

Legal Analysis of Intellectual Property Rights Protection in Musical Works Produced Through Artificial Intelligence: A Case Study of Suno AI Platform Implementation

Angga Sandhika Raharjo¹⁾ & Andriyanto Adhi Nugroho²⁾

¹⁾ Faculty of Law, Universitas Pembangunan Nasional "Veteran" Jakarta, Indonesia, E-mail: 2210611063@mahasiswa.upnvj.ac.id

²⁾ Faculty of Law, Universitas Pembangunan Nasional "Veteran" Jakarta, Indonesia, E-mail: andriyanto.adhi.n@upnvj.ac.id

Abstract. *The rapid development of Artificial Intelligence (AI) technology has significantly transformed the fields of art and creative industries, particularly in musical creation. One of the most notable AI platforms capable of automatically generating music is Suno AI, which raises legal debates regarding its legal status and copyright protection for AI-generated works. This study aims to analyze the legal standing of Suno AI as a creator and examine the legal responsibilities related to musical works produced through artificial intelligence within the framework of Intellectual Property Rights (IPR). The research employs a normative juridical method with a statutory and conceptual approach, using data derived from legislation, legal literature, and relevant national and international case studies. The findings indicate that Suno AI cannot be recognized as a legal subject or creator, as it lacks consciousness and legal personality as required by Article 1 paragraph (2) jo. Article 31 of Law No. 28 of 2014 concerning Copyright. Therefore, AI functions merely as a technological tool, while legal rights and responsibilities rest entirely on humans, namely developers or users who control the system. In cases of copyright infringement, as stipulated in Articles 34 and 112 of the Copyright Law, human operators of the AI system bear legal responsibility, not the AI itself. Cases such as the lawsuit against Suno AI and Udio AI in the United States, as well as instances of AI-based music fraud in Indonesia, highlight the urgent need for adaptive and comprehensive legal regulations. This study concludes that Indonesia must establish a comprehensive legal framework on AI-generated creations to ensure legal certainty, protect the moral and economic rights of human creators, and promote the ethical and responsible use of AI technology in the music industry.*

Keywords: *Artificial; Copyright; Intellectual; Responsibility.*

1. Introduction

Essentially, humans are created with intellect. In this regard, humans are required to have the ability to think and be creative in several fields, one of which is music. In this field,

people who are referred to as musicians in the music world are required to produce works originating from their thoughts. The meaning of this is that humans are required to create works purely from their own thinking. In appreciating a work resulting from human thought, something called protection is needed. In this case, it is legal protection, because many things must be sacrificed when creating music, especially time and energy for thinking (Jacob et al., 2023).

Article 28G paragraph (1) of the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia stipulates that every individual has the right to personal, familial, and property protection, as well as the right to safeguard their honor and dignity. It also guarantees security and protection from any threats or fears that might hinder a person from exercising or refraining from exercising their human rights. The meaning of this article is that everyone has the right to legal protection, including protection for human works. Legal protection itself can protect a work from plagiarism or copying the work of others.

In the era of globalization, everyone can easily obtain and share information. In addition, technology is developing very rapidly, which can produce many new innovations. Artificial Intelligence (AI) technology is one of the new technologies that is developing very rapidly. With its various capabilities, such as searching for something, summarizing something, doing something, or creating something, this artificial intelligence is very beneficial to humans. AI itself can be found in many electronic devices used every day. In other words, AI is not limited to any field, including music.

One AI that is proficient in the field of music is Suno AI. Suno AI is an artificial intelligence capable of creating musical works very quickly. Suno AI is very often used by musicians because it can create a song by simply writing lyrics and selecting the desired song genre in a matter of minutes for free. Although AI has many uses, there are also ethical challenges and debates in using AI to create music, such as copyright, originality, and creativity. In addition, a musical work needs to have its IPR registered because this is useful for protection of a brand, copyrighted work, and product of the creator.

Intellectual property rights themselves are rights to an object originating from the work of the brain, the work of reason (Atmoko et al., 2023). The work of the brain or reason in the form of immaterial objects or intangible objects, for example, a musical work. IPR is useful for providing protection for copyrighted works and products of the creator (Mustofa, 2024). In other words, such a musical work can avoid similarity or plagiarism to other brands and avoid lawsuits. However, if someone else plagiarizes or reproduces the work without the permission of the original creator, it can be considered a violation of the law (Prahara, 2024).

