

ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE IN CREATIVE WORK: THE FUTURE AND THE CHALLENGE OF COPYRIGHT IN MALAYSIA

*Lew Chooi Ling**

Abstract

Artificial Intelligence (AI) is a programme trained to perform some advanced functions based on instructions. As AI usage is rapidly developing day by day, AI can be seen as a contributor to the creation process nowadays. The function of AI in creation causes the authorship of content to be blurred. Therefore, AI involvement in the creation process brings challenges and issues, such as copyright infringement. Content generated by AI challenges the existing legal framework of copyright, raising issues of authorship and sparking controversy over ownership of such content. This paper discusses the challenges faced by the existing legal framework in handling issues related to AI-generated content. It also aims to propose recommendations to improve existing law to ensure that a more balanced approach is taken in handling issues related to AI and copyright, and to facilitate coexistence between technological advancement and legal integrity in the creative domain.

Introduction

AI is a familiar program nowadays and is always used in any field. The function of the AI includes generating a picture based on the instructions from the user. It led to the role of AI in contributing to the creation nowadays, and AI can be seen as a platform to provide ideas that humans may not have. Undeniably, there are advantages when AI is involved in creative work in any form, such as movies, images, and videos, etc. However, it also brings several issues at the same time.

It raises a challenge within the legal framework related to copyright. Before AI launched, the legal framework was designed to regulate the creative work created by humans.

* LLB (Honours) candidate, Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia (UKM).

The current legal framework cannot play the regulatory role in handling issues related to copyright and intellectual property (IP). The disputes over the authorship of creative works can lead to controversy. In the case of *Thaler v Perlmutter*,¹ the court held that a human is the only party allowed to grant authorship as humans have legal capacity to own property, but machines cannot. Other than that, as AI involvement in creative work is unavoidable in the present and future, some recommendations can improve the current legal framework, aiming to facilitate coexistence between the advancement of AI and humans in content creation and achieve a balance.

Governing Laws and Cases of Copyright

The primary authority regulating copyright under Malaysian jurisdiction is the Copyright Act 1987 (Act 332). In addition to the Act, the other legislations that form part of Malaysia's intellectual property law include the Patent Act 1983 (Act 291), the Industrial Design Act 1996 (Act 552), and the Trademark Act 2019 (Act 815). The Intellectual Property Corporation of Malaysia (MyIPO) plays the role of administering and enforcing these laws in Malaysia.²

In the United States of America (USA), copyright is governed by the U.S. Copyright Law (Title 17, U.S. Code). Similar to Malaysia, intellectual property in the USA encompasses both copyright and patents. The United States Constitution included an intellectual property clause under **Article I, Section 8, Clause 8**, where the Congress is given the power to enact the law to govern matters of copyright and patents³.

In the context of the European Union (EU). EU copyright law⁴ is formed by 13 directives and 2 regulations. It aims to harmonise the standard and guarantee protection to the owner. It includes the European Union Copyright Directive (Directive 2019/790). On 12 July 2024, the EU launched the Artificial Intelligence Act (AI Act), which serves as a guideline to AI-related matters, including copyright issues. In the United Kingdom (UK), the **UK Copyright, Designs, and Patents Act 1988** is the main law that regulates copyright. In addition to the legislation, several cases illustrate the issues arising from AI-related

¹ 687 F. Supp. 3d 140 (D.D.C. 2023).

² Malaysian Investment Development Authority, 'Safeguard Your Intellectual Property Rights In Malaysia' (2024) p. 85 <https://www.mida.gov.my/wp-content/uploads/2024/01/ENG-MIDA_Policy-Booklet_MK-2022_Updated_11_01_Chapter-7.pdf> accessed 16 July 2025.

³ Craig Joyce, 'Intellectual Property: United States Law' (2009) Oxford International Encyclopedia of Legal History 2 <<https://ssrn.com/abstract=3657606>> accessed 16 July 2025.

