IJCRT.ORG ISSN : 2320-2882

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF CREATIVE RESEARCH THOUGHTS (IJCRT)

An International Open Access, Peer-reviewed, Refereed Journal

Intergenerational Equity and Inheritance of Intellectual Property Rights: A Socio-Legal Analysis

Ankita Bhatnagar and Prof. (Dr.) Babita Chugh

Research Scholar, Professor
Apex School of Law
Apex University, Jaipur, India

Abstract: Intellectual property rights (IPRs) have become valued inheritable assets that can create wealth and preserve cultural, scientific, and artistic legacies for future generations due to their increasing economic relevance. IPR inheritance, however, presents difficult socio-legal issues pertaining to striking a balance between private proprietary rights, public knowledge access, innovation, and the intergenerational justice principle. While intellectual property regimes are based on time-bound monopolies meant to promote invention while ultimately enriching the public domain, succession rules make it easier for proprietary rights to be transferred upon the death of the owner. This article critically investigates whether these conflicting goals are sufficiently balanced by the current legal framework governing the inheritance of copyrights, patents, trademarks, and associated intellectual property. In order to assess the consequences of inherited intellectual assets for future generations, the study examines the relationship between intellectual property law, succession law, constitutional values, and international legal principles using a socio-legal and comparative methodology. It also looks at new issues related to digital intellectual property, works created by AI, and changing business models that are influencing the ownership and transfer of intangible assets. The essay makes the case that in order to protect the legitimate interests of creators and their heirs while making sure that inherited intellectual property does not unnecessarily obstruct innovation, competition, or fair access to knowledge, a balanced legal framework is necessary. It ends by promoting legislative changes that include the idea of intergenerational equality into the management of intellectual property inheritance.

Index Terms - Intergenerational Equity; Intellectual Property Rights; Inheritance; Succession Law; Socio-Legal Analysis; Innovation.

I. Introduction

Intellectual Property Rights (IPRs) have emerged as one of the most valuable categories of intangible assets in the contemporary knowledge-based economy. Unlike conventional forms of property that derive value from their physical existence, intellectual property embodies the outcome of human creativity, innovation, scientific advancement, artistic expression, and technological development. Copyrights, patents, trademarks, industrial designs, geographical indications, plant variety protections, and trade secrets collectively constitute a legal framework that incentivises innovation by granting exclusive rights to creators for a limited duration. As intellectual property increasingly contributes to economic growth, commercial competitiveness, and national development, questions concerning its ownership, transfer, succession, and inheritance have assumed unprecedented legal and policy significance. The transformation of intellectual creations into commercially valuable assets has consequently expanded the discourse beyond traditional intellectual property law to include succession law, constitutional governance, commercial regulation, and principles of social justice.

The inheritance of intellectual property rights presents distinctive legal complexities that differentiate it from the succession of tangible property. While physical assets generally retain their value through possession and transfer, intellectual property rights exist as statutory monopolies that derive their enforceability from legal recognition rather than physical control. Their transfer upon the death of the owner requires the interaction of multiple branches of law, including intellectual property legislation, inheritance law, contract law, taxation, corporate governance, and international legal obligations. Moreover, different categories of intellectual property possess varying durations, conditions of transferability, licensing mechanisms, and commercial implications. Consequently, succession involving copyrights, patents, trademarks, and other intellectual assets raises intricate questions regarding ownership continuity, valuation, exploitation rights, licensing arrangements, and public access to knowledge.

The concept of intergenerational equity introduces an additional normative dimension to this legal discourse. Traditionally associated with environmental law and sustainable development, intergenerational equity embodies the principle that present generations hold resources, opportunities, and societal institutions in trust for future generations. The doctrine seeks to ensure that contemporary legal and economic decisions do not unfairly diminish the ability of future generations to enjoy equivalent opportunities for development, innovation, cultural participation, and economic prosperity. Although originally articulated in the context of environmental conservation, climate justice, and natural resource management, the principle has gradually expanded into several areas of governance, including constitutional law, economic regulation, public policy, and intellectual property. Within the intellectual property framework, intergenerational equity requires a careful balance between protecting creators and ensuring that intellectual monopolies do not unnecessarily restrict future innovation, scientific advancement, education, cultural dissemination, or equitable access to knowledge.

