



## JOURNAL OF CYBER GOVERNANCE AND INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY

---

Volume 1

Article 1

---

### **Digital Watermarking as an IP Enforcement Tool: Analyzing Legal Gaps in Recognition and Evidentiary Standards**

Payal Kumari

Vijayabhoomi University

---

#### **Recommended Citation:**

Kumari (2026) “Digital Watermarking as an IP Enforcement Tool: Analyzing Legal Gaps in Recognition and Evidentiary Standards” Journal of Cyber Governance and Intellectual Property, Vol. 1, Article 2. (DOI)

This article is published under the Creative Commons Attribution–NonCommercial–ShareAlike 4.0 International (CC BY-NC-SA 4.0) License, which allows for free non-commercial use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided appropriate credit is given to the original work.

**ABSTRACT**

*This paper deals with Digital watermarking, including its types such as visible and invisible watermarking. It also highlights its importance. This led to the evolution of Reversible watermarking, AI watermarking and 3D mesh watermarking, etc. The Copyright Acts sections 65A and 65B are mainly discussed in this paper in relation to watermarking. The paper also examines the landmark case Neela Films Pvt. Ltd. Vs Taarak Mehta Ka Ooltah Chashmah.com and the judgment given by the Delhi High Court in this case. It additionally deals with the current problem which is being faced in the realms of watermark such as lack of knowledge about trademark, lack of police training and unrealistic three hours take down rule and also gives the solution which have the capacity to solve such issues such as provide education to the people, establish district-level cyber forensic-cum-training laboratories and set timelines based on severity of act and platform size.*

**KEYWORDS**

*Digital watermarking, Section 65A and 65B of the Copyright Act,1957, Ad-interim injunction, Copyrighted work*

## INTRODUCTION

---

Nowadays, there has been a lot of digital content, including audio-video, pictures, files, etc., shared online. Which is leading to numerous chances of data being used by third parties under their own name. So, to prevent third parties from doing so and getting profit from others' content, a watermark has been introduced. This assists in knowing the real owner of the data. However, the visible watermark<sup>1</sup> can be seen easily, but the invisible watermark can't, which makes it mostly used for audio content, such as in songs. As invisible watermarks<sup>2</sup> are hard to see with only the eyes, there is software available out there that makes it possible. Watermarks mostly help in protecting the copyright of the owner. For example, if a person has taken a picture with his camera and it got famous because of its quality and the depth in the picture. People are claiming rights to the picture; in this situation, ownership can be found easily if a watermark has been embedded in the picture. There are websites available out there that help third parties in movie piracy, leading to the owner's hard work going in vain, as the creators don't earn enough. The piracy doesn't happen only with movies but with files and images also. In this case, watermarks play a vital role in saving content from use by third parties without the consent of the real owner.

The evolution of time has led to the development and formation of many types of watermarking, such as Reversible watermarking, video watermarking and 3D mesh watermarking<sup>3</sup>. which primarily focuses on ensuring the rights under the copyright act rather than the content being used by a third party. Because it works as is evident when the infringement has already been done. As infringement leads to a change in the watermark, which can be seen easily. Neela Films

---

<sup>1</sup> Harsh Agarwal & Renu Dawar, A Novel Approach to Digital Image Watermarking Using DWT and DCT, IJCA 71(11) (2013), <https://research.ijcaonline.org/volume71/number11/pxc3889057.pdf> (Int'l J. Computer Applications) (last visited Feb. 10, 2026).

<sup>2</sup> P. G. Simu & V. Kamakshi Prasad, Application of Invisible Image Watermarking Using SVD and DWT Techniques, IJERT (2015), <https://scispace.com/pdf/application-of-invisible-image-watermarking-4feb0d8k4c.pdf> (Int'l J. Eng'g & Tech.) (last visited Feb. 10, 2026).

<sup>3</sup> Formaglio et al., C68\_Formaglio\_etal\_EH06, (2006), [https://engineering.purdue.edu/~hongtan/pubs/PDFfiles/C68\\_Formaglio\\_etal\\_EH06.pdf](https://engineering.purdue.edu/~hongtan/pubs/PDFfiles/C68_Formaglio_etal_EH06.pdf) (Purdue Univ. Eng'g) (last visited Feb. 10, 2026).

