DESIGN INFRINGEMENT IN THE ERA OF 3D PRINTING AND AI

Ms. Nirmala R Harish[1] & Hemalatha C[2]

ABSTRACT

In today's digital era, technologies such as 3D printing and artificial intelligence (AI) are transforming how designs are created, shared, and replicated. The rapid advancement of digital tools, particularly additive manufacturing and AI-generated design software, has redefined the boundaries of creativity, innovation, and intellectual property rights (IPR). This paper critically analyses the challenges posed by design infringement in the digital age, focusing on the intersection of generative AI, 3D printing, and existing legal frameworks. It explores the complexities surrounding authorship, originality, and ownership in AI-generated works, as well as the ease with which 3D printing enables the unauthorized reproduction of protected designs. By examining key statutory provisions and landmark rulings from Indian and international jurisdictions, the paper highlights the shortcomings of current IPR regimes in dealing with non-human creators and decentralized production models. Through theoretical exploration and comparative legal analysis, it proposes responsive legal reforms aimed at safeguarding design rights without stifling technological progress. Ultimately, it advocates for a re-evaluation of IPR standards to reflect the realities of digital design ecosystems and ensure equitable protection for creators in the age of algorithmic innovation.

Keywords: Design Infringement, Intellectual Property Rights (IPR), 3D Printing (Additive Manufacturing), Artificial Intelligence (AI), AI-Generated Designs, Digital Innovation, Copyright and Design Law, Authorship and Originality, Ownership of AI Creations, Patent and Design Protection

[1] Assistant Professor, CMR University School of Legal Studies
[2] Student of B.A.,LL.B. (Hons), CMR University, School of legal studies

Introduction:

Artificial intelligence (AI) and 3D printing are two examples of emerging technologies that are changing the creation, usage, and sharing of designs in the modern world. People may create tangible items from digital data using 3D printing, frequently in the comfort of their own homes. At the same time, AI is increasingly able to generate models and design concepts independently, often with little to no human assistance. These technologies speed up and increase the creativity of design, but they also create new legal issues. Many industries, including technology, consumer products, fashion, and autos, value design rights. By protecting originality, they provide consumers' confidence in the goods they purchase and support fair competition for businesses. However, modern technologies like artificial intelligence (AI) and 3D printing are altering how designs are made and recreated. Anyone may create perfect copies of a product utilizing 3D printing at a very low cost by only using a digital file. Even though AI is capable of automatically creating new designs, sometimes these may unintentionally copy or copy previous ones. Since the legislation was drafted when duplicating designs was considerably more difficult and simpler to detect, this presents significant issues. The primary issue is that these novel circumstances are difficult for existing design laws to handle. Online file sharing, cross-border product copying, and even design creation without obvious human authorship are becoming simple processes. These issues raise questions about originality, ownership, and how to stop infringement. It aims to show whether current design laws are enough for the digital or if they need to change.

Understanding the design infringement:

Under Indian law, the Designs Act, 2000 defines a "design" as the features of shape, configuration, pattern, ornament, or composition of lines or colours that can be applied to an article by an industrial process. it is about the look and appearance of a product, not its function. **For example**, the unique shape of a bottle, the pattern on fabric, or the design of a smartphone case can also be protected. In order to guarantee that member nations give designers legal protection, international agreements such as the Hague Agreement and the TRIPS Agreement (Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights) also acknowledge designs as a type of intellectual property.

What constitutes design infringement:

Design infringement takes place when someone uses a registered design without the consent

of its owner. The purpose of design law is to make sure that the person who has invested time, money, knowledge and creativity in developing a unique design gets absolute rights over it. When others copy or imitate that design, it harms both the owner and the market. There are few situations where infringement occurs are:

1. **Exact coping:**

This is the most direct form of design infringement. It happens when someone copies a registered design without any change and consent, so that the new product looks almost the same as the original. The infringer takes advantage of the owner's effort and reputation without the owner's permission. **For example**: a company copies the exact shape and design of a branded perfume bottle and sells it under another name. Even if the name is changed, the design itself is protected, so this amounts to infringement.

2. **Limitation with minor changes:**

This is another type of infringement that happens when someone makes small alterations to an existing registered design but keeps the main features and overall look the same. The changes are usually external like colour, size, or any slight change while the essential design remains copied. Courts generally look at the "overall visual impression" rather than small differences. **For example:** A local brand imitates the curved body design of a well-known soft drink bottle but modifies the label or cap slightly. Consumers may still confuse it with the original, so it also amounts to infringement.

