JSS Law College
Autonomous
Kuvempunagar, Mysuru

JSS Journal for Legal Studies and Research
[ISSN 2321-4171]

Navigating Intellectual Property in Brain-Computer Interfacing Technology Systems

Dr. Anil S. M. [1]

Dr. N. Vani Shree [2]

Abstract

The advent of Brain-Computer Interface (BCI) technology represents a transformative shift in human-machine interaction, with applications spanning healthcare, education, and entertainment. As BCIs hold the potential to revolutionize industries and improve quality of life, they also introduce complex Intellectual Property Rights (IPR) challenges. Key issues include the patentability of neural algorithms, ownership of neural data, and the protection of BCI-generated creative works. Proprietary concerns surrounding signal processing algorithms and machine learning models, coupled with the cross-border nature of BCI innovation, complicate international IP enforcement. Additionally, the integration of data protection laws with IPR frameworks is vital to safeguarding sensitive neural data that could reveal personal cognitive patterns. This article examines the tension between encouraging technological advancement and protecting user privacy, exploring recent case law and regulatory developments. It also proposes strategies for harmonizing global IP regulations, promoting open innovation through collaborative research models, and addressing ethical concerns such as equitable access and user consent. The aim is to provide policymakers, legal professionals, and technology developers with a balanced approach to navigating the evolving intersection of IPR and BCI technology, ensuring the protection of both innovation and individual rights.

Keywords: Brain-Computer Interface, IPR, Intellectual Property Rights, Neural Data Ownership Patentability of Neural Algorithms, Data Protection and Privacy

CITATION: Dr. Anil S. M. & Dr. N. Vani Shree," Navigating Intellectual Property in Brain-Computer Interfacing Technology Systems", JSS Journal for Legal Studies and Research, Vol. 10 (2) (2024), pp. 117-137, available at https://www.jsslawcollege.in/jsslc-online-journal/

[1] Student of LLM at JSS Law College, Autonomous, Mysuru, Karnataka 570023.
[2] Principal and Faculty of Law at JSS Law College, Autonomous, Mysore, 570023.
Email: vanishreejsslc@gmail.com

INTRODUCTION

The rapid advancement of Brain-Computer Interface (BCI) technology is revolutionizing and reforming the way humans interact with machines, marking a substantial shift in fields such as healthcare, education, and entertainment.[3] By enabling direct communication between the brain and external devices, BCIs have the potential to overcome physical and cognitive limitations, affecting the intellectual and perceptive thinking transforming and metamorphosing lives and industries. This pioneering and cutting edge technology offers unprecedented opportunities to improve quality of life, enhance learning and understanding experiences, and create more immersive and ingressive digital environments. In healthcare, BCIs are being used for neurorehabilitation, helping patients recover motor functions after strokes or spinal cord injuries, and controlling advanced prosthetics that respond to neural signals.[4] In education, BCIs facilitate personalized learning, allowing real-time monitoring of students' cognitive engagement to tailor educational content in a concurrent and instantaneous manner. The entertainment industry is also leveraging BCI technology to create immersive gaming and virtual reality experiences[5] that respond dynamically to users' mental states, offering a new level of interactivity and engagement. Despite their transformative potential, BCIs pose complex Intellectual Property Rights (IPR) challenges that require adaptive and comprehensive legal frameworks. From questions of patentability for neural algorithms to data ownership and privacy issues, BCI technologies blur the lines between human creativity and machine intelligence.[6] To harness their full potential while safeguarding individual rights and promoting equitable access, it is imperative to address these legal challenges through innovative regulatory approaches.

BRAIN-COMPUTER INTERFACE (BCI) TECHNOLOGIES

Brain-Computer Interface (BCI) technologies enable direct communication between the human brain and external devices, revolutionizing how humans interact with machines. By bypassing traditional communication pathways, BCIs allow users to control and manipulate external systems through neural signals, unlocking and unravelling transformative potential across various diverse fields.[7]

[3] SpringerLink. (2023). *Brain-Computer Interface Technology: Applications and Ethical Challenges*
[4] DelveInsight. (n.d.). *Brain-Computer Interface (BCI) in Healthcare: Transforming Patient Care.*
[5] MDPI. (2024). *Advancements in Brain-Computer Interfaces for Immersive Gaming and Virtual Reality.*
[6] 42Lawyers. (n.d.). *Intellectual Property in Brain-Computer Interface Technologies.*
[7] Vahle, J. (2020). *Opportunities and Implications of Brain-Computer Interface Technology in Defense. Department of Defense Media.*

The core of BCI technology lies in its ability to capture and translate neural activity into actionable commands. Signal acquisition is the first step, where data is collected through non-invasive methods like EEG or invasive intracranial or other implants for higher precision. Once collected, signal processing filters and amplifies the data, analyses the signals, reduces the associated noise signals and allows an impeccable feature extraction to identify meaningful patterns, such as motor intentions in relation to the mind and the though process. Translation algorithms then convert these patterns into commands that control output devices, which range from robotic arms to communication aids. This seamless integration of hardware and software components is what enables BCIs to function effectively across different applications.

BCIs have significant real-world applications, particularly in healthcare, where they assist individuals with motor impairments by enabling them to control prosthetic limbs or wheelchairs.[8] Communication aids empower patients with conditions like Locked-In Syndrome (LIS) to express themselves which was hither to unheard of. In gaming and entertainment, BCIs offer unique experiences where players control avatars using only their thoughts, enhancing engagement.[9] For defence and security, BCIs provide soldiers with cognitive monitoring tools to manage stress and fatigue. Additionally, in education, personalized learning systems driven by neural feedback adapt to individual cognitive states, optimizing learning outcomes. Despite their promise, BCI technologies raise significant ethical and social concerns.[10] Privacy and security are paramount, given the sensitivity of neural data and its potential misuse for surveillance or manipulation. The concept of cognitive liberty ensures individuals retain control over their mental processes, safeguarding against intrusive applications. Accessibility and equity[11] are also critical, as disparities in access to advanced BCIs could exacerbate socio-economic inequalities. On the technical front, challenges such as improving the accuracy and reliability of neural signal interpretation and minimizing latency remain priorities. Furthermore, legal and regulatory