⁴ Andres Guadamuz, 'The EU's Artificial Intelligence Act and copyright' (2025) Journal of World Intellectual Property 213 <<https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1111/jwip.12330>> accessed 16 July 2025.

copyright concerns. For example, in the case of *Andersen v Stability AI*,⁵ various artists sued the company for using their images to train its AI system, claiming that it constitutes copyright infringement.⁶ The United States District Court, Northern District of California, held that the AI model can contribute to copyright infringement even if the output is identical, and the extent to which to protect copyright includes training the AI by using data without permission. Similarly, in the case of *Kadrey v Meta*⁷, the same court held that the copyrighted work used to train the AI system without permission is not under the fair use concept. The Federal Court in San Francisco on 1 May 2025 made this case a test of fair use. Meanwhile, although the case of *Ziff Davis v OpenAI*⁸ is still pending in proceedings and has been filed in the Delaware Federal Court, the issue brought by this case also involves a copyright dispute. These cases illustrate the challenges and issues that arise because of the AI involvement in copyright, and it is not the end.

The cases related to intellectual property and AI can be seen in the case of *Getty Images (US) Inc. & Ors. v Stability AI Ltd.*⁹ The plaintiff, who is a global visual content provider of the case, claimed that the defendant used their material to train the AI system without consent, and the action led to copyright infringement, as the output of the defendant's Stability AI contained a watermark from the plaintiff's company. In Malaysia, in the case of *Creative Purpose Sdn Bhd & Anor v Integrated Trans Corp Sdn Bhd & Ors*,¹⁰ the court held that if a 'qualified person' as an 'author' includes a body corporate, it would be correct to read the word 'author' to include both natural person and body corporate in any other provision of the Copyright Act 1987.

From various acts and case laws, it shows that the existence of AI has led to issues that would never have happened in copyright matters previously. This has alarmed stakeholders, alerting them to these emerging issues, and their potential consequences, and how they affect the current legal framework. Consequently, there have been calls for reform of the related law to ensure that these issues are regulated and that protection is provided to the parties involved.

⁵ [2023] Inc. (3:23-cv-00201).

⁶ Lindberg, Matthew, 'Applying Current Copyright Law to Artificial Intelligence Image Generators in the Context of Anderson v. Stability AI, Ltd.' (2024) 15(1) *Cybaris*® 37 <<https://open.mitchellhamline.edu/cybaris/vol15/iss1/3>> accessed 20 July 2025.

⁷ [2023] Inc. (3:23-cv-03417).

⁸ [2025] Case 1:25-cv-00501-UNA.

⁹ [2025] EWHC 38 (Ch).

¹⁰ [1997] 2 MLJ 429.

Challenges of the Existing Legal Framework of Copyright

The involvement of AI in copyright presents challenges within the existing legal framework. As the role of AI in creating works is unavoidable and becomes increasingly important in the future, the issues arising from this development will be a challenge. The authorship and ownership of AI-generated content are uncertain¹¹. The definition of “author” in the law is always defined as a person who creates the work, and some laws protect the rights of such authors. The Malaysian **Copyright Act 1987 (Act 332)** has provided the following definition under Section 3:

“*author*”—

- (a) *in relation to literary works, means the writer or the maker of the works;*
- (b) *in relation to musical works, means the composer;*
- (c) *in relation to artistic works other than photographs, means the artist;*
- (d) *in relation to photographs, means the person by whom the arrangements for the taking of the photograph were undertaken;*
- (e) *in relation to films or sound recordings, means the person by whom the arrangements for the making of the film or recording were undertaken;*
- (f) *in relation to broadcasts transmitted from within any country, means—*
 - (i) *the person transmitting the programme, if he has responsibility for the selection of its contents; or*
 - (ii) *any person providing the programme who makes with the person transmitting it the arrangements necessary for its transmission;*
- (g) *in relation to any other cases, means the person by whom the work was made;*

In the case of ***Creative Purpose Sdn Bhd & Anor v Integrated Trans Corp Sdn Bhd & Ors***,¹² the court held that a “qualified person” as an “author” includes a body corporate and a natural person. Based on the statutory and judicial definitions, Malaysian law recognises only natural persons and bodies corporate to have the authorship and other than that is not allowed,

¹¹ Irene Xin Hui Ling, Chuin-Loong Tan and Eng Siang Tay, ‘AI-Generated Contents: Blurring the Lines of Copyright Ownership’ (2024) 22(2) Pakistan Journal of Life and Social Sciences 15120 <<https://doi.org/10.57239/PJLSS-2024-22.2.001089>> accessed 16 July 2025.

¹² [1997] 2 MLJ 429.

including a machine. It also means that creative work involving AI is not qualified to receive protection from the law.