3. **Substantial similarity test:**

In these circumstances the courts do not expect a design to be copied exactly. Instead, they check whether the alleged infringing design is "substantially similar" to the registered one. This means that even if there are small or slight differences, they will not be enough to avoid liability if the overall visual effect of the design is the same. Then The test is usually applied from the perspective of an ordinary observer, someone who looks at both designs casually, without expert knowledge. If the observer cannot easily distinguish between the two designs, the court finds its amounts to infringement.

Case law: Bharat Glass Tube Ltd. v. Gopal Glass Works Ltd. (2008).

In this case, Gopal Glass Works Ltd. had a registered design for glass sheets with a specific

pattern. Bharat Glass Tube Ltd. began manufacturing and selling glass sheets with a very similar, if not identical, pattern. The Supreme Court had to determine if the competing product constituted an infringement of the registered design.

The court dismissed arguments that the designs were different due to the manufacturing process or minor variations. It emphasized that the finished article, the glass sheet, was what mattered, and the visual similarity between the two products was a clear case of design piracy. The decision strengthened the legal framework for intellectual property protection in India, ensuring that the purpose of the Designs Act to protect novel and original designs is upheld**.**

Conditions for infringement:

if a person wants to claim of design infringement to be valid generally:

1. The design must be registered under the design act 2000.
2. The alleged infringer must have applied the design to an article.
3. The infringing product must be used for commercial purposes, such as sale or distribution.

3D printing and design infringement:

3D printing, also called additive manufacturing, is a technology that creates physical objects directly from digital blueprints. This technology allows businesses and individuals to create complex designs quickly and at low cost. The process usually involves:

1. CAD (Computer-Aided Design) files – A design is created using specialized software.

2. Digital blueprints – The design is saved in a format (like STL files) that a 3D printer can read.

3. Rapid model – The 3D printer builds the product layer by layer using materials such as plastic or metal.

Risks of infringement

One of the biggest risks of 3D printing is that it makes copying

designs are extremely easy. Unlike traditional manufacturing, which requires machines, labour, and investment, 3D printing only needs a digital design file (CAD file) and a printer. Once a CAD file is created or scanned from an existing product, it can be used to make unlimited copies of the design.

• **Unlimited Copies**: A single file can be printed as many times as desired, meaning that even if the original design was meant to be absolute, duplicates can overflow in the market.

• **Online Sharing:** These CAD files can be uploaded on websites, forums, or in many platforms just like songs or movies. Once uploaded, they can be downloaded by thousands of people worldwide.

• **Loss of Control:** For the design owner, it becomes almost impossible to track who is using the file or to stop its distribution once it is on the internet. So, in these cases, the original owner cannot file or search that person who has infringed the copies.

1. Challenges in detecting unauthorized 3D printing:

In traditional manufacturing, which usually happens in large factories that can be monitored, 3D printing can be done privately, even at home or in small workshops. This makes it very hard for design owners and authorities to identify when infringement is taking place.

• **Private Production**: A person with a basic 3D printer and a CAD file can copy products without leaving clear identification Since there is no need for large-scale machinery, the copying often goes unnoticed.

• **Small-Scale Infringement, Big Impact:** Even if copying happens in small batches, it can still harm the original designer's market. For example, if multiple individuals or small businesses copy and sell the design locally, the increasing effect can be serious.

2. Cross-border issues:

One of the biggest challenges with 3D printing and design protection is that CAD files can be shared across countries in seconds. The internet makes it easy for anyone to upload a design file on global platforms, and once it is available online, people from anywhere in the world can download and use it.

• **Jurisdiction Problems:** Design rights are territorial, meaning they are valid only in the country where they are registered. For example, if a design is registered in India, the protection usually applies only within India. If someone in another country downloads the design and copies it there, it may not be considered infringement under their local law.

• **Enforcement Difficulties**: Even if infringement is proven, it is very hard to take legal action against someone operating in another country. Different nations have different laws, and international cooperation is often slow and complicated.

• **Global Online Sales:** Infringers can sell copied products on global e-commerce sites, reaching Indian consumers without even being present in India. This creates unfair competition and loss of revenue for the original designer.

AI and design infringement:

Artificial Intelligence (AI) is transforming the creative and industrial design sectors through the use of generative algorithms and machine learning. AI-powered tools are now capable of coping innovative product models, fashion patterns, and architectural structures by looking into large datasets and generating design variations. While this brings efficiency and innovation, it also raises new challenges for intellectual property protection. One major concern is that AI-created designs may unintentionally infringe existing works, as the system relies on vast datasets that often include protected designs. This makes it possible for outputs to closely favour registered works, even without any intention of copying. Another issue is the question of authorship and ownership. Should the rights belong to the programmer who built the AI or the user who provided the inputs, or the AI system that actually generated the design? Since current laws, including the Designs Act, 2000, only recognize human authorship, AI-generated works fall into a legal area. Furthermore, liability becomes a concern when infringement occurs. If an AI tool creates a design that violates an existing registered design, it is unclear whether responsibility lies with the developer, the user, or the company deploying the AI system. Examples can be seen in various fields: an AI generating a car component design resembling another company's registered product, fashion labels producing AI-generated patterns similar to existing designs, or architectural software creating facades that overlap with registered works. These issues show how AI blurs the boundaries of originality, authorship, and liability, posing significant challenges for traditional design law in the digital era.