[8] Frontiers in Computational Neuroscience. (2022). *Personalized Learning Systems Using BCI Neural Feedback*
[9] Frontiers in Computer Science. (2022). *Immersive Gaming through Brain-Computer Interfaces.*
[10] AMA Journal of Ethics. (2007). *Ethical and Social Challenges of Brain-Computer Interfaces*
[11] MDPI Sensors. (2023). *Technical Challenges in Brain-Computer Interfaces: Accuracy, Latency, and Integration*

frameworks, including Intellectual Property Rights (IPR) and data protection laws, must evolve to address the unique issues posed by BCI technologies.[12]

GADGETS USED IN BRAIN-COMPUTER INTERFACE (BCI) TECHNOLOGIES

Brain-Computer Interface (BCI) technologies rely on a variety of devices to bridge the gap between neural activity and external systems. The first crucial step in any BCI workflow is signal acquisition, which involves capturing neural signals directly from the brain. Non-invasive devices such as EEG headsets (e.g., Emotiv Epoc+ and NeuroSky MindWave)[13] are widely used for their convenience and portability, while more advanced tools like fNIRS devices and MEG systems offer real-time monitoring of brain activity.[14] For higher precision, implantable brain sensors such as the NeuroPace RNS System are employed in clinical applications, enabling direct neural data acquisition.[15]

Once neural signals are captured, they must be processed and translated into usable formats. Signal processing units,[16] such as Open BCI[17] modules, filter and amplify raw neural data to ensure accuracy.[18] This is followed by feature extraction and translation gadgets, like the Brain Gate Decoder,[19] which analyze neural patterns and convert them into commands. These components are powered by sophisticated machine learning algorithms, enabling accurate interpretation of complex neural signals.[20] The translated commands are then executed by output devices, which allow users to interact with their environment. For instance, prosthetic limbs like the DEKA Arm System and exoskeletons from Ekso Bionics[21] help restore mobility and independence to individuals with motor impairments. In the entertainment sector, VR interfaces integrated with BCI enhance gaming and training experiences, while communication aids like EyeControl devices enable individuals with speech impairments to communicate effectively using neural inputs.

---

[12] Nature. (2019). *Legal and Regulatory Considerations for Brain-Computer Interfaces*
[13] Emotiv. (n.d.). *Emotiv Epoc+ EEG Headset.*
[14] NeuroSky. (n.d.). *MindWave Mobile 2 EEG Headset*
[15] Nirx. (n.d.). *NIRSport 2 Functional Near-Infrared Spectroscopy Device*
[16] Elekta. (n.d.). *Neuromag MEG System.*
[17] OpenBCI. (n.d.). *OpenBCI Processing Units*
[18] NeuroPace. (n.d.). *RNS System for Epilepsy Treatment*
[19] BrainGate. (n.d.). *BrainGate Neural Decoder*
[20] DEKA Research. (n.d.). *DEKA Arm System*
[21] Ekso Bionics. (n.d.). *EksoGT Exoskeleton*

Finally, advancements in wearable and hybrid BCIs are making the technology more accessible and versatile.[22] Portable gadgets, such as the Muse 2 EEG system and Neurable Smart Glasses, provide users with lightweight, wireless solutions for everyday use.[23] Hybrid systems, combining BCI with technologies like eye tracking (e.g., Tobii Pro Glasses)[24] or muscle sensors (e.g., Myo Armband), enhance functionality by integrating multiple input modalities.[25] These innovations are driving BCI adoption across healthcare, defense, and consumer markets, paving the way for broader and more impactful applications.[26]

METHODS FOR CAPTURING, INTERPRETING, AND TRANSLATING BRAIN SIGNALS INTO MACHINE COMMANDS

The first step in Brain-Computer Interface (BCI) technology involves capturing neural signals, which are electrical or physiological activities generated by neurons. Several methods are used depending on the accuracy and application. Electroencephalography (EEG)[27] is a widely used non-invasive method that places electrodes on the scalp to measure electrical signals, making it ideal for tasks like cursor control or typing.[28] However, its spatial resolution is limited, and it is prone to noise from muscle activity. Magnetoencephalography (MEG)[29], which measures magnetic fields produced by neural activity, offers higher temporal resolution but requires expensive and bulky equipment, limiting its use to lab environments. Functional Near-Infrared Spectroscopy (fNIRS)[30] measures changes in blood oxygen levels, providing a portable, non-invasive solution for basic brain-computer tasks. For high precision, implanted microelectrodes directly record neural activity, making them suitable for controlling prosthetics. However, these invasive methods come with surgical risks, including infection and tissue damage.

[22] Muse. (n.d.). *Muse 2: The Brain-Sensing Headband*
[23] Neurable. (n.d.). *Neurable Smart Glasses.*
[24] Tobii. (n.d.). *Tobii Pro Glasses*
[25] EyeControl. (n.d.). *EyeControl BCI Speech Device*
[26] Myo. (n.d.). *Myo Armband*
[27] Emotiv. (n.d.). *EEG Technology for Brain-Computer Interfaces*
[28] NeuroSky. (n.d.). *MindWave Mobile 2 EEG Headset*
[29] Elekta. (n.d.). *Magnetoencephalography (MEG) Technology*
[30] Nirx. (n.d.). *NIRSport 2 Functional Near-Infrared Spectroscopy Device*

Invasive Techniques for Brain-Computer Interfaces (BCIs) involve the surgical implantation of sensors to directly measure neural activity, offering high precision and reliability. Intracortical implants,[31] such as microelectrodes, are inserted into specific brain regions to record activity from individual neurons. These implants provide fine-grained neural data, making them ideal for controlling advanced devices like prosthetics, particularly in cases of paralysis where precise movement restoration is required. Another invasive method, Electrocorticography (ECoG),[32] involves placing electrodes directly on the brain's surface during surgery. ECoG captures high-resolution neural signals with less noise compared to non-invasive methods like EEG, making it suitable for tasks requiring detailed neural monitoring and control.