This balancing exercise has become increasingly significant in the digital economy. The commercial value of intellectual assets has expanded exponentially with the growth of software development, artificial intelligence, biotechnology, digital publishing, entertainment industries, online branding, and global technology enterprises. Intellectual property portfolios frequently constitute the most valuable assets owned by individuals and corporations, often exceeding the value of conventional immovable property. Consequently, the inheritance of intellectual property is no longer confined to literary manuscripts or artistic works but now encompasses software codes, patented pharmaceutical technologies, digital databases, online educational content, domain names, algorithms, trademarks with global commercial goodwill, and emerging forms of digital assets. The complexity of these assets requires legal systems to evolve beyond conventional succession doctrines and develop specialized regulatory mechanisms capable of addressing the distinctive characteristics of intangible property.

India has witnessed substantial development in its intellectual property regime over the past three decades. Legislative reforms, judicial interpretation, international treaty obligations, and economic liberalization have collectively strengthened the country's intellectual property framework. Statutes such as the Copyright Act, 1957, the Patents Act, 1970, the Trade Marks Act, 1999, the Designs Act, 2000, and the Geographical Indications of Goods (Registration and Protection) Act, 1999 recognize intellectual property as transferable property capable of assignment, licensing, transmission, and inheritance. Nevertheless, the legal treatment of succession remains fragmented across different enactments, with limited statutory guidance concerning valuation, administration, digital ownership, cross-border succession, and the inheritance of technologically evolving forms of intellectual property. This fragmented legislative approach often creates uncertainty for creators, legal heirs, commercial entities, and judicial authorities responsible for administering inherited intellectual assets.

International legal developments further complicate the regulatory landscape. Agreements administered by the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO), the Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS), the Berne Convention for the Protection of Literary and Artistic Works, the Paris Convention for the Protection of Industrial Property, and several regional instruments establish minimum standards for intellectual property protection while allowing domestic legal systems considerable discretion in regulating succession and inheritance. Consequently, jurisdictions have adopted diverse approaches regarding the transfer, licensing, taxation, duration, and posthumous management of intellectual property rights. Comparative legal analysis therefore becomes essential for identifying best practices capable of strengthening India's legal framework while remaining consistent with constitutional principles and international obligations.

The emergence of digital technologies has generated new legal questions that were largely absent from traditional succession law. Digital copyrights, software licenses, online content, social media accounts, cloud-based creative works, non-fungible tokens (NFTs), blockchain-authenticated assets, artificial intelligence-generated content, and virtual commercial platforms challenge conventional assumptions regarding ownership and inheritance. Many digital assets are governed not solely by statutory law but also by contractual licensing agreements imposed by online service providers, creating potential conflicts between contractual restrictions and succession rights. Similarly, the increasing involvement of artificial intelligence in creative and inventive processes raises unresolved questions concerning authorship, ownership, commercial exploitation, and inheritance of AI-assisted or AI-generated intellectual property. These technological developments demand continuous legislative adaptation capable of protecting innovation while preserving equitable access for future generations.

The socio-legal significance of intellectual property inheritance extends beyond private proprietary interests. Intellectual creations frequently embody cultural heritage, indigenous knowledge, scientific discoveries, educational resources, and technological innovations that contribute substantially to public welfare. Excessive concentration or indefinite control over inherited intellectual property may hinder competition, restrict access to knowledge, impede follow-on innovation, and undermine the public domain that intellectual property systems are ultimately designed to enrich. Conversely, inadequate protection of inherited intellectual property may discourage creativity, reduce investment in research and development, and weaken incentives for innovation. Effective legal governance therefore requires a carefully calibrated balance between individual proprietary rights and broader societal interests.

This paper adopts a doctrinal and socio-legal research methodology to critically examine the inheritance of intellectual property rights through the lens of intergenerational equity. It analyses the statutory framework governing copyrights, patents, trademarks, and related intellectual property under Indian law, while also examining constitutional principles, international legal instruments, comparative jurisprudence, and contemporary scholarly discourse. Particular attention is devoted to the evolving challenges posed by digital intellectual assets, artificial intelligence, cross-border succession, and emerging commercial practices. The study seeks to evaluate whether existing legal mechanisms adequately reconcile the competing objectives of protecting creators and their heirs, promoting innovation, preserving public access to knowledge, and ensuring fairness between present and future generations.