Law No. 28 of 2014 concerning Copyright explains that a creator is one person or several people who produce a creation. However, if examined further, AI cannot actually be categorized as a creator, because AI is not a person but rather a program created by humans. However, until now there is no law or regulation that regulates AI as a creator and whether AI needs to obtain copyright for its work. Because, basically, a program

cannot be called a legal subject, which means it does not need to be protected (Tanujaya, 2024).

AI can easily process data to produce new works that are comparable to or even equivalent to works that have been protected by the Copyright Law. Such actions can actually be classified as plagiarism, which is the act of taking someone else's writing and making it one's own writing. Until now, various regulations or laws have not explicitly regulated the results of AI-created works, so it cannot be assumed that the results of AI-created works cannot be disputed. Basically, this could happen if it is proven that the AI took someone else's work without permission or vice versa, namely people who actually use AI to reap profits.

Research on copyright protection for works produced through AI has been conducted by many legal academics. One of them is by Aqilah Putri Andanni and Budi Santoso (2025), in their research entitled "Legal Protection Against Violations of Works Produced Through AI and Commercialized Based on Law No. 28 of 2014 concerning Copyright." This study uses a normative juridical method with analysis of primary legal materials in the form of legislation, especially Law No. 28 of 2014 concerning Copyright, as well as secondary legal materials from scientific literature and tertiary materials in the form of legal dictionaries and online sources. The research results show that legal regulations in Indonesia have not been able to keep pace with the development of artificial intelligence technology, thus creating challenges in providing adequate legal protection for creators. Researchers recommend regulatory updates and inter-stakeholder collaboration in law enforcement in the field of intellectual property (Andanni & Santoso, 2025).

Furthermore, research by Aryuni Fitri Djaafara and R. Rahaditya (2024) entitled "Legal Protection for Singer's Copyright in the Digital Era: A Case Study of Fake Song Sales Fraud" uses an empirical normative research method with data collection through interviews and literature study as well as a conceptual approach. The research results show that the Copyright Law has not been fully effective in addressing legal challenges due to developments in digital technology and artificial intelligence, because there are still legal loopholes that have the potential to be exploited by certain parties. Researchers emphasize the need for revision and renewal of the Copyright Law to be able to provide optimal protection for creators and singers (Djaafara & Rahaditya, 2024).

Meanwhile, research conducted by Calista Putri Tanujaya (2024) with the title "Analysis of Artificial Intelligence Creations According to Law No. 28 of 2014 Concerning Copyright" uses a normative juridical method with primary legal material sources in the form of Law No. 28 of 2014 concerning Copyright and Government Regulation No. 56 of 2021 concerning Management of Copyright Royalties for Songs, as well as secondary legal materials from related journals and scientific publications. The research results show that according to the Indonesian legal system, artificial intelligence technology is not a legal subject that can be considered a creator, so the works it produces cannot be protected by copyright because they do not originate from human thought. Therefore, service

providers or parties using the system can be held legally accountable if a violation occurs (Tanujaya, 2024).

This research differs from previous research because it focuses on the legal standing of the Suno AI platform as a creator and legal responsibility for musical works produced through artificial intelligence from an intellectual property rights perspective. This study highlights the existence of a legal vacuum in Law No. 28 of 2014 concerning Copyright, which has not clearly regulated non-human creator subjects. This ambiguity raises issues regarding copyright ownership, legal responsibility, and protection for users and human creators, which has the potential to trigger disputes and IPR violations. Therefore, this research aims to provide a juridical and conceptual overview of the importance of establishing clear rules related to artificial intelligence-based musical works, so as not to create legal uncertainty. In addition, the research emphasizes the need for comprehensive regulation of platforms like Suno AI considering their potential for music innovation as well as their risks to copyright protection.