Once neural signals are captured, they must be processed and interpreted to identify the user's intent. Signal preprocessing involves removing noise and artifacts from the data, such as interference from eye blinks or muscle movements.[33] Techniques like band-pass filtering help isolate relevant frequencies. After preprocessing, feature extraction identifies meaningful patterns, such as specific brainwave frequencies (e.g., alpha or beta waves). Common techniques include Fast Fourier Transform (FFT) and Principal Component Analysis (PCA). Machine learning and AI algorithms play a crucial role in interpreting these patterns. Algorithms like Support Vector Machines (SVM)classify neural signal patterns, while neural networks learn complex patterns in large datasets. Hidden Markov Models (HMMs) are particularly useful for interpreting sequential data, such as tracking continuous movements.[34] The interpreted neural signals are then converted into actionable commands through translation algorithms. These algorithms map specific brain signal patterns to predefined machine actions, such as moving a cursor or controlling a robotic arm. Control systems further refine these commands. Proportional controllers adjust the intensity or speed of an action based on the signal strength, while discrete controllers trigger binary actions like "on/off" or "left/right." The commands are executed by brain-actuated devices, including neuroprosthetics that enable users to control robotic limbs or BCI-enabled software[35] for typing and gaming. For example, a user's thought to move a cursor right can be

---

[31] NeuroPace. (n.d.). *Intracortical Implants for Neural Monitoring and Control*

[32] SpringerLink. (2023). *Advances in Electrocorticography (ECoG) for Brain-Computer Interfaces.*

[33] NeuroPace. (n.d.). *RNS System for Epilepsy Treatment*

[34] OpenBCI. (n.d.). *BCI Signal Processing Modules.*

[35] BrainGate. (n.d.). *Neural Decoding and Translation Algorithms.*

captured by an EEG headset, interpreted by machine learning algorithms, and translated into a command that moves the cursor on a screen.[36]

A typical BCI workflow demonstrates how these components work together. First, the system captures neural signals using an EEG headset. The captured signals are then processed and interpreted using machine learning algorithms to identify the user's intent, such as "move right." This intent is translated into a machine command that moves a robotic arm or cursor. Finally, the system provides visual feedback, enabling the user to refine their control. This seamless integration of signal acquisition, advanced machine learning, and translation algorithms[37] allows BCIs to transform neural activity into actionable commands, paving the way for innovative applications in healthcare, defense, and beyond.

INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY RIGHTS (IPR) ISSUES IN BRAIN-COMPUTER INTERFACE (BCI) TECHNOLOGIES

The development of Brain-Computer Interface (BCI) technologies brings forth a range of Intellectual Property Rights (IPR) challenges due to its interdisciplinary nature, combining hardware, software, algorithms, and neural data. These technologies are rapidly evolving, leading to legal complexities surrounding their protection and commercialization. One of the primary IPR concerns is patentability.[38] While hardware components like EEG headsets or implants often qualify for patents, they usually involve incremental innovations. The patentability of software and algorithms, crucial for signal processing[39] and machine learning, varies significantly across jurisdictions.[40] For example, Europe has stricter standards compared to the U.S. Moreover, determining the novelty and non-obviousness of these algorithms remains contentious, as illustrated in cases like *Thaler v. Commissioner of Patents (2021)*, which questioned AI's role in inventorship—a growing issue in BCI innovations.[41]

[36] MDPI Sensors. (2023). *Advancements in Signal Processing for BCIs.*
[37] SpringerLink. (2023). *Machine Learning in Brain-Computer Interfaces: Applications and Challenges*
[38] Legal Lawyers. (2021). *Thaler v. Commissioner of Patents: The Landmark Case About AI as an Inventor in Australia*
[39] MDPI Sensors. (2023). *Advancements in Signal Processing for BCIs*
[40] SpringerLink. (2023). *Machine Learning in Brain-Computer Interfaces: Applications and Challenges*
[41] NeuroPace. (n.d.). *Intracortical Implants for Neural Monitoring and Control*

Another pressing issue is copyright ownership of BCI-generated outputs. BCIs can produce creative works, such as digital art or music, from brain activity. This raises the question: who owns the copyright? The user whose neural signals were captured, the developer of the BCI system, or the creator of the algorithm? For instance, if a paralyzed artist uses a BCI to create art, does the copyright belong solely to them, or does the BCI developer have a claim? Additionally, neural data visualizations may require copyright protection, but their originality and authorship could be debated.[42] This complexity underscores the need for clear legal definitions in ownership and usage rights for BCI-generated content. Trade secrets and proprietary algorithms form another critical aspect of BCI-related IPR. Companies invest heavily in developing unique algorithms to interpret neural signals, which are often protected as trade secrets. However, these algorithms are vulnerable to reverse engineering if competitors gain access to the hardware or software. Balancing the need for confidentiality with the necessity of sharing technology with collaborators or users is a significant challenge. Legal frameworks like the Defend Trade Secrets Act (2016) in the U.S. offer protection, but cross-border enforcement remains difficult, creating potential loopholes for intellectual property theft

The issue of data ownership and privacy is particularly sensitive in BCI technology. Neural data, being highly personal and sensitive, raises significant concerns over its ownership and potential misuse. Should the user, the device manufacturer, or a third-party service analyzing the data hold ownership rights? Companies might seek to monetize this data for research or advertising, which could lead to ethical and legal disputes under regulations like the GDPR (EU) or CCPA (California).[43] Ensuring that neural data remains under the user's control and balancing innovation with privacy rights are pivotal in addressing these concerns.

The rise of Standard-Essential Patents (SEPs) in BCI technology also introduces complexities. As the industry evolves, certain BCI technologies may become standard, requiring SEPs to be licensed under FRAND (Fair, Reasonable, and Non-Discriminatory) terms.[44] Licensing disputes could emerge if patent holders demand excessive fees or deny licenses to competitors. This situation could hinder smaller companies and startups from accessing critical technology, potentially leading to monopolies. Ensuring fair licensing practices is essential for fostering a competitive and innovative environment in the BCI sector.