The principal objectives of this research are fourfold. First, it seeks to examine the conceptual relationship between intergenerational equity and intellectual property inheritance. Secondly, it analyses the legal framework governing the succession of intellectual property rights under Indian and international law. Thirdly, it critically evaluates emerging governance challenges associated with digital technologies, artificial intelligence, and transnational ownership of intellectual assets. Finally, it proposes legal and policy reforms aimed at establishing a balanced, sustainable, and future-oriented framework capable of safeguarding legitimate proprietary interests while simultaneously promoting innovation, competition, and equitable access to knowledge across successive generations.

II. CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK OF INTERGENERATIONAL EQUITY AND INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY RIGHTS

The principle of intergenerational equity is founded upon the ethical and legal proposition that each generation bears a responsibility to preserve and transmit valuable resources, opportunities, and institutional frameworks for the benefit of succeeding generations. Although the doctrine gained prominence through international environmental jurisprudence and the discourse on sustainable development, its normative foundations extend far beyond ecological conservation. It reflects a broader commitment to distributive justice, social responsibility, and sustainable governance by requiring that present legal and economic arrangements do not impose disproportionate burdens upon future generations. Within the domain of intellectual property, this principle assumes particular importance because intellectual creations simultaneously function as private economic assets and public resources contributing to scientific progress, cultural enrichment, technological innovation, and educational advancement.

Unlike tangible property, intellectual property embodies knowledge and creativity, resources that possess the unique characteristic of being capable of unlimited dissemination without physical depletion. The intellectual property system nevertheless grants temporary exclusive rights to creators in order to incentivise innovation, investment, and creative endeavour. This temporary exclusivity represents a carefully negotiated compromise between private proprietary interests and the long-term public objective of expanding the public domain. Consequently, inheritance of intellectual property introduces a significant jurisprudential question: whether the transmission of exclusive rights across generations continues to promote innovation or risks prolonging proprietary control in a manner inconsistent with the underlying objectives of intellectual property law.

The theoretical foundations of intergenerational equity have been extensively developed in international legal scholarship, particularly through the works of Edith Brown Weiss, who conceptualised the Earth and its resources as a trust held by the present generation for the benefit of future generations. Although originally formulated in the context of environmental governance, the doctrine has gained broader acceptance in fields such as constitutional law, public policy, cultural heritage protection, and intellectual property regulation. The principle emphasises that legal systems should neither exhaust valuable resources nor create institutional barriers that diminish the capacity of future generations to innovate, compete, participate in cultural development, or access accumulated human knowledge. When applied to intellectual property law, intergenerational equity requires lawmakers to ensure that exclusive proprietary rights remain consistent with the broader societal objective of encouraging continuous scientific and creative advancement rather than creating perpetual monopolistic control over knowledge-based assets.

The jurisprudential basis of intellectual property itself reflects this balancing philosophy. Intellectual property rights are neither natural rights nor perpetual proprietary entitlements; rather, they are statutory privileges conferred by the State to encourage creativity and innovation. Copyright protects literary, artistic, musical, dramatic, cinematographic, and software-related works for a limited statutory period, patents reward technological inventions by granting temporary exclusive exploitation rights, while trademarks protect commercial goodwill and consumer confidence through distinctive signs and identifiers. Each category of intellectual property operates within carefully defined statutory limits intended to balance private incentives with public interest. Consequently, inheritance of these rights must also be interpreted within the same legislative philosophy rather than being viewed solely through the lens of private succession law.

From a socio-legal perspective, intellectual property inheritance raises complex questions regarding ownership continuity, economic concentration, market competition, and equitable access to knowledge. Inherited intellectual assets often generate substantial royalty income, licensing revenue, technological advantages, and commercial goodwill long after the death of the original creator. Famous literary works, pharmaceutical patents, globally recognised trademarks, software platforms, entertainment franchises, and artistic creations frequently continue to produce significant economic returns for successive generations. While succession law appropriately protects the legitimate proprietary interests of legal heirs, prolonged commercial control over valuable intellectual assets may also delay their integration into the public domain, thereby affecting educational accessibility, technological diffusion, and follow-on innovation. The doctrine of intergenerational equity therefore requires legal systems to reconcile the private rights of successors with the collective interests of society and future innovators.

