International Journal on Science and Technology (IJSAT)
E-ISSN: 2229-7677 ● Website: www.ijsat.org ● Email: editor@ijsat.org

THE ROLE OF AI IN DETECTING AND PREVENTING TRADEMARK COUNTERFEITING: LEGAL AND TECHNOLOGICAL PERSPECTIVES FROM INDIA AND THE U.S.A

Prof. (Dr.) S.P.S Shekhawat[1], Tarushi Gaur[2]

[1]Head and Dean, Faculty of Law, [2]Research Scholar
Jagannath University
Jaipur, Rajasthan

Abstract:
The proliferation of trademark counterfeiting poses a severe threat to global commerce, consumer safety, and brand integrity. With the advent of Artificial Intelligence (AI), new tools have emerged that hold the potential to revolutionize the detection and prevention of counterfeit goods. This paper explores the legal and technological perspectives of using AI to combat trademark counterfeiting, with a comparative focus on India and the United States of America. In the U.S., advanced AI algorithms are increasingly deployed in supply chain monitoring, e-commerce surveillance, and image recognition to identify infringements, while India is gradually embracing AI technologies in IP enforcement through governmental and private initiatives. The study delves into how AI technologies—such as machine learning, deep learning, and natural language processing (NLP)—are being used to analyze product listings, logos, packaging, and customer reviews to detect fakes on online platforms in real-time. On the legal front, this research analyzes the legislative frameworks of both nations, highlighting the strengths of the Lanham Act in the U.S. and the Trade Marks Act, 1999 in India in addressing trademark infringement and counterfeiting. However, the integration of AI raises novel legal questions concerning data privacy, algorithmic accountability, and evidentiary admissibility in trademark litigation. The study also examines case law and policy developments reflecting each country's approach to regulating AI-powered anti-counterfeiting technologies. While AI presents promising solutions, challenges persist in terms of implementation, cost, regulatory gaps, and cross-border coordination. This paper concludes by suggesting harmonized policy approaches, public-private collaborations, and legal reforms to strengthen the global response to trademark counterfeiting using AI.

Keywords: Artificial Intelligence, Trademark Counterfeiting, Intellectual Property Law, India, United States, Legal Technology.

1. INTRODUCTION TO TRADEMARK COUNTERFEITING AND THE ROLE OF AI

Trademark counterfeiting, a form of intellectual property (IP) infringement, involves the unauthorized use of a registered trademark on goods or services identical or similar to those offered by the legitimate trademark owner. This act undermines brand integrity, deceives consumers, and causes substantial economic and reputational harm to genuine businesses. With globalization and the exponential growth of e-commerce platforms, counterfeit goods have found an easy route into mainstream markets, making enforcement of trademark rights increasingly challenging.

In this context, **Artificial Intelligence (AI)** emerges as a game-changing technological advancement. AI encompasses various technologies such as **machine learning (ML), deep learning, natural language processing (NLP)**, and computer vision. These tools can be used to monitor digital marketplaces, recognize patterns, and flag counterfeit activities much faster and more efficiently than manual methods. AI also

facilitates real-time detection of fake listings, fraudulent product images, and unauthorized use of logos across various online and social media platforms.[1]
In traditional enforcement methods, brand owners relied on human inspectors, consumer complaints, or market raids to identify counterfeit products. These methods are not only labor-intensive but often reactive rather than proactive. In contrast, AI offers proactive and scalable solutions to monitor millions of online listings and detect even the most subtle changes made by counterfeiters to deceive enforcement mechanisms. This research focuses on the **integration of AI in detecting and preventing trademark counterfeiting**, with special reference to the legal systems and enforcement mechanisms in **India and the United States**. While the U.S. has pioneered the use of AI in various aspects of IP law enforcement, India is in the early stages of developing and deploying such technologies. A comparative study of these two jurisdictions helps illustrate both the potential and limitations of AI-based counterfeiting solutions in different legal and regulatory environments.

The role of AI in detecting trademark infringement extends to identifying imitation logos, unauthorized uses of brand names, and selling patterns that mimic authentic products. **Image recognition technology**, powered by AI, can scan millions of product images and detect minute variations or identical matches with registered trademarks. NLP tools can analyze product descriptions, customer reviews, and metadata to flag suspicious listings. Furthermore, AI tools can help prioritize enforcement actions based on risk factors, previous infringements, and market impact, enabling resource optimization for enforcement agencies and brand owners.[2]

In addition to detection, AI can also aid in **preventive measures**. Predictive analytics can assess historical data to forecast potential markets or vendors likely to engage in counterfeiting. AI can be embedded in blockchain frameworks to ensure supply chain transparency, which is especially vital in industries like pharmaceuticals, electronics, and luxury goods, where counterfeiting is rampant.