[42] European Commission. (2018). *General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR).*
[43] California Legislature. (2018). *California Consumer Privacy Act (CCPA).*
[44] OpenBCI. (n.d.). *BCI Signal Processing Modules*

Lastly, cross-border IPR enforcement presents significant challenges due to the global nature of BCI development.[45] Companies often operate across multiple countries, requiring patents and copyrights to be filed and enforced in each jurisdiction. This not only increases costs but also complicates the legal process, as IPR laws vary widely. These differences can create loopholes, leaving innovations inadequately protected in certain regions. To address these challenges, international collaboration and harmonization of IPR laws are crucial. The BCI sector must strike a balance between protecting proprietary research and promoting accessibility to maximize its societal benefits.

NAVIGATING RISKS AND ETHICAL CHALLENGES IN BRAIN-COMPUTER INTERFACE (BCI) TECHNOLOGIES

While Brain-Computer Interfaces (BCIs) hold immense promise for transforming human-machine interaction, they also come with significant risks. One of the primary concerns is physical harm, particularly in the case of invasive BCIs[46]. Surgical implantation of devices like intracortical electrodes carries risks such as infection, bleeding, and long-term complications like scarring or inflammation. Even non-invasive methods, such as prolonged use of EEG caps, can cause discomfort and skin irritation. Additionally, both invasive and non-invasive devices may malfunction, potentially leading to adverse neural effects, such as seizures or unintended muscle movements, which could compromise user safety.[47]

BCI use also presents considerable psychological and cognitive risks. The mental focus required for prolonged use can lead to cognitive fatigue and stress, particularly if the system fails to interpret user intentions accurately. Users may also develop psychological dependence on BCIs, relying heavily on them for daily activities. This dependence could impact their ability to function independently in cases of device malfunction or unavailability. Emotional and identity concerns arise when BCIs attempt to decode emotions or mental states,

[45] Defend Trade Secrets Act (DTSA). (2016). *Public Law 114-153*
[46] Burwell, S., Sample, M., & Racine, E. (2017). Ethical aspects of brain computer interfaces: a scoping review. *BMC Medical Ethics*, 18(1), 60
[47] Klein, E., Brown, T., Sample, M., Truitt, A. R., & Goering, S. (2015). Engineering the brain: Ethical issues and the introduction of neural devices. *Hastings Center Report*, 45(6), 26-35

potentially leaving users feeling exposed or vulnerable, affecting their sense of autonomy and control.[48]

Privacy and security risks are paramount in BCI technology due to the sensitive nature of neural data. BCIs can capture deeply personal information, including thoughts and mental health conditions.[49] Unauthorized access to this data could result in profiling, discrimination, or targeted manipulation.[50] The systems are also vulnerable to cybersecurity threats, such as hacking, where attackers could manipulate device behavior or extract neural data for malicious purposes. Ensuring robust data protection and cybersecurity measures is critical to prevent such risks.[51] The interpretation of BCI data introduces another layer of risk, particularly when handled by healthcare professionals, engineers, or machine learning algorithms. Errors in data interpretation can lead to misdiagnoses or inappropriate actions, such as unnecessary medical interventions.[52] Additionally, biases in machine learning algorithms may result in unequal performance across different demographic groups, potentially disadvantaging certain users. Ethical dilemmas arise when deciding how to act on neural data insights, especially in legal or medical contexts, where the stakes are high, and misinterpretations can have profound consequences.[53]

Lastly, the ethical and social implications of BCI use cannot be overlooked. There are concerns about loss of autonomy, where BCIs could be exploited to monitor or even influence users' actions, raising questions about human agency. Socially, individuals using BCIs may face stigma or discrimination, particularly if they rely on visible invasive devices. In medical contexts, unintended consequences could arise if BCIs are used to guide treatment decisions without adequate accuracy or understanding. [54]Additionally, long-term risks include potential

---

[48] Ienca, M., & Haselager, P. (2016). Hacking the brain: Brain–computer interfacing technology and the ethics of neurosecurity. *Ethics and Information Technology*, 18(2), 117-129.

[49] Clausen, J. (2011). Ethical brain stimulation—neuroethics of deep brain stimulation in research and clinical practice. *European Journal of Neuroscience*, 32(7), 1152-1162.

[50] Yuste, R., Goering, S., Arcas, B. A. Y., Bi, G., Carmena, J. M., Carter, A., ... & Wolpaw, J. (2017). Four ethical priorities for neurotechnologies and AI.

[51] Nijboer, F., Clausen, J., Allison, B. Z., & Haselager, P. (2013). The Asilomar Survey: Stakeholders' opinions on ethical issues related to brain–computer interfacing. *Neuroethics*, 6(3), 541-578.

[52] Kübler, A., & Birbaumer, N. (2008). Brain–computer interfaces and communication in paralysis: Extinction of goal directed thinking in completely paralysed patients? *Clinical Neurophysiology*, 119(11), 2658-2666.

[53] Chaudhary, U., Birbaumer, N., & Ramos-Murguialday, A. (2016). Brain–computer interfaces for communication and rehabilitation. *Nature Reviews Neurology*, 12(9), 513.

[54] Friedrich, E. V., Scherer, R., & Neuper, C. (2013). Long-term evaluation of a 4-class imagery-based brain–computer interface. *Clinical Neurophysiology*, 124(5), 916-927.

alterations in neural pathways due to constant feedback loops, which might affect cognitive or motor functions over time. Addressing these risks requires robust regulatory frameworks, informed consent processes, and continuous monitoring to ensure the safe and ethical use of BCI technologies.[55]

GLOBAL IPR ENFORCEMENT CHALLENGES IN BCI TECHNOLOGIES

The global nature of Brain-Computer Interface (BCI) technologies introduces significant challenges in enforcing Intellectual Property Rights (IPR) across jurisdictions.[56] Different countries have varying legal standards and procedures for granting and enforcing patents and copyrights, leading to jurisdictional conflicts in cross-border disputes.[57] For instance, a BCI innovation patented in one country might face infringement in another jurisdiction where the same patent is not recognized. This disparity complicates enforcement and often results in prolonged legal battles. Case studies highlight such issues, where companies developing BCI technologies encounter conflicting IP laws that hinder the seamless protection and commercialization of their innovations across borders.