The constitutional dimensions of this debate are equally significant. Although the Constitution of India does not expressly recognize intellectual property as a fundamental right, constitutional guarantees under Articles 14, 19(1)(g), 21, and Article 300A collectively influence the legal regulation of intellectual property ownership and succession. Article 14 mandates equality before the law and prohibits arbitrary state action, requiring intellectual property legislation to maintain a rational balance between proprietary protection and public welfare. Article 19(1)(g) protects the freedom to practice any profession or carry on any occupation, trade, or business, thereby recognizing the commercial significance of intellectual creations. Article 21, through its expansive judicial interpretation, encompasses the right to dignity, education, and access to information in appropriate circumstances, while Article 300A protects property from deprivation except by authority of law. These constitutional principles collectively reinforce the necessity of designing inheritance rules that protect legitimate proprietary interests without undermining broader constitutional values relating to equality, innovation, and access to knowledge.

International legal instruments further strengthen the normative framework governing intellectual property inheritance. The Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS) establishes minimum standards for intellectual property protection while permitting member states to adopt measures necessary to promote public welfare and technological development. Similarly, the Berne Convention for the Protection of Literary and Artistic Works recognizes the transmissibility of copyright while preserving the temporary nature of exclusive rights. The Paris Convention, WIPO Copyright Treaty, WIPO Performances and Phonograms Treaty, and several regional agreements collectively contribute to the harmonization of intellectual property standards across jurisdictions. Nevertheless, these instruments largely leave questions concerning succession and inheritance to domestic legal systems, resulting in considerable variation in the regulation of inherited intellectual assets across different countries.

The emergence of the knowledge economy has substantially altered the practical significance of intellectual property inheritance. In contemporary commercial environments, intangible assets frequently constitute the primary source of corporate valuation and individual wealth. Technology companies, pharmaceutical enterprises, media organizations, educational institutions, and creative industries increasingly depend upon intellectual property portfolios rather than conventional physical assets. Consequently, succession planning has become an essential aspect of intellectual property management, requiring creators and business entities to develop sophisticated legal mechanisms governing testamentary disposition, licensing continuity, royalty administration, taxation, corporate restructuring, and cross-border ownership. These developments underscore the growing interaction between intellectual property law, corporate governance, succession planning, and international commercial regulation.

Moreover, intergenerational equity within intellectual property extends beyond purely economic considerations. Intellectual creations frequently embody cultural identity, traditional knowledge, indigenous heritage, scientific research, educational resources, and artistic expression that contribute significantly to national development and collective human progress. Excessive proprietary control over inherited intellectual assets may restrict public access to culturally significant works or impede scientific advancement through prolonged exclusivity. Conversely, inadequate protection of creators' rights may discourage investment in innovation and creative endeavor. A balanced legal framework must therefore recognize that intellectual property performs a dual function: it protects private proprietary interests while simultaneously serving broader societal objectives associated with education, technological advancement, cultural preservation, and economic development.

Accordingly, the principle of intergenerational equity provides an important analytical framework for evaluating the effectiveness of existing intellectual property inheritance laws. Rather than focusing exclusively upon proprietary succession, it encourages policymakers to consider the long-term consequences of inheritance rules upon innovation ecosystems, public knowledge, market competition, constitutional governance, and sustainable development. This broader perspective is particularly relevant in the twenty-first century, where rapid technological change, digital commerce, artificial intelligence, and globalized markets continuously reshape both the nature of intellectual property and the legal mechanisms governing its ownership and transmission.

III. LEGAL FRAMEWORK GOVERNING INHERITANCE OF INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY RIGHTS

The inheritance of intellectual property rights in India is governed through a combination of intellectual property statutes, succession laws, constitutional principles, contractual arrangements, and judicial interpretation. Unlike tangible property, which is primarily regulated through personal succession laws, intellectual property derives its existence from specialized statutory enactments that define the scope, duration, transferability, and enforceability of exclusive rights. Consequently, succession involving intellectual property requires harmonization between the statutory provisions creating proprietary rights and the legal principles governing inheritance upon the death of the owner. The absence of a single comprehensive legislative framework regulating intellectual property succession often necessitates reliance upon multiple legal instruments operating simultaneously.

The Copyright Act, 1957 provides one of the clearest statutory recognitions of inheritance within the Indian intellectual property framework. Copyright is expressly recognized as movable property capable of assignment, licensing, testamentary disposition, and devolution by operation of law. Upon the death of the author, economic rights ordinarily devolve upon the legal heirs or beneficiaries in accordance with the provisions of the Indian Succession Act, 1925 or applicable personal succession laws. These successors acquire the authority to exploit the copyrighted work commercially, grant licenses, assign rights, collect royalties, and institute infringement proceedings during the subsistence of copyright protection. At the same time, the Act preserves certain moral rights associated with authorship, reflecting the continuing personal connection between creators and their intellectual works even after economic rights are transferred.