Pvt. Ltd. Vs Taarak Mehta Ka Ooltah Chashmah.com case is a landmark case that sets the boundaries for third-party users as well as holds the platforms liable for the illegal action being done on their platforms.

## LITERATURE REVIEW

---

### ***Overview of Digital Watermark- For Images and Files By Bryan Smith***

This Paper clarifies the meaning of Digital Watermark and its types. Moreover, it deals with techniques for embedding a watermark. This is a very technical part, as it covers the process. It also discusses the distinction between watermarking and fingerprinting. Even though they are both embedded it clarifies that a fingerprint can also be attached externally to files. Moreover, it tends to deal with the attacks that happen either accidentally, such as by compression and format conversion of the files, or intentionally, including watermark overwriting and applying removal techniques, which are aimed at defeating the ownership detection. It not only talks about the attacks but also draws our attention to watermarks, which mostly depend on the infringer's software skills and knowledge and also the complexity of the watermark. Additionally, it deals with its application and the limitations as well. As everything does have its flip side, so does this paper, as it primarily focuses on a technical perspective rather than addressing legal enforceability or evidentiary standards. It also doesn't talk about the regulatory framework that governs watermark protection. It moreover tends to discuss early-stage technological assumptions, which leaves the contemporary issues without being noticed, such as deep fake manipulation and the liability of platforms.<sup>4</sup>

### ***Legal Framework of Watermark For Copyright Protection- By Muskan Arora, and Dr Neetu***

This paper examines the challenges of copyright protection as the digital environment has changed. With the span of time, technology has advanced, internet penetration has increased, and the digital distribution of multimedia content has become widespread. But it also led to piracy,

---

<sup>4</sup> Bryan Smith, Overview of Digital Watermark-For Images and Files, GSEC-352 (2002), <https://www.giac.org/paper/gsec/352/overview-digital-watermark-images-files/100945> (SANS Inst.) (last visited Feb. 11, 2026).

unauthorised downloads, and digital fraud as demands of digital content have increased insanely. Moreover, the paper describes watermarking as the process of embedding ownership-related information into digital content. So that it can be identified who the real owner of that content is. It also says that watermarking helps in monitoring as well as the detection of unauthorised use to reduce piracy. Apart from that, the paper not only focuses on the technological aspect but also discusses the legal mechanisms of it, such as its use in intellectual property protection. Moreover, it describes it as a unique anti-piracy technique that does not mainly stop others from copying it but works as evident whenever someone tries to do so or does it, as it can be noticed easily. It also discusses characteristics, features and techniques to embed the watermark in it. Most importantly, it also gives suggestions for legal reformation, such as clarifying the clear definition of effectiveness and also advises setting a standard so that it can be aligned with international standards. This paper is good doctrinal research, but it lacks empirical research and analysis of case laws on this topic. And apart from this, it also lacks in discussing current issues such as digital deep fakes.<sup>5</sup>

## METHODOLOGY

---

The paper is totally based on doctrinal research, where it focuses on analysing existing Research Papers, existing rules in the field of laws, judicial precedent and statutory provisions.

*The data has been collected from basically two sources-*

- 1) Primary source- Case law<sup>6</sup>
- 2) Secondary source- Research Papers<sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>5</sup> Legal Framework of Watermarks for Copyright Protection, ResearchGate, [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/395286145\\_LEGAL\\_FRAMEWORK\\_OF\\_WATERMARKS\\_FOR\\_COPYRIGHT\\_PROTECTION](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/395286145_LEGAL_FRAMEWORK_OF_WATERMARKS_FOR_COPYRIGHT_PROTECTION) (last visited Feb. 11, 2026).

<sup>6</sup> Manupatra Academy, Sources of Law - MCLR, (n.d.), <https://www.manupatracademy.com/notes-for-law-students/sources-of-law-mclr> (Manupatra Acad.) (last visited Feb. 12, 2026).