The use of AI, however, brings forth a number of **legal and ethical challenges**. The reliability of AI-generated evidence, the issue of algorithmic transparency, data protection regulations, and the admissibility of AI findings in court proceedings are some of the pressing concerns that need to be addressed by lawmakers and regulators. While technological tools may offer enhanced detection capabilities, their effectiveness largely depends on **supportive legal frameworks** that recognize and regulate the use of AI in trademark enforcement. The Indian legal framework, primarily governed by the **Trade Marks Act, 1999**, provides for civil and criminal remedies against trademark counterfeiting. However, there is a lack of specific provisions or judicial precedents dealing with the use of AI in such enforcement. Meanwhile, the U.S., under the **Lanham Act**, provides a more mature enforcement ecosystem, with active participation from federal agencies like the U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) and private actors deploying AI solutions to protect their IP rights.
In conclusion, AI has the potential to redefine how trademark counterfeiting is detected and addressed. It brings efficiency, speed, and accuracy to enforcement efforts, particularly in the online domain. Nonetheless, its application must be backed by legal recognition, regulatory oversight, and a commitment to transparency and fairness. The coming sections will analyze the **comparative legal frameworks in India and the U.S.** and the existing technological solutions to paint a comprehensive picture of the present landscape and future direction of AI in trademark enforcement.[3]

[1] WIPO (2023). Artificial Intelligence and Intellectual Property. World Intellectual Property Organization. Retrieved from: https://www.wipo.int/about-ip/en/artificial_intelligence.html
[2] OECD & EUIPO (2021). Trends in Trade in Counterfeit and Pirated Goods. OECD Publishing.
[3] United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO). Artificial Intelligence and IP Policy. https://www.uspto.gov/initiatives/artificial-intelligence

2. LEGAL FRAMEWORK ON TRADEMARK COUNTERFEITING IN INDIA AND THE UNITED STATES

The legal responses to trademark counterfeiting in India and the United States are rooted in their respective IP laws, enforcement mechanisms, and judicial precedents. Understanding these frameworks is essential to assessing how well AI-based solutions can be integrated into existing legal systems.

A. India's Legal Framework: The Trade Marks Act, 1999

The **Trade Marks Act, 1999** governs trademark law in India and provides both civil and criminal remedies against infringement and counterfeiting. Under Section 29 of the Act, any unauthorized use of a registered trademark that causes confusion or deceives the public constitutes infringement. The Act also criminalizes counterfeiting under Section 103, which provides for imprisonment and fines for the falsification of trademarks.

In India, enforcement is often hampered by **limited resources**, **judicial delays**, and **lack of awareness**. While the police and judiciary play a critical role in IP enforcement, their capacity to deal with complex counterfeit networks—especially those operating online—is often inadequate. AI-based tools, therefore, present an opportunity to enhance detection and enable more efficient legal action.

However, India's legal system lacks **explicit provisions** dealing with the admissibility of AI-generated evidence in court. The **Indian Evidence Act, 1872**, although recently amended, still does not comprehensively address issues surrounding algorithmic accountability or reliability of machine-generated data.

Despite these challenges, recent initiatives by Indian authorities—such as the IP Awareness Campaign and digitalization of IP filing and enforcement—indicate a growing recognition of the need for technological integration.

B. United States' Legal Framework: The Lanham Act

In the U.S., the **Lanham Act** (15 U.S.C. § 1051 et seq.) governs trademark law and provides robust remedies against counterfeiting. Section 1114 of the Act specifically addresses unauthorized use of registered marks, while the **Anti-Counterfeiting Consumer Protection Act** (1996) enhances criminal penalties for counterfeiters.