2. Research Methods

This research uses a normative juridical method, which is an approach that focuses on library studies by examining literature and secondary legal materials such as legislation, books, and journals (Soekanto & Mamudji, 2003). The aim is to understand and analyze applicable legal norms, both written and unwritten, through the exploration of basic principles and principles of law in the positive legal system. The approach used is a statutory approach, namely analyzing legal problems through a study of various relevant regulations (Fajar & Achmad, 2010). This research analyzes provisions in Law No. 28 of 2014 concerning Copyright and other regulations related to artificial intelligence (AI), including international regulations such as Executive Order No. 628: Establishing an Artificial Intelligence Strategic Task Force to be compared with existing policies in Indonesia. Data sources used include primary and secondary legal materials. Primary legal materials consist of legislation that has binding legal force, such as the Copyright Law, ITE Law, Government Regulation No. 71 of 2019, Ministerial Regulation of Communication and Information No. 3 of 2021, and Circular Letter of the Minister of Communication and Information No. 9 of 2023 concerning AI Ethics. While secondary legal materials used in this research are books, journals, articles, and expert opinions that provide explanations of primary legal materials and strengthen the legal analysis conducted (Ibrahim, 2008). Data collection techniques in this research use library research methods, namely data collection through written sources such as books, documents, and journals (Mahmud, 2011). Furthermore, data is analyzed qualitatively by grouping and interpreting findings based on applicable legal provisions and linking them to legal theory and expert views to assess the application of legal principles in the case being studied (Moeleong, 1996).

3. Results and Discussion

3. 1. Legal Standing of Suno AI Platform as Creator in Article 1 paragraph 2 in conjunction with Article 31 of Law No. 28 of 2014 Concerning Copyright

Legal standing basically refers to a situation where a party meets the requirements to be legally recognized, so that it has clear rights and obligations in the legal system. This standing becomes an important basis in determining the extent to which a party can act and be held accountable for its actions legally. In this case, the Suno AI platform is an application of technology designed to imitate the ability to think and create like humans, especially in producing musical works. The system is capable of processing audio data and musical patterns through complex algorithms, so that it can create new compositions simply by writing certain commands on the main menu. This capability shows that the technology no longer merely functions as a production tool, but has occupied a position resembling a creation subject in creative industry practice. Consequently, entities like Suno AI raise new problems in copyright law, particularly regarding their legal standing in the creation process and ownership of works. This raises debate about whether non-human entities can be recognized as having legal rights and obligations as creators regulated in legislation (Rama et al., 2023).

In the Indonesian legal system, the definition of creator is regulated in Article 1 paragraph 2 of Law No. 28 of 2014 concerning Copyright, which states that "A creator is one person or several people who individually or jointly produce a creation that is distinctive and personal." Based on this article, what is meant by creator is one person or several people who individually or jointly produce a creation. Then the element "distinctive and personal" in the article contains the meaning that the creation is born from the results of expression, inner experience, and human intellectual ability. Meanwhile, Article 31 of Law No. 28 of 2014 concerning Copyright emphasizes that "The creator is the party stated as the creator, listed in the creation, or registered in the general register of creations." This formulation shows that the element of personality is the main basis for recognizing someone as a creator, namely only humans (*natuurlijke persoon*) or legal entities (*rechts persoon*) who have legal consciousness and the ability to be responsible that can be recognized as legal subjects within the framework of copyright protection (Wasiska & Faisal, 2025).

Similar provisions are reflected in Law No. 11 of 2008 concerning Information and Electronic Transactions (ITE Law) as amended by Law No. 19 of 2016, which states in Article 1 paragraph 5 that "An electronic system is a series of devices and procedures that function to process and disseminate electronic information". This definition emphasizes that electronic systems are positioned as means or technological devices, not as legal actors. This explains that legal responsibility remains attached to humans as operators or users of the system. Further confirmation can be found in Government Regulation Number 71 of 2019 concerning Implementation of Electronic Systems and Transactions, which states that "Electronic system operators are fully responsible for the security, reliability, and continuity of the system used". Thus, digital platforms like Suno AI are only viewed as part of an electronic system controlled by the operator, not as an independent legal subject.

Then Regulation of the Minister of Communication and Informatics Number 3 of 2021 concerning Standards for Private Electronic System Implementation emphasizes the

principle of accountability and human responsibility in every activity using electronic systems. Operators are required to guarantee system integrity and maintain data security and generated activities. This strengthens the legal position that digital devices cannot have their own legal status, but are entirely under human supervision and responsibility (Mayana et al., 2024). A similar principle is emphasized in Circular Letter of the Minister of Communication and Informatics Number 9 of 2023 concerning Artificial Intelligence Ethics, which places human-centeredness, accountability, and human responsibility as the basis for using digital technology. This circular clearly rejects the view that automatic systems can stand as autonomous entities that have legal rights and obligations, thus still placing humans as the party who has full responsibility for all forms of its use.