The Patents Act, 1970 similarly recognizes patents as proprietary rights capable of assignment and transmission. Patent rights may be transferred inter vivos through contractual assignment or devolve upon legal representatives following the death of the patentee. Legal heirs are entitled to continue exploiting patented inventions, grant licenses, receive royalty payments, and enforce patent rights against infringers, subject to the statutory duration prescribed under the Act. However, the commercial value of inherited patents frequently depends upon continued technological relevance, regulatory approvals, licensing arrangements, and market competitiveness, thereby making succession of patent portfolios considerably more complex than succession of conventional property.

The Trade Marks Act, 1999 likewise facilitates the inheritance of trademarks together with the goodwill associated with commercial enterprises. Registered trademarks constitute valuable commercial assets capable of assignment, licensing, transmission, and succession. Since trademarks derive substantial value from consumer recognition and business reputation, their inheritance frequently occurs alongside the transfer of ongoing commercial undertakings, family businesses, or corporate entities. The continuity of trademark protection therefore depends not merely upon legal succession but also upon sustained commercial use, quality control, and preservation of the goodwill associated with the mark.

Other intellectual property statutes, including the Designs Act, 2000, the Geographical Indications of Goods (Registration and Protection) Act, 1999, and the Protection of Plant Varieties and Farmers' Rights Act, 2001, also contain provisions governing ownership and transfer, although the practical operation of inheritance differs according to the distinctive characteristics of each category of intellectual property. Collectively, these enactments demonstrate that Indian intellectual property law recognizes intangible creations as transferable proprietary interests capable of forming part of a deceased person's estate.

However, statutory recognition alone does not eliminate practical complexities associated with succession. Questions relating to valuation of intellectual assets, administration of royalty income, continuation of licensing agreements, taxation of inherited intellectual property, cross-border ownership disputes, jointly created works, and digital asset succession frequently remain unresolved or inadequately addressed under existing legislation. Consequently, courts are often required to reconcile specialized intellectual property statutes with general principles of succession law and commercial jurisprudence.

The Indian Succession Act, 1925 plays an important supplementary role by providing procedural mechanisms governing testamentary succession, probate, administration of estates, and the appointment of legal representatives. Where intellectual property rights form part of a deceased person's estate, these procedural provisions facilitate lawful transmission of proprietary interests to beneficiaries while ensuring orderly administration of the estate. Nevertheless, because personal succession laws applicable to Hindus, Muslims, Christians, Parsis, and other communities continue to operate alongside the Indian Succession Act in specified circumstances, inheritance of intellectual property may vary depending upon the personal law governing the deceased individual.

International legal obligations further influence the domestic legal framework. Although agreements administered by WIPO and the TRIPS Agreement do not prescribe uniform succession rules, they require participating States to maintain effective systems for recognizing and protecting intellectual property ownership. This international framework encourages legal certainty regarding transferability and succession while leaving domestic legislatures sufficient flexibility to regulate inheritance in accordance with constitutional principles and national policy objectives.

The existing legal framework therefore provides a substantial foundation for recognizing intellectual property inheritance but remains fragmented in its practical implementation. As intellectual assets become increasingly valuable within digital economies, there is a growing need for comprehensive legislative clarification concerning succession planning, digital ownership, artificial intelligence-generated works, cross-border administration, and institutional mechanisms capable of facilitating efficient transfer of intellectual property across generations.

IV. COMPARATIVE SOCIO-LEGAL ANALYSIS OF COPYRIGHT, PATENTS, TRADEMARKS AND OTHER INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY RIGHTS

Although all forms of intellectual property are recognised as proprietary rights capable of transmission, inheritance operates differently depending upon the nature, purpose, duration, and commercial characteristics of each category of intellectual property. A comparative socio-legal analysis demonstrates that the legal consequences of succession extend beyond mere transfer of ownership and significantly influence innovation, market competition, cultural preservation, and public access to knowledge. Consequently, succession law must recognise these distinctions while maintaining consistency with the broader objectives of intellectual property jurisprudence.