A similar position is provided in Section 9(1) of the UK Copyright, Designs, and Patents Act 1988, which defines an author as a person who creates the work. The similarities of these definitions show that the human is the foundation of ownership, and it does not include work involving non-human elements. It will raise the concern that creative work involving a partial or full AI in the creation process may not receive protection under the law. Other than this, the authorship will be hard to determine, as the author or the owner of the work involved may not be fully human. The work produced by AI also raises confusion among the three parties: the programmer, the user, and the owner of the training data. If the work is given copyright or intellectual property rights¹³, confusion arises as to who should hold ownership or authorship rights. One of the criteria to receive protection under copyright law is originality. The definition of “original” is provided in the case of *University of London v. University Tutorial Press Limited*,¹⁴ where Peterson J stated that:

“...But the Act [Copyright Act 1911] does not require that the expression be in an original or novel form, but that the work must not be copied from another work – that it should originate from the author....”

This judgement provides the meaning of "original" in copyright, but this is unable to apply to the creative work that involves AI in the creation process, as authorship of the content is difficult to identify.

Other than that, the challenge arises when the resources used to train the AI system cause copyright infringement. As in the cases mentioned earlier, such as *Andersen v Stability AI*¹⁵ and *Getty Images (US) Inc. & Ors. v Stability AI Ltd*,¹⁶ the authors of the resources sued the AI companies for using their works without permission, and they rely on a large database to train their AI systems.¹⁷ This issue not only threatens the rights of the authors or the owners of the intellectual property. This confuses the customers when AI-generated works resemble the original creations. Consequently, such situations would lead to an increase in infringement

¹³ Mazzi, F., ‘Authorship in artificial intelligence-generated works: Exploring originality in text prompts and artificial intelligence outputs through philosophical foundations of copyright and collage protection’ (2024) *Journal of World Intellectual Property* 410-427.

¹⁴ [1916] 2 Ch 601.

¹⁵ [2023] Inc. (3:23-cv-00201).

¹⁶ [2025] EWHC 38 (Ch).

¹⁷ Karen Reynolds and Naiose Cosgrove, ‘AI and Intellectual Property Rights – Cases To Watch in 2025’ (*Matheson*, 27 Mar 2025) <<https://www.matheson.com/insights/detail/ai-and-intellectual-property-rights---cases-to-watch-in-2025>> accessed 20 July 2025.

cases, and even extend to patents and other intellectual property despite currently only involve images, audio, and video content.

As AI-generated content is a relatively new phenomenon, the current legal framework is unable to provide a comprehensive regulation as the definition only regulates the creative work from human and legal bodies that can own property. The AI-generated content lacks clear regulation, and it will bring economic implications. When clear regulation is not provided, investors from other countries will be less confident about investing in a related field in the country, as it brings uncertainty and a lack of legal protection to the investor.¹⁸ The legal ambiguity is the main challenge facing copyright and intellectual property.

Lastly, ethical and economic implications must be considered.¹⁹ AI shows opportunities to lower the barriers to entry for people who want to be involved in businesses related to this field²⁰. However, when AI-generated content is involved in the creative work market, it will lead to investors and stakeholders being willing to invest more resources in AI companies instead of the creative work market.²¹ The creativity of humans will not be appreciated, as society can access the free and unlimited creative work from AI systems²² and easily generate creative work based on what they want. In the aspect of economic impact, the usage of AI will lead to job displacement, as AI can replace certain jobs in the creative industry,²³ such as artists, proofreaders, and proofreading-related jobs.

In summary, the challenges in the existing law will not only affect the creative work industry and raise legal issues related to copyright and intellectual property, but also affect consumer rights and cause economic implications to the industry and the country.

Recommendations to Improve the Existing Law of Malaysia

¹⁸ 'Artificial Intelligence and Copyright' (WIPO, 1 October 2017) <<https://www.wipo.int/web/wipo-magazine/articles/artificial-intelligence-and-copyright-40141>> accessed 29 August 2025.

¹⁹ Kristofer Erickson, 'AI and work in the creative industries: digital continuity or discontinuity?' (2024) *Creative Industries Journal* p. 2 <<https://doi.org/10.1080/17510694.2024.2421135>> accessed 16 July 2025.

²⁰ Dan Valeriu Voinea, 'AI and Copyright - Who Owns AI Generated Content?' (2023) *10(1) Social Sciences And Education Research Review* p. 265 <<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.15252004>> accessed 16 July 2025.