<sup>7</sup> William & Mary L. Sch., Secondary Sources, (n.d.), <https://law.wm.edu/library/research/legalpracticehandouts/pdfs/secondarysources.pdf> (Wm. & Mary L. Libr.) (last visited Feb. 12, 2026).

**The collection of data is followed by written processes-**

- 1) The first stage involves the review of literature so that the gap can be recognised - many papers related to watermarking were analysed, where each paper discussed a different aspect, but none of them mainly focused on dealing with the current issue and giving a solution to it.
- 2) Based on the gap, the research question and objective are being framed- Based on the recognised gap of lack of solutions to the current problem in the realm of watermarking. These were the main research questions and research objectives that were formulated-
  - a) What is the current issue that is faced in the realm of watermarking?
  - b) What could be the solutions?
- 3) Finalising the sources- The sources were followed by the research question and objection, as well as the relativity of it with the current situation.
- 4) Rechecking the sources- The sources were double checked to ensure the current importance of the paper, as well as to set a strong base for this paper.

## **ANALYSIS OF DIGITAL WATERMARKING**

---

Digital watermarking refers to a technique that is used to embed information such as the name of an individual or a company, or a logo, which can be either visible or invisible in the digital content, so that no one else can make use of that data under their own name.<sup>8</sup> It basically protects the digital content from unauthorized use and deters others from earning from others' work. It helps in protecting the copyright rights of the owner because it is very easily detectable when the data which has a watermark has been changed. As any kind of change in the watermark can be found easily, as minute change also reduces the quality of the content.

*There are basically two types of digital watermarking-*

- i. Visible Watermarking- If the content has a semitransparent logo or name or any written text related to a company or an individual is known as the visible watermarking. Which is mostly

---

<sup>8</sup> About Digital Watermarks, DIGIMARC, <https://www.digimarc.com/blog/about-digital-watermarks/> (last visited Feb. 13, 2026).

used in photos, files, etc.<sup>9</sup> It is basically used to show the third party that they must refrain from copying it with their own name, or if they do, it can be caught easily. It is mainly used in branding, and as the watermark is very visible. However, it does have disadvantages as well, as it makes the content less appealing and with the help of editing tools, it can be removed easily.

- ii. Invisible watermarking- These kinds of watermarking can't be seen by the naked eye.<sup>10</sup> To identify the real owner, software is needed. It is used in songs, movies, etc. and does not reduce the quality of content as it is not visible, and also cannot be removed easily.

*The importance of watermarking-*

- a) It helps in identifying the real owner of the content.
- b) It prevents the content from unauthorized use.
- c) It helps the content creators in attaining exclusive rights over their content.
- d) It helps in solving cases related to copyright infringement.
- e) It helps in getting back the data to its real owner.
- f) The infringement can be noticed easily, as a minute change in the content also leads to a reduction in its quality.
- g) Most importantly, it does work with the files without increasing their file size significantly.

*Because of the variance in the use of watermark, there have been many innovations in this field, which are-*

- i. Reversible watermarking- This kind of watermarking can be removed easily, and after removing it, the file can be restored to its original state.<sup>11</sup> As this process does not reduce the quality of the file. Example- when a doctor embeds a patient ID in an X-ray image, but when the verification is done, they remove it. So that they can diagnose it easily.

---

<sup>9</sup> T. Dekel et al., On the Effectiveness of Perceptual Weights in Digital Watermarking, PROC. CVPR (2017), [https://openaccess.thecvf.com/content\\_cvpr\\_2017/papers/Dekel\\_On\\_the\\_Effectiveness\\_CVPR\\_2017\\_paper.pdf](https://openaccess.thecvf.com/content_cvpr_2017/papers/Dekel_On_the_Effectiveness_CVPR_2017_paper.pdf) (last visited Feb. 13, 2026).

<sup>10</sup> WJARR-2024-3623, WJARR, <https://wjarr.com/sites/default/files/WJARR-2024-3623.pdf> (last visited Feb. 13, 2026).

<sup>11</sup> Reversible Watermarking, SCIENCE DIRECT, <https://www.sciencedirect.com/topics/computer-science/reversible-watermarking> (last visited Feb. 14, 2026).