Another critical aspect of global IPR challenges is the licensing of Standard-Essential Patents (SEPs) in BCI technologies. SEPs are crucial for ensuring interoperability among devices from different manufacturers, enabling standardized communication and functionality. Licensing SEPs under FRAND[58] (Fair, Reasonable, and Non-Discriminatory) terms is essential to prevent monopolistic practices and ensure fair access to core technologies.[59] However, disputes often arise over what constitutes "fair and reasonable" terms, with patent holders sometimes demanding exorbitant fees or denying licenses to competitors. Such conflicts can delay innovation and limit market access, particularly for smaller companies and startups striving to enter the BCI market.

[55] Haselager, P., Vlek, R., Hill, J., & Nijboer, F. (2009). A note on ethical aspects of BCI. *Neural Networks*, 22(9), 1352-1357.
[56] World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO). (n.d.). *Cross-Border Intellectual Property Disputes and Enforcement.*
[57] World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO). (n.d.). *Cross-Border Intellectual Property Disputes and Enforcement*
[58] Ericsson v. Micromax, Delhi High Court, India. (2015). *Case on FRAND Licensing and SEPs*
[59] Ericsson v. Micromax, Delhi High Court, India. (2015). *Case on FRAND Licensing and SEPs*

Global IPR Enforcement Challenges in BCI Technologies: The Indian Scenario

In India, the enforcement of Intellectual Property Rights (IPR) for Brain-Computer Interface (BCI) technologies faces unique challenges due to jurisdictional complexities and evolving legal frameworks. Indian IP law,[60] particularly under the Patents Act, 1970,[61] provides protection for hardware innovations and certain software inventions. However, enforcing these rights across borders can be problematic. For instance, a BCI technology patented in India may face infringement in jurisdictions where similar protections are either non-existent or interpreted differently.[62] Indian courts have addressed cross-border IP disputes, but the process remains cumbersome, especially when seeking enforcement or damages in multiple countries with diverse legal standards.

India's approach to Standard-Essential Patents (SEPs) and FRAND (Fair, Reasonable, and Non-Discriminatory)licensing is still evolving.[63] SEPs play a critical role in ensuring interoperability for emerging BCI technologies. Indian courts, such as in *Ericsson v. Micromax* (2015),[64] have emphasized the importance of FRAND licensing to prevent monopolistic practices. However, disputes often arise over the interpretation of "fair and reasonable" terms, with companies arguing over licensing fees and access. In the BCI context, ensuring affordable access to SEPs is vital for fostering innovation and supporting India's growing tech ecosystem, particularly for startups and small enterprises entering the BCI market.[65]

Future Directions for Brain-Computer Interfaces (BCIs) and Intellectual Property Rights (IPR)

The rapid advancement of Brain-Computer Interface (BCI) technologies highlights the urgent need for harmonizing global IP regulations to ensure uniform standards across jurisdictions. The lack of standardized frameworks can lead to inconsistencies in patentability, licensing, and enforcement, hampering innovation and commercialization. International cooperation is

[60] Indian Patents Act, 1970. (2022). *Legislation Governing Patent Law in India*
[61] Indian Patents Act, 1970. (2022). *Legislation Governing Patent Law in India.*
[62] Grosse Ruse-Khan, H. (2013). *The International Legal Framework for Cross-Border IPR Disputes. Journal of Intellectual Property Law & Practice*, 8(5), 340-352
[63] Choudhary, R., & Sengupta, A. (2021). *Standard-Essential Patents and FRAND Licensing in India. Indian Journal of Intellectual Property Law*, 12(2), 55-78
[64] OpenBCI. (n.d.). *Interoperability and Licensing Challenges in BCI Systems*
[65] Narayanan, R. (2020). *Cross-Border IPR Enforcement: An Indian Perspective. Asian Journal of Legal Studies*, 9(3), 25-42

essential to address these disparities, with organizations like the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO)[66] playing a pivotal role in facilitating the creation of uniform IP standards. WIPO's [67]initiatives could help streamline the process for obtaining and enforcing patents globally, reducing jurisdictional conflicts and encouraging cross-border collaboration. Such harmonization would provide clearer guidelines for innovators and investors, fostering a more predictable and supportive environment for BCI development.

Another promising direction involves promoting open innovation through collaborative research models and open-source frameworks. Open innovation encourages the sharing of knowledge, resources, and technologies among researchers, startups, and established companies, significantly accelerating advancements in BCI. Open-source platforms allow developers to build upon existing technologies, reducing duplication of effort and lowering costs. Successful collaborations in the tech industry, such as those seen in the development of Linux or TensorFlow, demonstrate the potential of such frameworks in driving innovation. In the BCI space, similar models could lead to breakthroughs in signal processing algorithms, device interoperability, and real-time neural data interpretation, ultimately expanding the accessibility and impact of BCI technologies.

Lastly, as BCI technology advances, it is crucial to anticipate emerging challenges, particularly in the realms of ethics and AI integration. Future BCI innovations, such as brain-to-brain communication or direct brain-cloud interfaces, raise complex ethical questions about privacy, autonomy, and consent. These technologies could blur the boundaries between human thought and external control, necessitating robust ethical frameworks to prevent misuse. Additionally, the integration of AI in BCIs introduces concerns around bias, accountability, and decision-making. The development of AI ethics guidelines[68] tailored for BCI applications will be critical in addressing these challenges, ensuring that these transformative technologies are deployed responsibly and equitably.