When compared with policies in the United States, especially in the State of Massachusetts where the Suno AI platform is domiciled, the legal approach applied also does not place digital systems as independent legal entities. Through Executive Order No. 628: Establishing an Artificial Intelligence Strategic Task Force, the Governor of Massachusetts formed a strategic task force that functions to provide recommendations regarding technology governance, research development, industry collaboration, and ethical and security guidelines in its use. This policy focuses on establishing a strategic framework and ethical oversight of technological developments, not on granting legal status or recognition as a creator subject

There is an important precedent in the United States that clarifies the legal position of artificial intelligence in the realm of copyright, namely a decision issued by the U.S. Copyright Office (USCO). In a case filed by Stephen Thaler, a scientist who applied for copyright registration for a picture entitled "A Recent Entrance to Paradise" that was entirely produced by his artificial intelligence called Creativity Machine, USCO rejected the application. The agency emphasized that the work could not obtain copyright protection because it did not meet the element of creation by humans. According to copyright law principles in the United States, only works produced through human expression and creativity can obtain legal recognition as protected creations. When compared with legal provisions in Indonesia, USCO's view is in line with Article 1 paragraph 2 in conjunction with Article 31 of Law No. 28 of 2014 concerning Copyright, which explicitly requires that creators must be humans or legal entities that have legal personality.

Thus, both in the Indonesian legal system and in Massachusetts, the position of digital systems like Suno AI is still viewed as a tool or technical means in the creative process and digital economic activities. Both have the same view that such systems cannot be categorized as legal subjects that have consciousness and responsibility like humans. However, the difference lies in the approach where Indonesia emphasizes aspects of accountability and legal responsibility of operators, while Massachusetts focuses on establishing strategic policies and ethical oversight to regulate the direction of its development (Nararya et al., 2024).

Based on the entire national and international legal framework, it can be seen that the legal standing of Suno AI as a creator has not been recognized normatively because it does

not meet the element of legal personality as determined in legislation. This platform only serves as a tool used by humans to facilitate the creation process, not as a legal subject that has copyright. Thus, legal rights and obligations remain with humans as users or developers of the system. However, increasingly rapid technological developments demand updates to the legal system, especially in the field of copyright, so that it can adapt to new realities without changing its basic principle, namely appreciation of creativity and human responsibility as the main source of work creation (Sukmaningsih, 2025).

3.2. Legal Responsibility for Musical Works Produced Through Artificial Intelligence in the Perspective of Intellectual Property Rights

Advances in digital technology have changed the landscape of intellectual work creation, including in the field of music. The presence of artificial intelligence-based systems capable of processing data and producing musical compositions raises fundamental questions about who is legally responsible for the works produced. In the aspect of intellectual property rights, especially related to copyright, the issue of legal responsibility becomes important because it concerns the protection of moral and economic rights of legitimate creators, as well as legal certainty for parties utilizing such technology in creative activities. As stated in Article 4 of Law No. 28 of 2014 concerning Copyright, which explains that "Copyright as referred to in Article 3 letter a is an exclusive right consisting of moral rights and economic rights." The essence of this article is that the term "exclusive right" refers to a privilege granted solely to the Creator, meaning no other individual or entity may use or exploit that right without the Creator's consent. Meanwhile, copyright holders who are not the original Creators possess only a portion of this exclusive right, specifically limited to economic rights. According to Article 1 paragraph (3) of Law No. 28 of 2014 on Copyright, "a creation refers to any intellectual work in the realms of science, art, or literature that results from inspiration, ideas, imagination, talent, skill, or expertise, and is manifested in a tangible or perceptible form." Based on this article, a musical work produced through AI can be registered or granted copyright because basically the work is the thinking of Suno AI users which is then realized and manifested in tangible form. However, musical works produced through Suno AI still give rise to legal consequences if they contain elements of infringement on the copyright of others. Legal responsibility for such infringement is not attached to Suno AI, but to humans who act as developers, owners, or users of Suno AI. This provision is contained in Article 34 of Law No. 28 of 2014 on Copyright, which stipulates that "when a work is conceptualized by one person but executed and realized by another under the direction and supervision of the designer, the individual who conceived the work shall be regarded as the Creator." Based on this Article, all three can be held accountable for violations that occur according to their level of involvement in the creation process or utilization of works (Agustina et al., 2024).

