ruihan L. Copyright Infringement Risks and Institutional Responses of Generative AI "Creation" - A Concurrent Review of the "First Global AIGC Infringement Case" [J]. Journal of Guangxi University of Finance and Economics, 2025, 38(03): 56-67.

[5] Dongrun Z. The Challenges and Overcoming of Copyright System by Generative Artificial Intelligence [J]. High Technology and Industrialization, 2025, 31(04): 125-128.

[6] Xiaoqing F, Chang G. Copyright Infringement Liability and Hierarchical Governance of Generative AI Platforms: Reflections Based on the Hangzhou Ultraman Case [J]. Digital Rule of Law, 2025, (02): 56-75.

[7] Yunfei L. Research on the Regulatory Path for Infringement Risks of Training Data in Generative Artificial Intelligence [J]. Xiamen Science & Technology, 2025, 31(02): 32-37.

[8] Wenmao L, Yu Y. Copyright Infringement Risks and Resolution Paths of Generative AI Public Legal Services [J]. China Public Legal Services, 2024, (04): 169-180.

[9] Weijun Z. On the Copyright Regulation Path for the Use of Data in Large Model Training [J]. East China University of Political Science and Law Journal, 2025, (02): 79-92.

[10] Ran T. On the Responsibility Determination for Infringement of Copyright by AI-generated Works [J]. Journal of Taiyuan Normal University (Social Sciences Edition), 2025, 24(01): 7-16.

[11] Ye C. The Regulation of Copyright Infringement in the "Feeding" of Data for Generative Artificial Intelligence [J]. Science, Technology & Law (Chinese & English), 2025, (02): 31-41.

[12] Jianjun Z. Research on Copyright Infringement Issues of Generative Artificial Intelligence [J]. Intellectual Property, 2025, (02): 44-60.

[13] Ping D. Copyright Infringement Risks and Prevention of Training Data Used in Generative Artificial Intelligence [J]. Zhongguancun, 2025, (01): 144-146.