Copyright represents one of the most frequently inherited forms of intellectual property. Literary works, artistic creations, cinematographic films, musical compositions, software programs, architectural designs, and educational materials often continue to generate commercial returns long after the death of their authors. Legal heirs inherit the economic rights associated with reproduction, publication, communication to the public, adaptation, translation, licensing, and royalty collection during the statutory term of protection. However, copyright inheritance also carries broader societal implications because excessive commercial control over culturally significant works may delay their incorporation into the public domain, thereby limiting educational dissemination, research, and creative adaptation. The statutory limitation on copyright duration therefore reflects the legislative objective of balancing private proprietary interests with society's long-term interest in unrestricted access to cultural and intellectual resources.

Patent succession presents a distinctly different legal and commercial framework. Unlike copyright, patents protect technological inventions that often require continuous investment, regulatory compliance, commercial licensing, manufacturing infrastructure, and research-based development. The economic value of inherited patents depends not only upon legal ownership but also upon their continuing technological relevance and commercial viability. Patent holders and their successors must frequently engage in licensing negotiations, collaborative research arrangements, and strategic commercial planning to preserve the value of inherited inventions. Consequently, patent inheritance requires specialised administrative and commercial expertise in addition to traditional succession planning.

Trademark inheritance introduces yet another dimension to intellectual property succession because trademarks primarily represent commercial goodwill and consumer confidence rather than creative expression or technological innovation. The value of a trademark depends upon consistent commercial use, quality assurance, brand recognition, and business reputation. In many instances, trademarks are inherited together with family-owned enterprises or corporate businesses, making succession closely intertwined with business continuity and corporate governance. Failure to maintain commercial use or preserve consumer confidence may substantially diminish the value of inherited trademarks despite formal legal ownership.

Industrial designs, geographical indications, plant variety protections, semiconductor layout designs, and trade secrets similarly possess distinctive legal characteristics affecting inheritance. While registered designs and plant variety rights may be transmitted through succession, their commercial value frequently depends upon industrial application, market demand, and technological relevance. Geographical indications differ fundamentally because they protect collective regional interests rather than individual proprietary claims and therefore follow a different legal framework governing ownership and transmission. Trade secrets present additional complexity since their commercial value depends upon continued confidentiality; inheritance must therefore ensure that secrecy obligations are preserved while enabling lawful succession.

A comparative examination of international legal systems demonstrates varying approaches towards intellectual property inheritance. The United Kingdom generally recognises intellectual property as personal property capable of testamentary and intestate succession, subject to the specific statutory provisions governing each category of intellectual property. The United States similarly permits inheritance of copyrights, patents, and trademarks while placing considerable emphasis upon contractual licensing arrangements and estate planning mechanisms. Several European jurisdictions have adopted integrated succession frameworks that facilitate efficient administration of inherited intellectual assets through specialised legal procedures. These comparative approaches illustrate the importance of harmonising intellectual property legislation with modern succession practices while preserving flexibility for technological developments and commercial innovation.

From a socio-legal perspective, intellectual property inheritance influences not only private wealth distribution but also broader questions of economic inequality, innovation ecosystems, access to education, technological advancement, and cultural preservation. Concentration of valuable intellectual assets within a limited number of families or corporations may affect market competition and restrict opportunities for emerging innovators. Conversely, inadequate protection of inherited intellectual property may discourage long-term investment in research, creativity, and technological development. Sustainable governance therefore requires legal frameworks capable of balancing proprietary protection with broader constitutional and public policy objectives.

Comparative Overview of Inheritance across Major Intellectual Property Rights

Type of Intellectual Property	Nature of Right	Inheritance Position	Major Legal Concern
Copyright	Literary, artistic and creative works	Freely inheritable during statutory term	Balancing creators' rights with expansion of the public domain
Patent	Technological invention	Transferable through succession	Commercial exploitation and technological relevance
Trademark	Commercial identity and goodwill	Inherited along with business goodwill	Business continuity and preservation of consumer confidence
Industrial Design	Visual appearance of products	Transferable property	Commercial marketability
Plant Variety Rights	Protection of new plant varieties	Inheritable subject to statutory provisions	Agricultural innovation
Trade Secrets	Confidential commercial information	Practically inheritable through contractual mechanisms	Maintaining confidentiality after succession

V. Emerging Challenges: Digital Intellectual Property, Artificial Intelligence and Cross-Border Succession

Technological transformation has fundamentally altered both the nature of intellectual property and the legal challenges associated with its inheritance. The digital economy has generated entirely new categories of intellectual assets that were largely unknown when most intellectual property statutes were enacted. Software applications, cloud-based databases, digital publications, online educational platforms, mobile applications, blockchain-authenticated assets, non-fungible tokens (NFTs), virtual commercial platforms, digital entertainment content, and algorithm-based technologies now constitute significant components of modern intellectual property portfolios. These developments have exposed important gaps within traditional succession law, which was originally designed to regulate tangible property rather than technologically complex intangible assets.