Article 112 of Law No. 28 of 2014 on Copyright stipulates that any act of copyright infringement may result in criminal penalties, which include imprisonment for up to two years and/or a maximum fine of at most Rp300,000,000.00 (three hundred million rupiah).

Legal proceedings are conducted according to the type of violation (offense) that occurs, and are usually initiated with a report from the aggrieved copyright holder. One solution that can be applied is the implementation of a proportional royalty payment system, either through an initial licensing agreement or based on standard rates in the relevant sector. In addition, compensation as a form of compensation also needs to be considered if violations cannot be avoided. This compensation must include the profits obtained by the infringer from the use of the copyrighted work, with the amount clearly determined by the plaintiff without taking into account other factors outside copyright aspects. Types of losses that can be claimed include loss of income, decline in reputation, and costs incurred to protect copyright (Fadillah, 2024).

There was a case of using AI in song creation in America. On June 24, 2024, Sony Music Entertainment, Universal Music Group, and Warner Records officially sued Suno AI and Udio AI in federal court in Boston and New York. The Recording Industry Association of America (RIAA) announced lawsuits against Suno AI and Udio AI on allegations of copyright infringement. Both platforms are accused of exploiting recording works owned by various famous artists, from Chuck Berry to Mariah Carey, to train their systems without permission, so they are considered to violate the copyright and moral rights of music creators. The lawsuit demands compensation of up to US\$150,000 (approximately Rp2.25 billion) for each infringed work. Mitch Glazier, Chairman and Chief Executive of RIAA, stated that the music industry supports collaboration with responsible AI developers. In response, Suno and Udio defended themselves by filing a "fair use" claim based on United States copyright law, and considered the lawsuit an attempt by the big industry to block competition from independent developers. Thus, Suno AI and Udio AI, which copy and exploit artists' works for their own benefit without consent or compensation, actually hinder progress and commitment to truly innovative and ethical AI development (Zalfa'na et al., 2024).

In addition, in early 2025, GEMA (*Gesellschaft für musikalische Aufführungs- und mechanische Vervielfältigungsrechte*), a collective management organization for music copyright in Germany, also sued Suno for similar alleged violations. This shows that legal issues related to the use of musical works by AI have become a global issue. In Indonesia, similar practices also raise legal concerns because they intersect with Law No. 28 of 2014 concerning Copyright and Law No. 27 of 2022 concerning Personal Data Protection (PDP), especially if AI imitates the voice or distinctive style of an artist. Because, AI that imitates the voice or style of artists has the potential to violate the rights of performers (Article 23 of the Copyright Law) and moral rights (Articles 5-7 of the Copyright Law), especially if it damages the artist's reputation. Voice as biometric data is also protected by the PDP Law, so its use without permission can result in administrative to criminal sanctions. In addition, Circular Letter of the Minister of Communication and Informatics Number 9 of 2023 concerning Artificial Intelligence (AI) Ethics emphasizes the importance of compliance with intellectual property principles (Hutasoit & Boen, 2025).

In Indonesia, there was recently a case related to the misuse of AI in song creation. A man

from East Jakarta named Fasal Hasan alias Luciano (50) allegedly committed fraud against a victim who ordered songs manually. In the initial agreement, the victim ordered 60 songs at a price of Rp 2 million per song, so the total reached Rp 120 million. However, in its implementation, Luciano did not actually create the songs manually, but used AI technology to create musical works that he sold to the victim. These actions made the victim feel deceived because the work results received were not in accordance with the agreement and the promised creative value. After realizing this, the victim reported to the police, and Polrestabes Semarang designated Luciano as a Wanted Person (DPO). In the investigation process, police found that Luciano utilized AI technology to produce songs without significant human involvement, but still sold them as if they were his own creations.