[66] **World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO).** (n.d.). *Patent Law Harmonization: The Need for Global Standards*

[67] **World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO).** (2020). *Open Innovation and Intellectual Property: Encouraging Collaboration and Innovation. WIPO Magazine*

[68] **SpringerLink.** (2021). *Anticipating Ethical Challenges in Brain-Computer Interface Technologies*

CONCLUSION

The development and deployment of Brain-Computer Interface (BCI) technologies present a complex web of Intellectual Property Rights (IPR) challenges, ethical dilemmas,[69] and regulatory requirements. IPR issues, such as the patentability of algorithms and hardware, ownership of neural data, and cross-border enforcement of IP, remain at the forefront of legal discussions. Similarly, ethical concerns related to privacy, autonomy, and equitable access require careful consideration. The need for robust regulatory frameworks is evident to ensure that BCI innovations are protected without stifling competition or limiting accessibility.[70]

A balanced approach is essential to foster innovation while safeguarding individual rights and societal values. BCIs have transformative potential, particularly in healthcare and assistive technologies, but their benefits must not come at the cost of privacy, security, or ethical integrity. Legal frameworks should adapt to provide clear guidelines on data protection, licensing, and the ethical use of neural data.[71] At the same time, innovation should be encouraged through open-source initiatives and collaborative research models, which can accelerate progress and democratize access to cutting-edge technologies. Policymakers, legal professionals, and technologists have a pivotal role to play in shaping the future of BCI regulation[72]. Collaborative efforts across these domains are critical to developing international standards that address the unique challenges[73] of BCI technologies. Organizations like WIPO can help harmonize global IP laws, while industry leaders and academics can contribute by identifying and mitigating emerging risks.[74]

Finally, the rapid evolution of BCI technologies calls for proactive engagement from all stakeholders. Policymakers must prioritize creating adaptive regulations, legal professionals should focus on refining IPR frameworks, and technologists[75] should ensure ethical innovation[76]. By working together, these stakeholders can build a regulatory environment that

---

[69] **Burwell, S., Sample, M., & Racine, E.** (2017). Ethical aspects of brain computer interfaces: a scoping review. *BMC Medical Ethics*, 18(1), 60.

[70] **Ienca, M., & Haselager, P.** (2016). Hacking the brain: brain–computer interfacing technology and the ethics of neurosecurity. *Ethics and Information Technology*, 18(2), 117–129

[71] **Klein, E., Brown, T., Sample, M., & Truitt, A. R.** (2015). Engineering the brain: ethical issues and the introduction of neural devices.

[72] **Nijboer, F., Clausen, J., Allison, B. Z., & Haselager, P.** (2013). The Asilomar Survey: Stakeholders' opinions on ethical issues related to brain–computer interfacing

[73] **Tamburrini, G.** (2009). Brain to computer communication: ethical perspectives on interaction models. *Neuroethics*, 2(3), 137–149

[74] **Wolpe, P. R.** (2007). Ethical and social challenges of brain–computer interfaces.

[75] **Yuste, R., Goering, S., Arcas, B. A. Y., Bi, G., Carmena, J. M., Carter, A., ... & Wolpaw, J.** (2017). Four ethical priorities for neurotechnologies and AI. *Nature News*, 551(7679), 159.

[76] **Zuk, P., & Lázaro-Muñoz, G.** (2019). Neuroethics and the ethical design of neurotechnologies. *Oxford Handbook of Neuroethics*.

maximizes the benefits of BCI technologies while minimizing their risks, ensuring a future where these innovations can thrive responsibly.

REFERENCES

1. Indian Patents Act, 1970. (2022). *Legislation Governing Patent Law in India.* Retrieved from https://legislative.gov.in/
2. Ericsson v. Micromax, Delhi High Court, India. (2015). *Case on FRAND Licensing and SEPs.* Retrieved from https://indiankanoon.org/
3. Burwell, S., Sample, M., & Racine, E. (2017). Ethical aspects of brain computer interfaces: A scoping review. *BMC Medical Ethics*, 18(1), 60. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12910-017-0220-y
4. Ienca, M., & Haselager, P. (2016). Hacking the brain: Brain–computer interfacing technology and the ethics of neurosecurity. *Ethics and Information Technology*, 18(2), 117-129. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10676-016-9398-9
5. Nijboer, F., Clausen, J., Allison, B. Z., & Haselager, P. (2013). The Asilomar Survey: Stakeholders' opinions on ethical issues related to brain–computer interfacing. *Neuroethics*, 6(3), 541-578. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12152-011-9132-6
6. World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO). (2020). *Open Innovation and Intellectual Property: Encouraging Collaboration and Innovation. WIPO Magazine.* Retrieved from https://www.wipo.int/wipo_magazine/en/2020/02/article_0005.html
7. OpenBCI. (n.d.). *Interoperability and Licensing Challenges in BCI Systems.* Retrieved from https://openbci.com/
8. Yuste, R., Goering, S., Arcas, B. A. Y., Bi, G., Carmena, J. M., Carter, A., ... & Wolpaw, J. (2017). Four ethical priorities for neurotechnologies and AI. *Nature News*, 551(7679), 159. https://doi.org/10.1038/551159a
9. "Brain interfacing, copyright and the patent system," *Asia IP*, Link.

10. "Brain interfacing and its intertwined aspects with copyright and patent laws," *Top IP Firm*, Link.
11. "Intellectual Property in Brain-Computer Interface Technologies," *42Lawyers*, Link.
12. "The Ethics of Brain-Computer Interfaces: Identifying the Ethical and Legal Issues of Merging the Brain and Computer," *Journal of Medical and Health Sciences*, Link.
13. "Brain Computer Interfaces and Human Rights: Brave new rights for a brave new world," *ACM Digital Library*, Link.
14. SpringerLink. (2023). *Brain-Computer Interface Technology: Applications and Ethical Challenges.* Retrieved from https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s12551-023-01138-6
15. DelveInsight. (n.d.). *Brain-Computer Interface (BCI) in Healthcare: Transforming Patient Care.* Retrieved from https://www.delveinsight.com/blog/brain-computer-interface-bci-in-healthcare
16. MDPI. (2024). *Advancements in Brain-Computer Interfaces for Immersive Gaming and Virtual Reality. Applied Sciences.* Retrieved from https://www.mdpi.com/2076-3417/14/21/9855
17. 42Lawyers. (n.d.). *Intellectual Property in Brain-Computer Interface Technologies.* Retrieved from https://42lawyers.com/legal-practice-areas/corporate-and-business-law/intellectual-property/intellectual-property-in-brain-computer-interface-technologies.html
18. Vahle, J. (2020). *Opportunities and Implications of Brain-Computer Interface Technology in Defense. Department of Defense Media.* Retrieved from https://media.defense.gov/2020/Jul/27/2002465145/-1/-1/0/WF_0075_VAHLE_OPPORTUNITIES_AND_IMPLICATIONS_OF_BRAIN_COMPUTER_INTERFACE_TECHNOLOGY.PDF.
19. Frontiers in Computer Science. (2022). *Immersive Gaming through Brain-Computer Interfaces.* Retrieved from https://www.frontiersin.org/journals/computer-science/articles/10.3389/fcomp.2022.860619/full.
20. Frontiers in Computational Neuroscience. (2022). *Personalized Learning Systems Using BCI Neural Feedback.* Retrieved from https://www.frontiersin.org/journals/computational-neuroscience/articles/10.3389/fncom.2022.939202/full.