One of the most pressing contemporary issues concerns the inheritance of digital intellectual assets governed by contractual licensing arrangements. Many online platforms provide users with limited licences rather than transferable ownership rights, creating uncertainty regarding whether legal heirs may lawfully access, manage, or commercially exploit such assets following the death of the creator. Cloud storage services, software licences, digital publishing platforms, streaming services, and online marketplaces frequently impose contractual restrictions that may conflict with ordinary principles of succession. Resolving these conflicts requires legislative clarification capable of harmonising contractual autonomy with established principles governing inheritance and proprietary rights.

Artificial intelligence introduces an even more complex dimension to intellectual property succession. AI-assisted and AI-generated works challenge traditional legal assumptions concerning authorship, inventorship, originality, ownership, and commercial exploitation. As artificial intelligence increasingly participates in scientific research, literary creation, artistic production, software development, pharmaceutical innovation, and industrial design, legal systems must determine whether such outputs qualify for intellectual property protection and, if so, who possesses inheritable proprietary rights. The absence of internationally harmonised legal standards has generated considerable uncertainty regarding the succession of AI-generated intellectual assets and the proprietary interests of creators, developers, investors, and future legal heirs.

Cross-border ownership further complicates intellectual property inheritance within an increasingly globalised economy. Intellectual property portfolios frequently extend across multiple jurisdictions through international registrations, licensing agreements, franchising arrangements, multinational corporations, and cross-border commercial transactions. Consequently, succession disputes may involve conflicting domestic laws concerning probate, taxation, applicable jurisdiction, recognition of foreign judgments, and enforcement of intellectual property rights. Differences between national succession laws often increase litigation costs, delay estate administration, and create uncertainty for legal heirs seeking to manage inherited intellectual assets across international markets.

Digital commerce has also increased the economic significance of personal branding, influencer-generated content, domain names, online businesses, virtual identities, and monetised digital platforms. These assets frequently derive value from a combination of copyright, trademark, contractual rights, goodwill, and personal reputation, making their legal classification particularly challenging. Existing succession laws provide limited guidance regarding the inheritance of such hybrid digital assets, highlighting the urgent need for legislative modernisation.

These emerging developments demonstrate that conventional succession doctrines cannot adequately regulate the evolving landscape of intellectual property ownership. Future legal reforms must therefore adopt technologically neutral principles capable of accommodating continuous innovation while maintaining legal certainty, commercial predictability, and equitable protection for both creators and future generations.

VI. Policy Gaps and Governance Challenges

Despite the considerable progress achieved in strengthening India's intellectual property framework, significant policy and governance challenges continue to affect the effective inheritance and administration of intellectual property rights. One of the principal concerns is the absence of a comprehensive legislative framework specifically addressing succession of intellectual assets. Existing statutes recognise transferability but provide only limited guidance regarding valuation methodologies, digital ownership, royalty administration, licensing continuity, taxation, and dispute resolution following the death of the proprietor. This fragmented legal structure frequently generates uncertainty for creators, legal heirs, commercial entities, and judicial authorities.

Another important challenge concerns the valuation of inherited intellectual property. Unlike tangible assets whose market value may be readily ascertainable, intellectual property often derives its worth from projected future earnings, licensing potential, technological utility, commercial goodwill, market recognition, and innovation capacity. Absence of standardised valuation mechanisms frequently results in inconsistent estate administration, taxation disputes, and commercial uncertainty. Development of specialised valuation guidelines would significantly improve transparency and facilitate more efficient succession planning.

Institutional capacity also remains an area requiring substantial improvement. Judges, legal practitioners, tax authorities, intellectual property offices, estate administrators, and commercial professionals increasingly encounter technologically sophisticated intellectual assets requiring specialised expertise. Continuous professional training, interdisciplinary collaboration, and technological capacity-building are therefore essential for ensuring consistent and informed decision-making. Strengthening institutional competence would also reduce litigation, improve administrative efficiency, and enhance public confidence in intellectual property governance.

The regulatory treatment of digital assets and artificial intelligence remains comparatively underdeveloped. Existing legislation was enacted before the emergence of many contemporary technologies and therefore provides limited guidance regarding ownership, transferability, succession, and commercial exploitation of digitally created or AI-assisted intellectual property. Legislative modernisation should therefore prioritise technology-neutral drafting capable of accommodating future innovations without requiring repeated statutory amendments.