This case is a concrete example of how AI technology can be used unethically in the field of art and creative industries. The use of AI without transparency to consumers or clients has the potential to violate the economic and moral rights of others. Legally, according to Article 9 paragraph (1) and Article 5 paragraph (1) of the Copyright Law, such actions violate the economic rights and moral rights of creators, because the perpetrator claims works that are not the result of his own creativity (Prasetyo, 2022). In addition, based on Article 112 of the Copyright Law, such violations can be subject to imprisonment of up to 2 years and/or a maximum fine of Rp300 million. From a juridical perspective, AI cannot be recognized as a "creator" because according to Article 1 paragraph 2, only humans have the capacity to create that is distinctive and personal. Therefore, works entirely produced by AI have no copyright protection unless there is a real human contribution (Gayatri, & Samsithawrati, 2025). In this case, Luciano himself is fully responsible for the misleading use of AI. His actions also violate the principle of good faith in contracts as regulated in Article 1338 of the Civil Code, because the perpetrator was not honest about the manual song-making method that had been agreed upon.

Regarding legal responsibility for musical works produced through Suno AI artificial intelligence, as regulated in Law No. 28 of 2014 concerning Copyright and Law No. 1 of 2024 concerning ITE, it emphasizes that legal responsibility is attached to legal subjects, namely developers or users who control AI technology. If copyright infringement occurs through systems like Suno AI, then the party controlling or using it can be held legally accountable, not the AI itself. Unlike Indonesia, the United States does not yet have comprehensive regulations related to AI, but its legal practice refers to the Copyright Act of 1976 and the principle of "fair use". Only works that have an element of human authorship are recognized as protected creations, so works entirely produced by AI do not obtain copyright, unless there is significant human intervention. In addition, the Federal Trade Commission (FTC) and U.S. Copyright Office emphasize that AI developers or operators can be held accountable if copyright infringement, data misuse, or unethical commercial practices occur. Thus, in cases like Suno AI, users or developers who utilize the system to produce or distribute music without permission remain the party legally responsible, not the AI system itself (Kondoahi et al., 2024).

4. Conclusion

Based on the results of analysis of national and international legal provisions, it can be concluded that the legal standing of the Suno AI platform as a creator is not legally recognized in the Indonesian legal system, because AI is not a legal subject that has consciousness and legal responsibility. Based on Article 1 paragraph 2 in conjunction with Article 31 of Law No. 28 of 2014 concerning Copyright, creators can only be humans or legal entities that have legal personality. Thus, Suno AI only serves as a technological tool in the music creation process, while legal rights and responsibilities remain attached to users, developers, or parties who operate it. Wherein if copyright infringement occurs, then the party who can be held accountable is the human who uses or controls the AI system, not the AI system itself. This is in line with Articles 34 and 112 of Law No. 28 of 2014 which emphasize that copyright infringement can be subject to criminal sanctions and compensation against parties who consciously commit violations. Cases such as lawsuits against Suno AI and Udio AI in the United States, as well as cases of song creation fraud using AI in Indonesia, show that the use of AI without permission or transparency can violate moral rights, economic rights, and the principle of good faith in civil law. Therefore, regulatory updates in Indonesia are very urgent to adapt to the development of artificial intelligence technology in the field of copyright, in order to create legal certainty, protection of intellectual property rights, and ethical and responsible use of AI that is just and accountable.

5. References

Journals:

- Agustina, Salma, Elsa Bonde, Dea Lutfiananda Salsabila, Sylvana Murni Deborah Hutabarat, & Ridha Wahyuni. (2024). *Perlindungan Hak Cipta Karya Musik di Dalam Digital Service Platform*. UNES Journal of Swara Justisia, 7(1), 431-432. <https://swarajustisia.unespadang.ac.id/index.php/UJSJ/article/view/48>.
- Andanni, Aqilah Putri, & Budi Santoso. (2025). *Perlindungan Hukum Terhadap Pelanggaran Karya Cipta yang Dihasilkan Melalui AI dan dikomersilkan Berdasarkan Undang-Undang Nomor 28 Tahun 2014 tentang Hak Cipta*. Jurnal Ilmu Hukum, Humaniora Dan Politik, 5(3), 2274-2280. <https://doi.org/10.38035/jihhp.v5i3.4039>.
- Djaafara, Aryuni Fitri, & R. Rahaditya. (2024). *Perlindungan Hukum Terhadap Hak Cipta Penyanyi dalam Era Digital: Studi Kasus Penipuan Penjualan Lagu Palsu*. Jurnal Pendidikan Indonesia, 5(12), 1599-1605. <https://doi.org/10.59141/japendi.v5i12.6502>.
- Fadillah, Rafly Nauval. (2024). *Perlindungan Hak Atas Kekayaan Intelektual Artificial Intelligence (AI) dari Perspektif Hak Cipta dan Paten*. Das Sollen: Jurnal Kajian Kontemporer Hukum Dan Masyarakat, 2(02), 1-13. <https://journal.forikami.com/index.php/dassollen/article/view/745>.
- Gayatri, Ni Made Laksmi Suya, & Putu Aras Samsithawrati. (2025). *Pengaturan hak cipta seni generatif AI di Indonesia: perspektif perbandingan dengan Uni Eropa*. Jurnal