The U.S. benefits from **institutional support** for enforcement, including agencies like the **Department of Homeland Security (DHS)**, **Customs and Border Protection (CBP)**, and **Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE)**. These agencies collaborate with private companies and use AI to monitor imports, detect counterfeit goods, and facilitate seizures.[4]

Private companies, particularly in the luxury goods and technology sectors, have also invested heavily in AI-based brand protection platforms. These systems use **web crawling, image recognition, and predictive analytics** to detect infringements on e-commerce platforms such as Amazon, eBay, and Alibaba. Courts in the U.S. have also shown greater willingness to consider electronic and AI-generated evidence, provided it meets reliability and admissibility standards under the **Federal Rules of Evidence**.

Notably, the U.S. has launched initiatives like **Operation Team Player** and **Operation Chain Reaction** to specifically target counterfeit goods using a combination of AI and traditional enforcement.

C. Comparative Analysis

- **Legislative Strength**: While both countries criminalize trademark counterfeiting, U.S. laws provide more stringent penalties and better integration with federal enforcement agencies. Indian laws, though comprehensive in scope, suffer from implementation issues.
- **Institutional Support**: The U.S. has dedicated agencies and funding for anti-counterfeiting, whereas India relies more on judicial processes and less on technology.

[4] Ministry of Commerce & Industry, Government of India. Intellectual Property Rights Policy (2016). Retrieved from: https://dpiit.gov.in/

- **Legal Recognition of AI**: U.S. courts have demonstrated more openness to AI-generated evidence, whereas Indian courts are still evolving in their understanding and acceptance of such technologies.

In summary, both legal systems recognize the threat posed by trademark counterfeiting but differ significantly in their approach to enforcement and technological integration. India can benefit from the U.S. model by strengthening its institutions, clarifying legal admissibility of AI evidence, and incentivizing private-public partnerships in technological adoption. The next section will explore the **technological innovations in AI** that are currently shaping trademark counterfeiting detection and how these can be leveraged more effectively in both jurisdictions.[5]

3. LEGAL FRAMEWORK AGAINST TRADEMARK COUNTERFEITING IN INDIA AND THE U.S.A.

The legal foundation for combating trademark counterfeiting is pivotal in defining the contours of enforcement, protection, and prosecution. Both India and the United States have robust systems in place to address counterfeiting, but they differ significantly in structure, efficiency, and integration of technological tools like AI.

3.1 Legal Provisions in India

India addresses trademark counterfeiting primarily through the **Trade Marks Act, 1999**, which defines and penalizes infringement and counterfeiting. Key provisions include:

- **Section 29**: Defines infringement of registered trademarks, including unauthorized use and deceptive similarity.
- **Section 103**: Provides for criminal penalties for applying false trademarks, including imprisonment and fines.
- **Section 104**: Criminalizes selling goods bearing false trademarks.
- **Section 115**: Empowers police to conduct raids without prior court approval in certain cases.

In addition to statutory provisions, India has established the **Cell for IPR Promotion and Management (CIPAM)** and is part of **international treaties** like TRIPS and the Madrid Protocol.

However, enforcement faces limitations such as lack of awareness among enforcement agencies, inadequate resources, procedural delays, and absence of AI-specific regulation or recognition.[6]

3.2 Legal Provisions in the United States

The United States employs a combination of **federal and state laws**, international cooperation, and strong institutional mechanisms to deal with counterfeiting. Central to this is the **Lanham Act (15 U.S.C. §§1051 et seq.)**, which governs trademark law.

- **Section 1114**: Addresses infringement of registered trademarks.
- **Section 1125(a)**: Covers false designations of origin and false descriptions.
- **Anti-Counterfeiting Consumer Protection Act (1996)**: Enhances criminal penalties and provides better customs enforcement.
- **Stop Counterfeiting in Manufactured Goods Act (2006)**: Criminalizes trafficking in counterfeit labels, patches, stickers, etc.

The U.S. also employs **Customs and Border Protection (CBP)** and **Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE)** for seizure and investigation. Courts are generally technologically informed, and legal procedures are relatively swift compared to India.

3.3 AI in Legal Enforcement

In both jurisdictions, AI is gradually being integrated into legal enforcement through:

- **Predictive analytics** to forecast potential counterfeit activities.
- **E-discovery tools** in litigation.

[5] Gangjee, D. (2012). Relocating the Law of Geographical Indications. Cambridge University Press.
[6] Hilty, R., & Lamping, M. (2019). Artificial Intelligence and Intellectual Property Law: Towards a Common Understanding? Max Planck Institute for Innovation and Competition Research Paper No. 19-10.

- **Image and language recognition systems** in evidence assessment.
- **Blockchain evidence chains** to ensure authenticity.