21. AMA Journal of Ethics. (2007). *Ethical and Social Challenges of Brain-Computer Interfaces.* Retrieved from https://journalofethics.ama-assn.org/article/ethical-and-social-challenges-brain-computer-interfaces/2007-02.
22. MDPI Sensors. (2023). *Technical Challenges in Brain-Computer Interfaces: Accuracy, Latency, and Integration.* Retrieved from https://www.mdpi.com/1424-8220/23/13/6001.
23. Nature. (2019). *Legal and Regulatory Considerations for Brain-Computer Interfaces.* Retrieved from https://www.nature.com/articles/d41586-019-02214-2.
24. Emotiv. (n.d.). *Emotiv Epoc+ EEG Headset.* Retrieved from https://www.emotiv.com/epoc/
25. NeuroSky. (n.d.). *MindWave Mobile 2 EEG Headset.* Retrieved from https://store.neurosky.com/
26. Nirx. (n.d.). *NIRSport 2 Functional Near-Infrared Spectroscopy Device.* Retrieved from https://nirx.net/nirsport2/
27. Elekta. (n.d.). *Neuromag MEG System.* Retrieved from https://www.elekta.com/
28. NeuroPace. (n.d.). *RNS System for Epilepsy Treatment.* Retrieved from https://www.neuropace.com/
29. OpenBCI. (n.d.). *OpenBCI Processing Units.* Retrieved from https://openbci.com/
30. BrainGate. (n.d.). *BrainGate Neural Decoder.* Retrieved from https://www.braingate.org/
31. DEKA Research. (n.d.). *DEKA Arm System.* Retrieved from https://www.dekaresearch.com/
32. Ekso Bionics. (n.d.). *EksoGT Exoskeleton.* Retrieved from https://eksobionics.com/
33. Muse. (n.d.). *Muse 2: The Brain-Sensing Headband.* Retrieved from https://choosemuse.com/
34. Neurable. (n.d.). *Neurable Smart Glasses.* Retrieved from https://www.neurable.com/
35. Tobii. (n.d.). *Tobii Pro Glasses 3.* Retrieved from https://www.tobiipro.com/
36. EyeControl. (n.d.). *EyeControl BCI Speech Device.* Retrieved from https://eyecontrol.co/
37. Myo. (n.d.). *Myo Armband.* Retrieved from https://www.myo.com/

38. Emotiv. (n.d.). *EEG Technology for Brain-Computer Interfaces.* Retrieved from https://www.emotiv.com/
39. NeuroSky. (n.d.). *MindWave Mobile 2 EEG Headset.* Retrieved from https://store.neurosky.com/
40. Elekta. (n.d.). *Magnetoencephalography (MEG) Technology.* Retrieved from https://www.elekta.com/
41. Nirx. (n.d.). *NIRSport 2 Functional Near-Infrared Spectroscopy Device.* Retrieved from https://nirx.net/nirsport2/
42. NeuroPace. (n.d.). *RNS System for Epilepsy Treatment.* Retrieved from https://www.neuropace.com/
43. OpenBCI. (n.d.). *BCI Signal Processing Modules.* Retrieved from https://openbci.com/
44. BrainGate. (n.d.). *Neural Decoding and Translation Algorithms.* Retrieved from https://www.braingate.org/
45. MDPI Sensors. (2023). *Advancements in Signal Processing for BCIs.* Retrieved from https://www.mdpi.com/1424-8220/23/13/6001
46. SpringerLink. (2023). *Machine Learning in Brain-Computer Interfaces: Applications and Challenges.* Retrieved from https://link.springer.com/
47. NeuroPace. (n.d.). *Intracortical Implants for Neural Monitoring and Control.* Retrieved from https://www.neuropace.com/
48. SpringerLink. (2023). *Advances in Electrocorticography (ECoG) for Brain-Computer Interfaces.* Retrieved from https://link.springer.com/
49. Legal Lawyers. (2021). *Thaler v. Commissioner of Patents: The Landmark Case About AI as an Inventor in Australia.* Retrieved from https://www.legallawyers.com.au/uncategorized/thaler-v-commissioner-of-patents-the-landmark-case-about-ai-as-an-inventor-in-australia/
50. SpringerLink. (2023). *Machine Learning in Brain-Computer Interfaces: Applications and Challenges.* Retrieved from https://link.springer.com/
51. MDPI Sensors. (2023). *Advancements in Signal Processing for BCIs.* Retrieved from https://www.mdpi.com/1424-8220/23/13/6001
52. NeuroPace. (n.d.). *Intracortical Implants for Neural Monitoring and Control.* Retrieved from https://www.neuropace.com/