- Kertha Wicara, 15(5), 291-301.
<https://ejournal4.unud.ac.id/index.php/wicara/id/article/view/34>.
- Kondoahi, Clianta Manuella, Emma V. T. Senewe & Imelda Amelia Tangkere. (2024). *Regulasi hukum terhadap perlindungan karya cipta lagu yang dihasilkan oleh teknologi artificial intelligence*. Lex Administratum, 12(5), 1-10.
<https://ejournal.unsrat.ac.id/v3/index.php/administratum/article/view/58014>.
- Mayana, Ranti Fauza, Tisni Santika, Yin Yin Win, Jamil Adrian Khalil Matalam, and Ahmad M Ramli. (2024). *Legal Issues of Artificial Intelligence Generated Works: Challenges on Indonesian Copyright Law*. LAW REFORM, 20(1), 58-76.
<https://doi.org/10.14710/lr.v20i1.61262>.
- Mustofa, Roqi Akbar. (2024). Hak Cipta Atas Musik Yang Diciptakan Melalui Aplikasi Artificial Intelligence Google Musiclm Perspektif Direktorat Jenderal Kekayaan Intelektual Kantor Wilayah Jawa Timur. Skripsi. Malang: Universitas Islam Negeri Maulana Malik Ibrahim. <http://etheses.uin-malang.ac.id/id/eprint/64862>.
- Nararya, Chama Lamellosa, Sudirman, & Wahyudi Umar. (2024). *Kepastian Hukum Kekayaan Intelektual Terhadap Karya Ilmiah Yang Dihasilkan Chatgpt*. Jurnal Hukum Lex Generalis, 5(4), 1-13.
<https://Ojs.Rewangrencanq.Com/Index.Php/Jhlq/Article/View/596>.
- Prasetyo, Ramadhio Adi. (2022). *Hak Kekayaan Intelektual (Hak Cipta) Sebagai Objek Waris Dalam Hukum Perdata*. Jipro: Journal Of Intellectual Property, 5(1), 58-69.
<https://doi.org/10.20885/Jipro.Vol5.Iss1>.
- Rama, Bagus Gede Ari, Dewa Krisna Prasada, & Kadek Julia Mahadewi. (2023). *Urgensi Pengaturan Artificial Intelligence (Ai) Dalam Bidang Hukum Hak Cipta Di Indonesia*. Jurnal Rechtsens, 12(2), 216-231. <https://doi.org/10.56013/Rechtsens.V12I2.2395>.
- Sukmaningsih, Ni Komang Irma Adi. (2025). *Urgensi Pengaturan Hak Cipta Di Era Kecerdasan Buatan: Tantangan Dan Solusi Hukum Di Indonesia*. Prosiding Seminar Nasional Hukum, Bisnis, Sains Dan Teknologi, 5(1), 13-21.
<https://Ojs.Udb.Ac.Id/Hubisintek/Article/View/4281>.
- Tanujaya, Calista Putri. (2024). *Analisis Karya Ciptaan Artificial Intelligence Menurut Undang-Undang Nomor 28 Tahun 2014 Tentang Hak Cipta*. Jleb: Journal Of Law Education And Business, 2(1), 435-443. <https://doi.org/10.57235/Jleb.V2i1.1763>.
- Wasiska, Asti & Ahmad Faisal. (2025). *Perlindungan Hukum Atas Karya Yang Dihasilkan Oleh Kecerdasan Buatan (Ai) Dalam Kerangka Hak Kekayaan Intelektual Di Indonesia*. Mustika Justice, 4(2), 1-10.
<https://Jurnal.Uic.Ac.Id/Mustikajustice/Article/View/406>.
- Zalfa'na, Najma, Bernard Nainggoan, & Wiwik Sri Widiarty. (2024). *Royalti Atas Lagu Dan/Atau Musik Yang Dinyanyikan Oleh Kecerdasan Buatan (Artificial Intelligence) Di Platform Digital*. Action Research Literate, 8(10), 1-20.
<https://doi.org/10.46799/ar.v8i10.2235>.