Illustration: Product Design: An AI tool used to design consumer electronics may generate a phone casing or car part that looks similar to a competitor's patented design.

Fashion Industry: AI algorithms trained on thousands of luxury brand designs may create handbags, footwear, or patterns that mimic high-end products, making it difficult to distinguish between original and AI-derived works.

Legal challenges in the digital era:

The rise of 3D printing and Artificial Intelligence has exposed several gaps in existing design laws, both in India and globally. Current legislation, such as the Designs Act, 2000, was primarily drafted with traditional manufacturing in mind and struggles to address issues of digital coping through CAD files and online sharing platforms. Enforcement of design rights has become increasing with the difficulty on the internet, especially with cross-border infringements, since design rights are territorial in nature and legal remedies are often limited to the jurisdiction where the design is registered. Another major challenge lies in the field of AI-generated designs. Traditional design law requires originality and creativity, but when an AI system creates a design by looking into datasets, questions arise regarding whether such works can be considered truly original or not. Moreover, authorship and ownership become a combination with laws currently recognizing only human creators, AI-generated works exist in a legal area. Finally, the next step of technological change far exceeds the speed at which legislation evolves, creating a spread gap between innovative practices in industry and the protections available under law. This mismatch leaves designers unprotected to infringement and reduces the effectiveness of intellectual property rights in the digital era.

Comparative with international perspective:

Different countries have different jurisdictions and have adopted varied approaches to address the challenges of design protection in the digital era. The European Union (EU) has developed a strong framework under the Directive on the Legal Protection of Designs and the Community Design Regulation, administered by the EUIPO (European Union Intellectual Property Office). The EU recognizes both registered and unregistered designs, offering broader protection to creators against unauthorized copying, which is particularly relevant in industries like fashion and consumer goods. In contrast, the United States relies heavily on design patents to protect the fancy features of products. While design patents provide strong rights, the system is time-

consuming and costly. However, the US has also utilized the Digital Millennium Copyright Act (DMCA) to issue takedowns of infringing CAD files uploaded online, offering a practical tool to stop digital infringement. At the global level, the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO) and agreements like TRIPS and the Hague Agreement provide minimum standards and facilitate international registration of designs, though enforcement still depends on national laws. For India, these models offer important lessons like adopting flexible systems like the EU's recognition of unregistered designs, incorporating digital enforcement mechanisms similar to DMCA takedowns, and strengthening participation in international treaties could help modernize its legal framework. Such steps would better align Indian design law with the realities of 3D printing, AI, and cross-border infringements.

Conclusion:

The rapid growth of technologies like 3D printing and Artificial Intelligence has transformed the way designs are created, shared, and copied. While these tools speed creativity, innovation, and they also pose serious threats to the traditional framework of design protection under intellectual property laws. Issues such as easy digital copying, cross-border infringements, authorship of AI-generated works, and enforcement challenges on online platforms highlight the limitations of existing legal systems. A comparative study of international practices shows that the EU's dual protection system, the US's use of DMCA for digital enforcement, and WIPO's global treaties provide useful lessons for India in bridging the gap between law and technology. To address these challenges, there is a pressing need for reforms in Indian design law including broader recognition of digital infringements, clearer rules on AI authorship, stronger online enforcement mechanisms, and active participation in international frameworks. Without such measures, the law risks falling behind technological progress, leaving creators unprotected in an increasingly digital and globalized market. Ultimately, a balanced approach that protects designers while encouraging innovation will be crucial in ensuring that intellectual property law remains relevant in the era of 3D printing and AI.