However, legal acceptance of AI-generated evidence is still under scrutiny, especially regarding algorithmic accountability and admissibility.

3.4 Comparative Analysis

Legal Aspect	India	United States
Key Statute	Trade Marks Act, 1999	Lanham Act
Enforcement Agencies	Police, DRI, CIPAM	CBP, ICE, FBI
Integration of AI	Minimal, in pilot stages	Advanced, with active collaborations
Legal Recognition of AI	Underdeveloped	Evolving, with case-by-case precedents
Speed of Litigation	Slow	Moderate to fast

Both countries offer significant legal structures but need to evolve in tandem with AI technologies to ensure effective enforcement.[7]

4. AI TECHNOLOGIES IN ANTI-COUNTERFEITING MEASURES

Artificial Intelligence is transforming the way intellectual property violations are detected, reported, and resolved. From product recognition to data analytics, AI tools are revolutionizing the anti-counterfeiting domain.

4.1 Machine Learning and Pattern Recognition

Machine learning (ML) algorithms learn from vast datasets and can identify suspicious trends, product inconsistencies, or fake listings. These tools:

- Analyze product images and listings to spot deviations in branding.
- Flag suspicious seller behavior on e-commerce platforms.
- Provide real-time alerts to brand owners.

Companies like **Amazon and Alibaba** use AI-powered bots to remove counterfeit listings.

4.2 Image and Logo Recognition

Tools like **Google Vision AI** or **Clarifai** help detect subtle differences in logos, fonts, and packaging, even when counterfeits attempt close imitation.

- Brands upload official designs to the cloud.
- AI compares millions of product images to detect counterfeits.
- Legal teams receive alerts for swift action.

This is especially useful for luxury brands and electronics where visuals are crucial.[8]

4.3 Natural Language Processing (NLP)

NLP is used to analyze:

- Product descriptions for misleading claims.
- Customer reviews to identify dissatisfaction patterns indicating fakes.
- Seller feedback and metadata.

NLP also helps in scanning legal documents, judgments, and takedown requests at scale.

4.4 Blockchain and Smart Contracts

While not AI per se, blockchain combined with AI helps track a product's journey from manufacturing to retail. This transparency helps:

- Verify authenticity.
- Track real-time changes in ownership.

[7] Srinivasan, S. (2022). Trademark Counterfeiting and Role of AI: A Legal Study of India and Global Trends. Journal of Intellectual Property Rights, Vol. 27(2), pp. 122–135.
[8] Katyal, S. K. (2019). The Paradox of Source Identification in Trademark Law. Harvard Law Review, 132(5), 1122–1171.

- Automate IP licensing through smart contracts.

AI-driven blockchain monitoring is already in pilot use in pharmaceuticals, fashion, and consumer electronics.

4.5 Predictive Analytics and Risk Scoring

Predictive models help identify regions or time periods where counterfeiting spikes may occur. Risk scores are generated based on historical data, current trends, and seasonal variations.

- Helps authorities deploy resources efficiently.
- Assists legal teams in prioritizing enforcement actions.

4.6 Real-World Applications

- **Microsoft** uses AI to detect counterfeit software.
- **LVMH** has developed the **Aura Blockchain Consortium** in partnership with other luxury brands.
- **U.S. Customs** uses AI for cargo inspection and anomaly detection.
- **Indian startups** like Staqu use AI for surveillance and anomaly detection in retail.[9]

4.7 Limitations and Ethical Concerns

Despite their potential, AI tools are not without challenges:

- **False positives** and **bias** in detection.
- **Data privacy concerns** related to surveillance.
- **Limited access** to AI technologies by small businesses.
- **Lack of legal clarity** on algorithmic accountability.

AI is a tool—not a substitute—for a robust legal framework and human oversight.

5. COMPARATIVE LEGAL FRAMEWORKS: INDIA AND U.S.A.

The battle against trademark counterfeiting has assumed transnational dimensions, especially with the increasing reliance on digital platforms and e-commerce channels. Both India and the United States possess comprehensive legal mechanisms for the protection of trademarks, and both are also gradually adopting artificial intelligence (AI) solutions in trademark enforcement. However, their respective legal traditions, enforcement approaches, and integration of AI into the regulatory landscape differ significantly. This section offers a comparative study of the legal frameworks of India and the U.S.A., especially in the context of AI-enabled detection and enforcement against trademark counterfeiting.