Books:

- Atmoko, Dwi, Rara Amalia Cendhayanie, Marissa Kemala Dirgantini, & Lindri Purbowati. (2023). *Hukum Hak Kekayaan Intelektual*. Malang: PT Literasi Nusantara Abadi Grup.
- Fajar, Mukti dan Yulianto Achmad. (2010). *Dualisme Penelitian Hukum Normatif Dan Empiris*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.
- Ibrahim, Johnny. (2008). *Teori dan Metodologi Penelitian Hukum Normatif*. Surabaya: Bayumedia.
- Jacob, Yossie Maria Y., Ishak Alfred Tungga & Umbu Lily Pekuwali. (2023). *Hukum Bisnis & Hak atas Kekayaan Intelektual (HaKI)*. Kupang: Universitas Nusa Cendana.
- Mahmud. (2011). *Metode Penelitian Pendidikan*. Bandung: Pustaka Setia.
- Moeleong, Lexy J. (1996). *Metodologi Penelitian Kualitatif*. Jakarta: PT. Remaja Rosdakaya.
- Prahara, Surya. (2024). *Buku Ajar Hak Kekayaan Intelektual: Perlindungan Folklor dalam Konteks Hak Kekayaan Komunal yang Bersifat Sui Generis*. Padang: Universitas Bung Hatta.
- Soekanto, Soerjono dan Sri Mamudji. (2003). *Penelitian Hukum Normatif, Suatu Tinjauan Singkat*. Jakarta: Raja Grafindo Persada.

Internet:

- Hukumonline. (2025). "Karya Tanpa Jiwa: AI vs Musisi dan Hak Cipta." Accessed on November 9, 2025, from <https://www.hukumonline.com/berita/a/karya-tanpa-jiwa--ai-vs-musisi-dan-hak-cipta-lt685cf17dcf299/>.
- Hukumonline. (2025). "Undang-Undang Republik Indonesia Nomor 28 Tahun 2014 tentang Hak Cipta." Accessed on November 9, 2025, from <https://www.hukumonline.com/pusatdata/detail/lt5460681737444/undang-undang-nomor-28-tahun-2014/>.
- Kumparan. (2025). "Tipu-tipu pria di Jaktim pakai AI ciptakan lagu lalu dijual Rp 2 juta." Accessed on November 9, 2025, from <https://kumparan.com/kumparannews/tipu-tipu-pria-di-jaktim-pakai-ai-ciptakan-lagu-lalu-dijual-rp-2-juta-26C6xnjf81l>.
- U.S. Copyright Office (USCO). (2022). "A Recent Entrance to Paradise-Review Board." Accessed on November 8, 2025, from <https://www.copyright.gov/rulings-filings/review-board/docs/a-recent-entrance-to-paradise.pdf>.

Regulation:

- 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia.
- Law No. 11 of 2008 concerning Information and Electronic Transactions.
- Law No. 28 of 2014 concerning Copyright.
- Government of the Republic of Indonesia. (2019). Government Regulation Number 71 of 2019 concerning Implementation of Electronic Systems and Transactions.
- Minister of Communication and Informatics Number 3 of 2021 concerning Business Activity Standards and Product Standards in Risk-Based Business Licensing in the Postal, Telecommunication, and Electronic Systems and Transactions Sectors.



Jurnal Daulat Hukum
Volume 8 No.4 December 2025
ISSN: 2614-560X
SINTA 3 Decree No.
0547/ES/DT.05.00/2024
Dated May 15, 2024

Legal Analysis of Intellectual Property Rights...
**(Angga Sandhika Raharjo & Andriyanto Adhi
Nugroho)**

Ministry of Communication and Informatics of the Republic of Indonesia. (2023). Circular Letter of the Minister of Communication and Informatics Number 9 of 2023 concerning Artificial Intelligence Ethics.

Executive Office of the Governor, Commonwealth of Massachusetts. (2024). Executive Order No. 628: Establishing an Artificial Intelligence Strategic Task Force.