²¹ James Hutson and Peter Cotroneo, 'Generative AI tools in art education: Exploring prompt engineering and iterative processes for enhanced creativity' (2023) *4(1) Metaverse* <<https://digitalcommons.lindenwood.edu/faculty-research-papers/477/>> accessed 16 July 2025.

²² 'Artificial Intelligence and Copyright' (WIPO, 1 October 2017) <<https://www.wipo.int/web/wipo-magazine/articles/artificial-intelligence-and-copyright-40141>> accessed 29 August 2025.

²³ Kristofer Erickson, 'AI and work in the creative industries: digital continuity or discontinuity?' (2024) *Creative Industries Journal* p. 2 <<https://doi.org/10.1080/17510694.2024.2421135>> accessed 16 July 2025.

The involvement of AI in work creation is becoming the norm in our society, and it is unavoidable in the upcoming days. As AI can play a co-author role in the creation of any work, there are some recommendations to improve the current law to ensure proper protection of copyright and intellectual property.

The introduction of authorities related to AI-generated content seems to be a need to reform the existing law. The European Union (EU) launched the EU AI Act, and this is the first regulation related to AI. Although this act's primary objective is to regulate AI usage, it can be seen as a foundation for making the related law or improving the existing law. In Article 3(63) of the AI Act, the model that can generate content such as pictures will fall under this article, and the definition is as below.²⁴

“...an AI model, including where such an AI model is trained with a large amount of data using self-supervision at scale, that displays significant generality and is capable of competently performing a wide range of distinct tasks regardless of the way the model is placed on the market and that can be integrated into a variety of downstream systems or applications.”

Article 53 of the AI Act imposes obligations on general-purpose AI providers to identify and comply with the reservation of rights in the DSM Directive and to make a detailed summary about the content used for training.²⁵ The clause or section related to AI as stated in the AI Act can be inserted in certain provisions, such as the authorship of a creative work made by AI fully or practically or the process of registering a copyright of an AI work. These regulations provide guidelines to the parties involved, such as investors, artists, and consumers, to guarantee their rights. They prevent certain parties from misusing AI to conduct illegal actions such as copyright infringement, falsifying information, and so forth.

Other than this, the definitions of “AI-assisted” and “AI-generated”²⁶ content and creative work should be introduced. As creative processes increasingly involve AI, there is a need to have an “AI-assisted” or “AI-generated” label on every piece of content and creative work to avoid confusion in society. Generally, AI-assisted content is defined as content created with assistance from both AI and human involvement, while AI-generated works refer to the

²⁴ Andres Guadamuz, ‘The EU's Artificial Intelligence Act and copyright’ (2025) *Journal of World Intellectual Property* 213 <<https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1111/jwip.12330>> accessed 16 July 2025.

²⁵ Magdalena Serafin, ‘The EU AI Act and copyrights compliance’ (*iapp*, 30 April 2025) <<https://iapp.org/news/a/the-eu-ai-act-and-copyrights-compliance>> accessed 30 August 2025.

²⁶ World Intellectual Property Organization, ‘AI Inventions’ (2023) p. 3-4, <<https://www.wipo.int/edocs/pubdocs/en/wipo-pub-rn2023-11-en-ai-inventions.pdf>> accessed 30 August 2025.

full process of creating the work that AI entirely handles.²⁷ The definitions of “AI-assisted” and “AI-generated” can help shape the specific laws governing content in these two categories. Then, these definitions are able to identify the authorship of the creative work and resolve issues such as copyright.

Strengthening protection for consumers and creators is seen as a necessary step, and this objective can be achieved by developing AI transparency and disclosure requirements. The acknowledgement form is used in academic writing and applies in copyright-related matters.²⁸ The owner of the content work is required to fill out and submit the documents that contain information such as the usage of AI, the percentage of AI involvement, and a declaration form to the authorities that handle copyright matters, such as the Intellectual Property Corporation of Malaysia (MyIPO) in Malaysia. As a result, the consumers will acknowledge that the creative work is not fully created by humans and contains elements from AI. At the same time, the creators can make sure that the creative work they refer to in the process of creation and its creation can avoid the occurrence of copyright and intellectual property infringement. One of the examples of transparency and disclosure of AI is having a watermark on the copyright and intellectual property. It can provide information to the consumer, and at the same time, this would not cause any issues of infringement. In this issue, it may require certain amendments in the Consumer Protection Act to align with the current development of AI, such as being informed about the information of the creative work.²⁹