53. European Commission. (2018). *General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR).* Retrieved from https://ec.europa.eu/info/law/law-topic/data-protection_en
54. California Legislature. (2018). *California Consumer Privacy Act (CCPA).* Retrieved from https://oag.ca.gov/privacy/ccpa
55. OpenBCI. (n.d.). *BCI Signal Processing Modules.* Retrieved from https://openbci.com/
56. Defend Trade Secrets Act (DTSA). (2016). *Public Law 114-153.* Retrieved from https://www.congress.gov/bill/114th-congress/senate-bill/1890
57. Burwell, S., Sample, M., & Racine, E. (2017). Ethical aspects of brain computer interfaces: a scoping review. *BMC Medical Ethics*, 18(1), 60. BMC Medical Ethics
58. Klein, E., Brown, T., Sample, M., Truitt, A. R., & Goering, S. (2015). Engineering the brain: Ethical issues and the introduction of neural devices. *Hastings Center Report*, 45(6), 26-35.
59. Ienca, M., & Haselager, P. (2016). Hacking the brain: Brain–computer interfacing technology and the ethics of neurosecurity. *Ethics and Information Technology*, 18(2), 117-129.
60. Yuste, R., Goering, S., Arcas, B. A. Y., Bi, G., Carmena, J. M., Carter, A., ... & Wolpaw, J. (2017). Four ethical priorities for neurotechnologies and AI. *Nature News*, 551(7679), 159.
61. Clausen, J. (2011). Ethical brain stimulation—neuroethics of deep brain stimulation in research and clinical practice. *European Journal of Neuroscience*, 32(7), 1152-1162.
62. Nijboer, F., Clausen, J., Allison, B. Z., & Haselager, P. (2013). The Asilomar Survey: Stakeholders' opinions on ethical issues related to brain–computer interfacing. *Neuroethics*, 6(3), 541-578.
63. Kübler, A., & Birbaumer, N. (2008). Brain–computer interfaces and communication in paralysis: Extinction of goal directed thinking in completely paralysed patients? *Clinical Neurophysiology*, 119(11), 2658-2666.

64. Chaudhary, U., Birbaumer, N., & Ramos-Murguialday, A. (2016). Brain–computer interfaces for communication and rehabilitation. *Nature Reviews Neurology*, 12(9), 513.
65. Friedrich, E. V., Scherer, R., & Neuper, C. (2013). Long-term evaluation of a 4-class imagery-based brain–computer interface. *Clinical Neurophysiology*, 124(5), 916-927.
66. Haselager, P., Vlek, R., Hill, J., & Nijboer, F. (2009). A note on ethical aspects of BCI. *Neural Networks*, 22(9), 1352-1357.
67. World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO). (n.d.). *Cross-Border Intellectual Property Disputes and Enforcement.* Retrieved from https://www.wipo.int/
68. Ericsson v. Micromax, Delhi High Court, India. (2015). *Case on FRAND Licensing and SEPs.* Retrieved from https://indiankanoon.org/
69. Indian Patents Act, 1970. (2022). *Legislation Governing Patent Law in India.* Retrieved from https://legislative.gov.in/
70. Grosse Ruse-Khan, H. (2013). *The International Legal Framework for Cross-Border IPR Disputes. Journal of Intellectual Property Law & Practice*, 8(5), 340-352.
71. Choudhary, R., & Sengupta, A. (2021). *Standard-Essential Patents and FRAND Licensing in India. Indian Journal of Intellectual Property Law*, 12(2), 55-78.
72. Dutfield, G., & Suthersanen, U. (2019). *Global Intellectual Property Law.* Edward Elgar Publishing.
73. Jain, P. (2018). *IPR Challenges in Emerging Technologies: The Case of BCIs. Indian Law Review*, 3(1), 1-20.
74. European Commission. (2021). *Standard-Essential Patents (SEPs) and FRAND Licensing: Global Practices and Challenges.* Retrieved from https://ec.europa.eu/
75. OpenBCI. (n.d.). *Interoperability and Licensing Challenges in BCI Systems.* Retrieved from https://openbci.com/
76. Narayanan, R. (2020). *Cross-Border IPR Enforcement: An Indian Perspective. Asian Journal of Legal Studies*, 9(3), 25-42.
77. World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO). (n.d.). *Patent Law Harmonization: The Need for Global Standards.* Retrieved from https://www.wipo.int/patent-law/en/patent_law_harmonization.htm
78. World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO). (2020). *Open Innovation and Intellectual Property: Encouraging Collaboration and Innovation. WIPO*

Magazine. Retrieved from https://www.wipo.int/wipo_magazine/en/2020/02/article_0005.html

79. SpringerLink. (2021). *Anticipating Ethical Challenges in Brain-Computer Interface Technologies.* Retrieved from https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s11846-021-00482-9
80. Burwell, S., Sample, M., & Racine, E. (2017). Ethical aspects of brain computer interfaces: a scoping review. *BMC Medical Ethics*, 18(1), 60. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12910-017-0220-y
81. Ienca, M., & Haselager, P. (2016). Hacking the brain: brain–computer interfacing technology and the ethics of neurosecurity. *Ethics and Information Technology*, 18(2), 117–129. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10676-016-9398-9
82. Klein, E., Brown, T., Sample, M., & Truitt, A. R. (2015). Engineering the brain: ethical issues and the introduction of neural devices. *Hastings Center Report*, 45(6), 26–35. https://doi.org/10.1002/hast.504
83. Nijboer, F., Clausen, J., Allison, B. Z., & Haselager, P. (2013). The Asilomar Survey: Stakeholders' opinions on ethical issues related to brain–computer interfacing. *Neuroethics*, 6(3), 541–578. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12152-011-9132-6
84. Tamburrini, G. (2009). Brain to computer communication: ethical perspectives on interaction models. *Neuroethics*, 2(3), 137–149. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12152-009-9040-3
85. Wolpe, P. R. (2007). Ethical and social challenges of brain–computer interfaces. *AMA Journal of Ethics*, 9(2), 128–131. https://doi.org/10.1001/virtualmentor.2007.9.2.msoc1-0702
86. Yuste, R., Goering, S., Arcas, B. A. Y., Bi, G., Carmena, J. M., Carter, A., ... & Wolpaw, J. (2017). Four ethical priorities for neurotechnologies and AI. *Nature News*, 551(7679), 159. https://doi.org/10.1038/551159a
87. Zuk, P., & Lázaro-Muñoz, G. (2019). Neuroethics and the ethical design of neurotechnologies. *Oxford Handbook of Neuroethics*. https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780198753622.013.38