- ii. AI Watermarking- In this process, AI automatically decides the place and the proper way to embed the watermark so that it remains invisible.<sup>12</sup> Example- These are being used in a movie, so that if piracy happens, then AI can detect it easily.
- iii. 3D watermarking- In this process, the watermarking has been done on 3d objects. So that no one can copy the design.<sup>13</sup> It basically helps in safeguarding the design.
- iv. Video Watermarking- It is done frame by frame, very carefully, so that they can survive even after compressing or editing some parts of the video.<sup>14</sup> Example- even if a certain part has been removed still the watermark of Netflix remains on the videos.
- v. Physical Watermarking- It is the process where watermarking has been done in physical packaging<sup>15</sup> so that it can be detected by cameras.<sup>16</sup>

## **LAWS RELATING TO WATERMARKING**

---

It protects the rights related to infringement of the copyright of the real owner of the content. As we know, the transfer of data has increased exponentially over time. People have been transferring data digitally all day and night, so that work does not stop in the middle. With the advantages of helping people, it does have few disadvantages as well such as infringement of the rights of real owner which has been safeguarded by the process of watermarking and ensured under copyright act, 1957, section 65A and 65B. which talks about the name of the owner or author, Copyright details, terms of use, license condition, and also the digital identifier.<sup>17</sup>

---

<sup>12</sup> AI Watermarking, TECHTARGET, <https://www.techtargget.com/searchenterpriseai/definition/AI-watermarking> (last visited Feb. 15, 2026).

<sup>13</sup> Tsippy Dekel et al., On the Effectiveness of Perceptual Weights in Digital Watermarking, 114 PROC. CVPR 1088 (2017), <https://dl.acm.org/doi/full/10.1145/3708657.3708734> (last visited Feb. 15, 2026).

<sup>14</sup> Video Watermarking, BITMOVIN, <https://bitmovin.com/blog/video-watermarking/> (last visited Feb. 15, 2026).

<sup>15</sup> Robust Reversible Data Hiding Scheme Based on Sigmoid Activation Function and Pixel Difference Pair, 131 ADVANCED ENGINEERING INFORMATICS 101952 (2021), <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0947358021000704> (last visited Feb. 15, 2026).

<sup>16</sup> Digital Watermarking and Its Types, INSTASAFE, <https://instasafe.com/blog/digital-watermarking-and-its-types/> (last visited Feb. 16, 2026).

<sup>17</sup> Copyright Rules, No. 14, 1957 (India), <https://www.copyright.gov.in/Documents/Copyrightrules1957.pdf> (last visited Feb. 16, 2026).

- *Copyright Act, 1957*

a) Section 65A- it talks about Protection of Technological Measures, which is used to prevent unauthorised access or copying of others' work which has been registered under the Copyright Act.<sup>18</sup> It also includes Password protection, Encryption, Digital Rights Management<sup>19</sup> and Digital watermark. It also works as digital protection where human prevention is quite impossible. It mainly helps in protecting copyright, not copyrighted work directly.

I. Section 65A(1)- It talks about the situation where someone intentionally breaks or bypasses the technological protection, which can lead to imprisonment for up to 2 years and a fine as well.<sup>20</sup> But for the punishment, intention must be proved, and the act must be done voluntarily. If he/she has done the work under threat, they might not be punished if they prove so. It includes acts such as downloading movies illegally from OTT platforms or removing watermarks from images while copying.

II. Section 65A(2) - it talks about exceptions where bypassing TPM can be considered as a lawful act, such as<sup>21</sup>-

i. If it's to fulfil a lawful purpose. But if someone helps another bypass TPM, then they must have a record of that person's name, address and the purpose behind doing that.<sup>22</sup> So that there is no chance of misuse, and accountability is ensured.

ii. It can be used for Encryption research, such as a cybersecurity researcher studying encryption strengths.

---

<sup>18</sup> Union of India v. [Opposing Party], Draftbotpro (last visited Feb. 17, 2026), <https://app.draftbotpro.com/case/view/union-of-india-section/section-65a-in-the-copyright-act-1957/149946458>.