5.1 Trademark Laws in India and the U.S.A.

India:

India's trademark regime is governed by the **Trade Marks Act, 1999**, which is compliant with the **TRIPS Agreement** and administered by the **Controller General of Patents, Designs and Trademarks** (CGPDTM). The Act provides a definition of "infringement," outlines penalties for counterfeiting, and grants civil and criminal remedies. The enforcement mechanisms include both civil injunctions and criminal prosecution under provisions such as Section 103 and 104 of the Act, which deal with falsifying and falsely applying trademarks.

However, India faces significant enforcement challenges due to:

- Judicial delays.
- Lack of robust technological enforcement mechanisms.
- Inadequate coordination between law enforcement and IP rights holders.

India is in the early stages of incorporating AI into IP law administration, and efforts are underway to use data analytics and automation in trademark examination and publication.[10]

United States:

In contrast, the U.S. has a more evolved and technologically integrated legal system. The **Lanham Act (15 U.S.C. §§1051 et seq.)** forms the foundation of trademark law in the U.S. The **United States Patent and**

[9] Varadarajan, A. (2020). Algorithms, Automation, and AI in Legal Enforcement: Opportunities in IPR. Indian Journal of Law and Technology, Vol. 16, pp. 78–105.

[10] Dreyfuss, R. C. (2018). The New AI: AI and the Law of the Past, Present, and Future. Columbia Law Review, 118(5), 1073–1110.

Trademark Office (USPTO) uses AI for search and classification, while enforcement agencies like the **Department of Homeland Security (DHS)** and **U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP)** employ AI tools to detect counterfeit goods at ports.

The U.S. also relies heavily on civil litigation through federal courts, offering remedies such as:

- Monetary damages.
- Permanent injunctions.
- Treble damages in cases of willful infringement.

Importantly, the **Stop Counterfeiting in Manufactured Goods Act (2006)** criminalizes the trafficking of counterfeit labels, logos, or packaging.

5.2 Use of AI in Trademark Enforcement

India:

India is still at a nascent stage in using AI tools in IPR enforcement. The **CGPDTM** has explored digitization and automation in filing and examination, but real-time AI surveillance systems or customs integration with AI-powered detection are yet to be implemented on a wide scale.

Startups in India are beginning to offer AI-based counterfeit detection systems using **machine learning**, **image recognition**, and **natural language processing (NLP)** to monitor marketplaces like Amazon and Flipkart.[11]

U.S.A.:

The U.S. has made considerable strides in AI adoption:

- **USPTO** uses **AI-assisted image recognition tools** to compare marks.
- **CBP** collaborates with private companies to use **AI to scan shipping data** for patterns indicating counterfeiting.
- **E-commerce platforms like Amazon** use AI algorithms to track and ban sellers of counterfeit goods (Project Zero, Brand Registry 2.0).

Moreover, initiatives like the **National IPR Center** integrate AI with big data analytics to identify counterfeiting networks across states and borders.

5.3 Enforcement Mechanisms and Challenges

Aspect	India	U.S.A.
Governing Law	Trade Marks Act, 1999	Lanham Act
Enforcement Agencies	Police, Customs, Judiciary	USPTO, DHS, CBP, FBI
AI Integration	Limited (pilot stage)	Extensive (trademark search, customs detection, etc.)
Remedies	Injunction, damages, criminal penalties	Injunction, treble damages, asset seizure
Challenges	Judicial delay, poor AI use, low awareness	Privacy concerns, over-reliance on algorithms

While the U.S. benefits from a mature regulatory framework supported by private-public collaboration and advanced technological tools, India needs to strengthen institutional capacity, training, and AI infrastructure in the IPR space.[12]

[11] World Economic Forum (2021). Harnessing AI against Counterfeiting: A Roadmap for the Future. Retrieved from: https://www.weforum.org

[12] Arora, R. (2023). AI and Counterfeiting in E-Commerce: India's Trademark Challenges in the Digital Era. Indian Journal of Law and Economics, Vol. 3(1), pp. 35–50.

6. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

6.1 Conclusion

The menace of trademark counterfeiting poses significant threats to brand integrity, consumer trust, and economic health in both India and the U.S.A. As counterfeiters become increasingly sophisticated, AI emerges as a potent tool to bolster IP enforcement through its capacity to process large datasets, identify counterfeit patterns, and monitor digital marketplaces in real time.