Furthermore, limited public awareness regarding succession planning for intellectual property significantly contributes to avoidable legal disputes. Many creators, entrepreneurs, researchers, artists, and innovators fail to incorporate intellectual assets into testamentary planning despite their substantial economic value. Government agencies, educational institutions, bar associations, and intellectual property offices should therefore promote greater awareness regarding estate planning, licensing management, and inheritance of intellectual property rights.

VII. Recommendations for Sustainable Intellectual Property Governance

The growing economic and social significance of intellectual property necessitates a comprehensive governance framework capable of integrating intellectual property law with succession law, constitutional principles, commercial regulation, and technological innovation. Legislative reforms should provide greater clarity regarding inheritance of digital assets, artificial intelligence-generated works, cross-border intellectual property portfolios, valuation methodologies, and administration of royalty-based estates. Such reforms would reduce legal uncertainty while strengthening investor confidence and facilitating efficient intergenerational transfer of intellectual assets.

Institutional capacity-building should accompany legislative reform. Specialised training programmes for judges, intellectual property practitioners, estate administrators, tax authorities, and commercial professionals would significantly improve consistency in the interpretation and administration of inherited intellectual property. Development of specialised guidelines governing valuation, licensing continuity, and digital succession would further enhance administrative efficiency and reduce unnecessary litigation.

India should also strengthen international cooperation relating to cross-border succession of intellectual property through greater engagement with WIPO initiatives, bilateral agreements, and comparative legal research. Harmonisation of procedural standards would facilitate recognition and enforcement of inherited intellectual property rights across jurisdictions while promoting international commercial certainty.

Equally important is the incorporation of intergenerational equity as an explicit policy consideration within future intellectual property reforms. Intellectual property legislation should continue encouraging creativity and investment while ensuring that inherited proprietary rights do not unnecessarily impede competition, technological progress, educational access, or expansion of the public domain. Periodic legislative review, empirical research, stakeholder consultation, and evidence-based policymaking should therefore remain integral components of sustainable intellectual property governance.

VIII. Conclusion

The inheritance of intellectual property rights occupies an increasingly important position within contemporary legal systems as knowledge, innovation, and creativity become central drivers of economic growth and social development. The interaction between intellectual property law and succession law extends beyond private proprietary interests to encompass broader constitutional values relating to innovation, equality, cultural preservation, technological advancement, and access to knowledge. Consequently, the principle of intergenerational equity provides a valuable normative framework for evaluating whether existing legal mechanisms appropriately balance the interests of creators, legal heirs, future innovators, and society as a whole.

The present analysis demonstrates that Indian law recognises intellectual property as inheritable property capable of succession through statutory and personal law mechanisms. Nevertheless, significant challenges remain regarding digital intellectual assets, artificial intelligence-generated works, cross-border ownership, valuation methodologies, licensing continuity, and institutional coordination. The rapid evolution of technology has outpaced many traditional legal doctrines, creating uncertainty that requires comprehensive legislative and administrative responses.

Sustainable governance therefore framework integrating legislative clarity, institutional capacity-building, technological adaptability, international cooperation, and constitutional principles. Such a framework should protect the legitimate interests of creators and their successors while simultaneously ensuring that inherited intellectual property continues to promote innovation, competition, cultural enrichment, scientific progress, and equitable access to knowledge for present and future generations. In this manner, the principle of intergenerational equity can serve not merely as an ethical aspiration but as a practical foundation for developing a resilient, balanced, and future-oriented system of intellectual property governance.

REFERENCES

1. The Constitution of India.
2. The Copyright Act, 1957.
3. The Patents Act, 1970.
4. The Trade Marks Act, 1999.
5. The Designs Act, 2000.
6. The Geographical Indications of Goods (Registration and Protection) Act, 1999.
7. The Protection of Plant Varieties and Farmers' Rights Act, 2001.
8. The Indian Succession Act, 1925.
9. Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS), 1994.
10. Berne Convention for the Protection of Literary and Artistic Works.
11. Paris Convention for the Protection of Industrial Property.
12. WIPO Copyright Treaty, 1996.
13. WIPO Performances and Phonograms Treaty, 1996.
14. Edith Brown Weiss, In Fairness to Future Generations: International Law, Common Patrimony, and Intergenerational Equity.