<sup>19</sup> Manupatra, Digital Rights Management, (n.d.), <https://www.manupatra.com/roundup/328/Articles/digital%20rights%20management.pdf> (Manupatra) (last visited Feb. 17, 2026).

<sup>20</sup> M/s. Hindustan Petroleum Corpn. Ltd. v. M/s. Sardar Transp. Co. (Bom. H.C. Feb. 17, 1995), Indian Kanon, <https://indiankanon.org/doc/141430677/> (last visited Feb. 17, 2026) (India).

<sup>21</sup> Union of India, Draft Bot Pro, <https://app.draftbotpro.com/case/view/union-of-india-subsection/section-65a2-in-the-copyright-act-1957/69726939> (last visited Feb. 18, 2026) (India).

<sup>22</sup> Amit Kumar Thakur, Protection of Traditional Knowledge with Special Reference to India: A Critical Analysis, 6 IJIPR 17, 20 (2015), [https://iaeme.com/MasterAdmin/Journal\\_uploads/IJIPR/VOLUME\\_6\\_ISSUE\\_1/IJIPR-06\\_01\\_003.pdf](https://iaeme.com/MasterAdmin/Journal_uploads/IJIPR/VOLUME_6_ISSUE_1/IJIPR-06_01_003.pdf) (last visited Feb. 18, 2026).

- iii. It is also allowed for lawful investigation, for example, police bypassing DRM to investigate piracy.
- iv. If the owner allows, then computer or network security can be tested by others.
- v. It allows the necessary activity for system operators or intermediaries, such as an internet service provider, to operate a digital system.
- vi. Apart from this, it's also allowed to bypass for National security.<sup>23</sup>

b) Section 65B- This section talks about Protection of Rights Management Information (RMI)<sup>24</sup>, which further describes the infringement of the owner's right as well as the punishment given to the infringer. Infringement includes acts such as-

- i. Removing or Altering RMI<sup>25</sup> - It means someone is deleting or changing the copyright information without the permission of the owner. Example- Removing the photographer's name from the photo taken by him and using it on their own name.
- ii. Distributing or selling<sup>26</sup>- Distributing the work when RMI is removed, and the person is known to this fact. Example- selling a book in which the author's name is removed, and the seller has knowledge of it.

Section 65B just doesn't talk about the acts which lead to infringement, but clarifies the punishment as well, which is imprisonment up to 2 years and a fine. But before giving punishment, it must be proven that there was an intent to do so, and the person had infringed the law knowingly. Just infringement can't lead to punishment; intent matters too, in this case.

---

<sup>23</sup> Copyright Act, 1957, § 65A (India), <https://lawgist.in/copyright-act/65A> (last visited Feb. 18, 2026)

<sup>24</sup> Copyright Act, No. 14 of 1957, § 65B

(India), [https://www.indiacode.nic.in/show-data?actid=AC\\_CEN\\_9\\_30\\_00006\\_195714\\_1517807321712&sectionId=14592&sectionno=65B&orderno=90](https://www.indiacode.nic.in/show-data?actid=AC_CEN_9_30_00006_195714_1517807321712&sectionId=14592&sectionno=65B&orderno=90) (last visited Feb. 19, 2026).

<sup>25</sup>Manupatra, <https://docs.manupatra.in/newsline/articles/Upload/BEE7A809-A589-4597-999D-823A97850E9A.pdf> (last visited Feb. 19, 2026).

<sup>26</sup> Union of India, Draft Bot

Pro, <https://app.draftbotpro.com/case/view/union-of-india-subsection/section-65bii-in-the-copyright-act-1957/56066228> (last visited Feb. 19, 2026) (India).

Apart from this, in case of infringement, the owner can also seek civil remedies if they want, which has been discussed under Chapter XII<sup>27</sup>. It talks about awarding an injunction, damages, an account of profit and Delivery up of infringing copies<sup>28</sup>-

- a) Injunction- It is a court order given to the infringer to stop their business to prevent further loss to the real owner.
- b) Damages- In this case, the infringers are ordered to pay the damages that have been caused by their business to the real owner.
- c) Account of Profit- It talks about giving up the profit made by infringing products to the real owner by the infringer.
- d) Delivery of infringing copies- It means infringers are ordered to deliver all the infringing products to the real owner, as the products are very similar to the real product and destroying them won't make any sense; it will create a loss for the economy.