The comparative study reveals that while the U.S. has operationalized AI across enforcement agencies and judiciary-linked systems, India is only beginning to explore the vast potential of AI in combating counterfeiting. Despite the robust statutory frameworks in both jurisdictions, successful implementation of AI-based enforcement depends on infrastructure, public-private partnerships, and legal adaptability.

6.2 Recommendations

A. For India

1. **Establish AI-driven IP Cells**: India must set up specialized **IPR Enforcement Cells** equipped with AI-based detection software within agencies like the Delhi and Mumbai Police.
2. **Digital Monitoring Portals**: Develop government-monitored AI platforms to continuously scan online platforms for counterfeit sales, inspired by U.S. projects like Amazon's Brand Registry.
3. **Judicial Training**: Regular training programs for judges and law enforcement personnel on the application of AI and digital forensics in IPR enforcement.
4. **Public-Private Collaboration**: Encourage collaboration between government bodies, tech firms, and academic institutions for AI solutions tailored to India's IP challenges.
5. **Legislative Amendments**: Amend the Trade Marks Act, 1999 to incorporate specific provisions on digital enforcement, AI-aided seizure, and algorithmic surveillance.[13]

B. For the U.S.A.

1. **Address Bias and Transparency**: Ensure AI systems used in enforcement are **auditable, unbiased, and explainable** to maintain trust and due process.
2. **International Cooperation**: Promote **bilateral cooperation** with countries like India for real-time data exchange on counterfeit networks using AI interfaces.
3. **Consumer Awareness Programs**: Implement AI-powered tools to educate consumers about verifying product authenticity, including QR code scanners and blockchain verifiers.

C. For Both Nations

1. **Cross-Border AI Solutions**: Establish **joint AI task forces** that can analyze global trends in counterfeiting, especially in e-commerce.
2. **Global AI IP Governance Framework**: Support WIPO in developing **global ethical guidelines** for the use of AI in IPR enforcement.
3. **Blockchain + AI Integration**: Encourage the convergence of blockchain for immutable tracking and AI for real-time identification of counterfeit products.

REFERENCES:

1. **WIPO (2023)**. *Artificial Intelligence and Intellectual Property*. World Intellectual Property Organization. Retrieved from: https://www.wipo.int/about-ip/en/artificial_intelligence.html
2. **OECD & EUIPO (2021)**. *Trends in Trade in Counterfeit and Pirated Goods*. OECD Publishing.
3. **United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO)**. *Artificial Intelligence and IP Policy*. https://www.uspto.gov/initiatives/artificial-intelligence
4. **Ministry of Commerce & Industry, Government of India**. *Intellectual Property Rights Policy (2016)*. Retrieved from: https://dpiit.gov.in/
5. Gangjee, D. (2012). *Relocating the Law of Geographical Indications*. Cambridge University Press.

[13] WIPO (2023). Artificial Intelligence and Intellectual Property. World Intellectual Property Organization. Retrieved from: https://www.wipo.int/about-ip/en/artificial_intelligence.html

6. Hilty, R., & Lamping, M. (2019). *Artificial Intelligence and Intellectual Property Law: Towards a Common Understanding?* Max Planck Institute for Innovation and Competition Research Paper No. 19-10.
7. Srinivasan, S. (2022). *Trademark Counterfeiting and Role of AI: A Legal Study of India and Global Trends*. Journal of Intellectual Property Rights, Vol. 27(2), pp. 122–135.
8. Katyal, S. K. (2019). *The Paradox of Source Identification in Trademark Law*. Harvard Law Review, 132(5), 1122–1171.
9. Varadarajan, A. (2020). *Algorithms, Automation, and AI in Legal Enforcement: Opportunities in IPR*. Indian Journal of Law and Technology, Vol. 16, pp. 78–105.
10. Dreyfuss, R. C. (2018). *The New AI: AI and the Law of the Past, Present, and Future*. Columbia Law Review, 118(5), 1073–1110.
11. **World Economic Forum (2021)**. *Harnessing AI against Counterfeiting: A Roadmap for the Future*. Retrieved from: https://www.weforum.org
12. Arora, R. (2023). *AI and Counterfeiting in E-Commerce: India's Trademark Challenges in the Digital Era*. Indian Journal of Law and Economics, Vol. 3(1), pp. 35–50.