Finally, the introduction of Ethical AI Guidelines for the creation of content can be recommended as an improvement of the existing law of Malaysia. AI will play a role in creative work, especially in intellectual property, and it may lead to the devaluation of human creativity and potential copyright disputes. The guideline can play a role in ensuring that the balance between the usage of AI and the creativity of humans is appreciated. The guidelines exist to be able to help the artist or content creator know the limitations of using AI. As the copyright faces legal ambiguity, the elements suggested to include guidelines such as transparency, fairness, accountability, privacy and consent, auditability, and inclusivity.³⁰ The guidelines can

²⁷ Yohanna, Folmi and Sikkam Ibrahim, ‘The Impact of Artificial Intelligence on Creativity, Innovation and Intellectual Property Rights in Nigeria’ (2024) 4(2) IJSU <rchcommons.org/ijsu/vol4/iss2/6> accessed 16 July 2025.

²⁸ ‘Acknowledging the use of generative artificial intelligence’ (*Monash University*) <<https://www.monash.edu/student-academic-success/build-digital-capabilities/create-online/acknowledging-the-use-of-generative-artificial-intelligence>> accessed 30 August 2025.

²⁹ Karen Foong, ‘National Guidelines on Artificial Intelligence Governance and Ethics: Key Principles’ (*Rahmat Lim & Partners*, 29 October 2024) <<https://www.rahmatlim.com/perspectives/articles/29210/mykh-national-guidelines-on-artificial-intelligence-governance-and-ethics-key-principles>> accessed 30 August 2025.

³⁰ El Ali Abdallah, Venkatraj Karthikeya Puttur, Morosoli Sophie, Naudts Laurens, Helberger Natali and Cesar Pablo, ‘Transparent AI Disclosure Obligations: Who, What, When, Where, Why, How’ (2024) ACM 10 <<https://research.tudelft.nl/files/208039725/3613905.3650750.pdf>> accessed 16 July 2025.

play the role of filling the legal gap.³¹ Another issue that arises in this recommendation is addressing bias in AI systems. As AI is trained by using data from the internet and it exposes the potential risk that the AI produces some result flavour to a certain group, and it may mislead the user in certain decisions.

Coexistence between Technological Advancement and Legal Integrity

Technological advancement, especially AI, is a norm that cannot be avoided, and it will have an impact on the world, including creative work and the current framework. The coexistence between AI and legal integrity is foreseeable, and this is the best solution in ensuring the development of the field related to the creative work industry and the future of copyright and intellectual property in the era of AI advancement, and protected human creativity is valued. For example, even in judgement of the case of *Thaler v Perlmutter*³² emphasised that only humans can have authorship, but it does not resolve the complexity of the creative work involving AI and humans. The copyright office³³ declares that if a human provides the input to the creative work, then the work might qualify to receive copyright protection.

The main challenge to achieving the coexistence between AI advancement and legal integrity is balancing the usage of technology and copyright protection in creation. When AI is involved in creative and legal integrity, it will require a balanced approach to the usage of technology, and the approach is not only applicable to AI, but it can also apply to new technology in the future. The lawmaker should set the requirement of having a permit and which can ensure that the data used by the company in training the AI model is allowed, and it can ensure the copyright and intellectual property rights are guaranteed under the law.

Other than this, AI adapted in copyright law can achieve coexistence. If the provision of AI is inserted in the related law, such as the Copyright Act 1987 in Malaysia, it provides guidelines and limitations on the usage of AI when creating any work. However, one of the challenges to allowing AI to adapt in related law is the authorship. AI is always seen as a tool and does not receive protection like other creations. The debate is whether authorship is given to the human or the AI party. Then, another debatable issue related to this is whether AI can be

³¹ Tegar Roli Anugrafianto, Amândio de Araújo Sarmento, I Gusti Agung, Aju Nitya Dharmani, Muhammad Rizki Perdana, and Aldian Yusup, 'Ethical Use of AI in Creative Industries and Recruitment: Legal, Transparency, and Data Accountability Implications' (2025) *Riwayat Educational Journal of History and Humanities* 3564.

³² 687 F. Supp. 3d 140 (D.D.C. 2023).