**Landmark Case- Neela Film Pvt. Ltd. vs Taarak Mehta Ka Ooltah Chashmah.com & ors.**

In this case, Neela Film Pvt. Ltd., which owns the show Taarak Mehta Ka Ooltah Chashmah, files a case against Taarak Mehta Ka Ooltah Chashmah.com and others as they were using the show's name, Taarak Mehta Ka Ooltah Chashmah, characters such as Jethalal, the place name Gokuldham and many more elements. Which were copyrighted in the name of Neela Pvt. Ltd. The infringers not only made a profit by using their name on products such as poster t-shirts, but also caused damage to the real owner and also misled the public.

In this case, the main issue was whether the defendant used the plaintiff's intellectual property illegally or not. So in this case, the Delhi High Court heard both parties' arguments and awarded an ex-parte ad-interim injunction to the infringers, in favour of Neela Film Productions Pvt. Ltd., on 14th August, 2024. Because the company has earned a reputation after so much hard work, and it was all defamed by infringers' AI content and wrong use. Apart from this, the court also made it illegal to upload content without a label or disclaimer stating that it is fake. The

---

<sup>27</sup> Copyright Act, No. 14 of 1957, ch. XII (India), [https://copyright.gov.in/Copyright\\_Act\\_1957/chapter\\_xii.html](https://copyright.gov.in/Copyright_Act_1957/chapter_xii.html) (last visited Feb. 20, 2026).

<sup>28</sup> Copyright Act, 1957, No. 14, 1957, § 65B (India) (as amended by Copyright (Amendment) Act, 2012, No. 27, 2012), [https://www.indiacode.nic.in/show-data?actid=AC\\_CEN\\_9\\_30\\_00006\\_195714\\_1517807321712&sectionId=14592&sectionno=65B&orderno=90](https://www.indiacode.nic.in/show-data?actid=AC_CEN_9_30_00006_195714_1517807321712&sectionId=14592&sectionno=65B&orderno=90) (last visited Feb. 21, 2026).

judgment was given against a significant number of organisations, including websites, YouTube channels, etc., so that no one even tries to do so in the future.<sup>29</sup>

Ad-interim injunction- it means the temporary estoppel order given by the court to prevent further loss to the plaintiff. It is basically given ex-parte, which means without even hearing the other party.

- i. The case made it clear that no one can use the name of copyrighted work even though the profit is very low, when the permission hasn't been taken by the author.
- ii. It made the implementation easy as it instructed the service provider to suspend or restrict access for the platform which are infringing others' rights.
- iii. The ad-interim<sup>30</sup> injunction was ordered in this case, which prevented Neela Film Private Limited<sup>31</sup> from further loss.
- iv. It also held the platform accountable for such actions, which can be seen easily when the court ordered YouTube to give the list of infringers.
- v. It also provided the necessary rights to the plaintiff when it stated that the plaintiff can ask YouTube to remove infringing content from the platform.
- vi. This case is related to copyright as well as the importance of a watermark, which made it easy to find out when infringers tried to edit the part and sell the content under their own name. Apart from this, it also helped in making the infringers liable and pay for the damages done by them.
- vii. As the AI video was uploaded with the real character's name, people thought it was real, which led to defamation of the company. In the long run, it also misled the public. So, in this case, the judgment made it clear that without a disclaimer or label and the real owner's

---

<sup>29</sup> Bhavpreet Singh Soni & Hritika Malhotra, Neela Film vs TaarakMehtaKaOoltahChashmah.com: Landmark Case on Digital IP Infringement, SONISVISION (last visited Feb. 21, 2026), <https://www.sonisvision.in/blogs/neela-film-vs-taarakmehtakaooltahchashmahcom-landmark-case-on-digital-ip-infringement>.