References

1. Asarkar, K. (2022). Intellectual Property Issues in 3D Printing. International Journal of Law Management & Humanities, 5(2), 283–287. Retrieved from https://ijlmh.com/paper/intellectual-property-issues-in-3d-printing

2. Wang, J. (2022). Reconceptualizing the Interface of Copyright and Design Rights for 3D Printing. Journal of Intellectual Property Law & Practice, 17(12), 1011–1022. Retrieved from https://academic.oup.com/jiplp/article/17/12/1011/6855271

3. González, E., Werner, S., & Colon, H. (2023). AI and Intellectual Property Rights: Emerging Issues. Journal of International Commercial Law & Technology, 4(1). Retrieved from https://jiclt.com/article/ai-and-intellectual-property-rights-emerging-issues-19

4. World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO). (2024). Response to WIPO Consultation on Issue 11: Designs – Authorship and Ownership. Geneva: WIPO. Retrieved from https://www.wipo.int/about-ip/en/artificial_intelligence/call_for_comments/pdf/ind_wang.pdf

5. Çelik, M. E. (2021). 3D Printing, Artificially Intelligent Robots and Software Inventions: Is Technology Shaking the Reign of IP Law? Selçuk Law Review, 29(4), 3325–3348. Retrieved from https://dergipark.org.tr/en/pub/suhfd/issue/65757/1012862

6. Applied Sciences. (2023). Intellectual Property Challenges in the Age of 3D Printing: Navigating the Digital Copycat Dilemma, 14(23), 11448. Retrieved from https://www.mdpi.com/2076-3417/14/23/11448

7. Singh, R. G., & Yadav, K. (2023). Mindless Creation and Mechanical Genius: Rethinking IP Ownership in the Age of Artificial Intelligence. Indian Journal of Law, Society & Social Studies, 3(4), 76–88. Retrieved from https://ijlsss.com/mindless-creation-and-mechanical-genius-rethinking-ip-ownership-in-the-age-of-artificial-intelligence

8. Kumari, R. (2024). Intellectual Property Aspects of 3D Printing Technology. Legal Vidhiya. Retrieved from https://legalvidhiya.com/intellectual-property-aspects-of-3d-printing-technology

9. Baranowska, N. N. (2024). The Intersection of 3D Printing and Trademark Law. Journal of Intellectual Property, Information Technology & E-Commerce Law (JIPITEC). Retrieved from https://www.jipitec.eu/jipitec/article/view/231

10. Zhang, C. (2025). Chinese Court Denies Copyright Protection for AI-Generated Content with Insufficient Human Input. IAM Media. Retrieved from https://www.iam-media.com/article/chinese-court-denies-copyright-protection-ai-generated-content-insufficient-human-input-in-first-of-its-kind-ruling

11. Indian Journal of Law and Legal Research (IJLLR). (2025). Design Without Designers? The IP Battle Over AI-Generated Works. Retrieved from https://www.ijllr.com/post/design-without-designers-the-ip-battle-over-ai-generated-works

12. Nielsen, J. L., & Liddicoat, J. E. (2024). The Multiple Dimensions of Intellectual Property Infringement in the 3D Printing Era. Australian Intellectual Property Journal. Retrieved from https://www.repository.cam.ac.uk/items/d0af9d66-959b-41f7-8ba5-277d68702286

13. Zhong, H., Chang, J., Yang, Z., Wu, T., Mahawaga Arachchige, P., Pathmabandu, C., & Xue, M. (2023). Copyright Protection and Accountability of Generative AI: Attack, Watermarking and Attribution. arXiv preprint. Retrieved from https://arxiv.org/abs/2303.09272

14. Torrance, A. W., & Tomlinson, B. (2023). Training Is Everything: Artificial Intelligence, Copyright, and Fair Training. arXiv preprint. Retrieved from https://arxiv.org/abs/2305.03720

15. Ducru, P., Raiman, J., Lemos, R., Garner, C., He, G., Balcha, H., & Bottino, C. (2024). AI Royalties – An IP Framework to Compensate Artists & IP Holders for AI-Generated Content. arXiv preprint. Retrieved from https://arxiv.org/abs/2406.11857

16. Sugdhare, M. D., Chavan, V. E., Singh, D., & Ature, V. C. (2023). 3D Printing and Its Implications for Intellectual Property Law. International Journal of Emerging Technologies and Innovative Research, 3(11). Retrieved from https://iciset.in/Paper2601.pdf

17. The Contemporary Law Forum (TCLF). (2025). Strengthening IP Protection for

3D-Printed Designs in India. Retrieved from https://tclf.in/2025/09/10/strengthening-ip-protection-for-3d-printed-designs-in-india

18. HG Legal Resources. (2024). Intellectual Property Issues in 3D Printing. Retrieved from https://www.hg.org/legal-articles/intellectual-property-issues-in-3d-printing-34700

19. Liu, S., Shi, Z., Lyu, L., Jin, Y., Faltings, B. (2025). CopyJudge: Automated Copyright Infringement Identification and Mitigation in Text-to-Image Diffusion Models. arXiv preprint. Retrieved from https://arxiv.org/abs/2502.15278

20. Ye, X., Huang, H., An, J., & Wang, Y. (2023). DUAW: Data-Free Universal Adversarial Watermark against Stable Diffusion Customization. arXiv preprint. Retrieved from https://arxiv.org/abs/2308.09889