³³ 'Copyright Registration Guidance: Works Containing Material Generated by Artificial Intelligence' (*National Archives*, 16 March 2023) <https://www.federalregister.gov/documents/2023/03/16/2023-05321/copyright-registration-guidance-works-containing-material-generated-by-artificial-intelligence?utm_source=chatgpt.com> accessed 29 August 2025.

seen as an “author” or merely as a “tool”, as AI is always seen as a “tool” but not as the creator in any creative work production process. So, the lawmaker needs to set a clear definition for the authorship and an appropriate concept of AI to avoid loopholes in the law. The clear definition of “author” will be crucial and make the legal framework of copyright adaptive from time to time³⁴. At the same time, the establishment of guidelines for copyright infringement provides a clear method for handling disputes related to copyright infringement. The guidelines set the line to ensure the user applies AI in the legal framework³⁵.

When AI and legal integrity can coexist, it not only avoids confusion and sets rules for related subject matters but also ensures creators and consumers are protected. Both parties are protected under the law directly or indirectly. From the creators' aspect, the creators will receive the protection and their rights are recognised under the law, and consumers will acknowledge the resource and protect it from illegal matters. For example, the EU AI Act mandates that users must be informed when they are interacting with an AI system³⁶. Moreover, the California AI Transparency Act requires AI-generated political and pornographic content to be disclosed. This step can be seen as protecting consumers from misinformation, fraud, and deceptive advertising.

The establishment of ethical AI use in creative industries is playing an important role in ensuring this objective is achieved. The guideline will contain some elements that align with UNESCO, and the ethical guidelines will play the role of monitoring the AI usage in the creative industry, aligning with the law. Other than that, the ethical AI will not only apply to handling matters related to copyright and other intellectual property matters, but it can also be applied to other fields related to AI³⁷. The guidelines of ethics launched to credit the contribution of humans and AI³⁸ in a creative work within a legal framework.

³⁴ David Lim and Athira Fatima, ‘Intellectual Property in the Age of AI: Navigating Patentability, Trademarking and Copyright Ownership of AI-Generated IP’ (*D&P Law*, 2023) <<https://dnplawgroup.com/article/intellectual-property-in-the-age-of-ai-navigating-patentability-trademarking-and-copyright-ownership-of-ai-generated-ip>> accessed 16 July 2025.

³⁵ Nasihah Naimat, Mimi Sofiah Ahmad Mustafa and Ida Rahayu Mahat, ‘Copyright Protection in Malaysia amid Legal Challenges of AI-Generated Content’ (2025) *IJRISS* <<https://dx.doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2025.906000127>> accessed 16 July 2025.

³⁶ ‘Article 50: Transparency Obligations for Providers and Deployers of Certain AI Systems’ (*EU Artificial Intelligence Act*, 2025) <<https://artificialintelligenceact.eu/article/50/#:~:text=This%20article%20states%20that%20companies,legal%20purposes%20like%20crime%20detection>> accessed 30 August 2025.

³⁷ Naeem AllahRakha, ‘UNESCO's AI Ethics Principles: Challenges and Opportunities’ (2024) 2(9) *International Journal of Law and Policy* 25 <<https://doi.org/10.59022/ijlp.225>> accessed 16 July 2025.

³⁸ Haolong Wen, ‘Legal and Ethical Implications of AI-Generated Content in Intellectual Property Law’ (2024) *Science of Law Journal* 17 <https://www.clausiuspress.com/assets/default/article/2024/12/26/article_1735205161.pdf> accessed 16 July 2025.

The coexistence between technological advancement, especially in AI-generating systems, is able to boost industry growth, but at the same time, it is the reason that causes the current legal framework to undergo reform and ensure legal integrity.

Conclusion

The challenges faced by all intellectual property, especially copyright, require a reform in law, mainly the Copyright Act 1987. The challenges appeared after AI was launched and applied in the creative work industry. As the existing law is not aligned with current technological developments, a loophole will exist in the related law. Therefore, reform is urged to ensure that the subject matter is regulated and that rights are protected under the law. The issue related to authorship is a main challenge to copyright and causes a legal loophole in Malaysia and other countries. The recommendation to the existing law is to ensure that the current law related to copyright and other intellectual property can play a role in setting the rules to regulate related matters. It can be seen as an opportunity to amend the related laws, such as copyright, patent, trademark, and consumer laws. Technological advancement should be seen as an opportunity to bring improvement in law and the creative industry, and to make the related law updated and aligned with the current global landscape.