<sup>30</sup> TIJER2304132, TIJER (2023), <https://tjjer.org/tjjer/papers/TIJER2304132.pdf> (Transnat'l Inst. J. Eng'g & Research) (last visited Feb. 21, 2026).

<sup>31</sup> Neela Film Prods. Pvt. Ltd. v. Taarak Mehta Ka Ooltah Chashmah.com, (2024), [https://images.assettype.com/barandbench/2024-08-16/4qilyoso/Neela\\_Film\\_Productions\\_Private\\_Limited\\_v\\_Taara\\_kMehtaKaOoltahChashmah\\_com\\_\\_\\_Ors.pdf](https://images.assettype.com/barandbench/2024-08-16/4qilyoso/Neela_Film_Productions_Private_Limited_v_Taara_kMehtaKaOoltahChashmah_com___Ors.pdf) (last visited Feb. 21, 2026).

permission, the content cannot be published. This further became a strict rule for other content creators as well.

viii. However, fair use is not restricted, but whenever it is necessary then users must take permission from the real owner before using their content.

## **ISSUE IDENTIFICATION AND SUGGESTIONS**

---

i. There is a lack of knowledge about the watermark.

Solution- Give education to people about watermark including its use and how it can be embedded.

ii. Everyone uses a different kind of format for a watermark.

Solution- The government should mandate one specific format for everyone so that it can be detected easily in case of piracy across platforms.

iii. Watermarks can be removed easily.

Solution- To stop infringers from infringing it, they must make the watermark robust and layered. So that it can't be removed easily. Apart from this, the act must be criminalised.

iv. There is a lack of police training in local police stations, as they don't have enough knowledge of how to extract metadata. So most of the time, they don't know how to deal with it; this is the main reason why cases related to this don't get solved easily.

Solution- Establish district-level cyber forensic-cum-training laboratories, so that police can be trained and solve the cases easily.

v. The three-hour take-down rule is very unrealistic, as removing all infringing content online in three hours is not easy because millions of pieces of content are being uploaded on the internet on a daily basis.

Solution- Give a realistic timeline for this, so that the authorities who are involved in solving the issue also feel motivated, work effectively and take the work seriously. And also give the timeline based on tier rather than setting one timeline for everyone. The timeline must be set according to the severity of the content and the size of the platform where it has been published.

vi. The tool used for watermarking is quite costly, so small creators can't make use of it.

Solution- The cost of such tools must differ based on the use and revenue of the content creator. Apart from this, the government should provide subsidies for such tools so that small creators can also embed a watermark on their work without feeling burdened.

vii. Anyone can upload the content without a watermark, so it is causing more infringement.

Solution- The platform must be held liable for uploading content without a watermark. Before the implementation of this rule, the government must provide a subsidiary for the watermark tool.

## CONCLUSION

---

Nowadays, the content has been spreading very fast, so as to ensure that the owner's rights are not being infringed. The use of a watermark must be ensured in each piece of content. There are many kinds of watermark that have been introduced over time, and the need for them. Each type of watermark does have their own use and importance, such as a visible watermark is used to make it clear to others that it is someone else's creation, so it must not be copied. On the other hand, an invisible watermark not only protects the creation but also makes the content visually appealing. The copyright laws are related to this as both protect the owner's exclusive right over their own creation. In the early days, watermark wasn't in much use, but with the evolution, the need can be seen easily. There are many cases as well where the judges have given tremendous judgments so that no one can infringe on others' rights. Neela Films Pvt. Ltd. v Taarak Mehta Ka Ooltah Chashmah.com case has played a vital role in making sure that others' creations must not be used without the real owner's permission. If it's been done, then the infringer will be held liable, and the platform will also be held accountable for such an act. Moreover, the platforms can not get rid of accountability by saying that they were not involved directly in making the content, as the court has clarified, stating that it's the platform's duty to maintain each work that is being published on their platform. Additionally, for the effectiveness of the watermark, the format followed by each must be the same, the cost of the watermark tool must be reduced, and the cost should be based on the revenue of that content creator, and the government should also provide subsidies to use such tools.