# USING END PUNCTUATION AND CAPITALIZATION

**Berdiyeva E'zoza**
Guliston State Pedagogical Institute
Scientific supervisor: **Khilola Mamatova**

**Abstract:** This comprehensive article provides an in-depth examination of the multifaceted debates and realities surrounding data ownership in the modern digital world. It analyzes the transformation of personal and institutional relationships with data, evaluates limitations of property law, reviews the rise of contractual arrangements, explores major legal frameworks, and discusses practical, ethical, and global challenges of possession and control over information. Special focus is given to power imbalances, stewardship responsibilities, technological change, and the search for fair governance. Drawing on interdisciplinary scholarship and contemporary developments, this work seeks to clarify ongoing debates and propose pathways toward equitable and sustainable management of data within a rapidly evolving digital society.

**Keywords:** Data ownership, data protection, privacy, data governance, digital economy, information law, intellectual property.

**Introduction.** The twenty-first century has witnessed an explosive transformation in the generation and circulation of data, marking data as the central asset of the digital economy. Every device, every movement, every interaction with technology now leaves a digital trace. From financial transactions and online shopping to streaming, fitness trackers, health records, and smart infrastructure, the world is immersed in continuous data production. This revolution has propelled questions of data ownership, access, and control to the forefront of legal, social, and political discourse, demanding new frameworks to manage the unique challenges that data presents. Contemporary societies are now compelled to rethink core ideas of property, rights, and stewardship as they pertain to information in an interconnected digital landscape. Traditional views of property and tangible assets offer only limited guidance when it comes to questions of data ownership. Data is unique in that it is intangible, infinitely replicable, and can simultaneously have value to multiple parties. The concept of absolute or exclusive ownership—central to classic property law—becomes blurred in the digital context, prompting a shift toward models of stewardship, shared control, and contractual agreements. Meanwhile, individuals, corporations, governments, and civil society continue to compete and collaborate to shape the rules governing who holds power over data, in which contexts, and for what legitimate ends.

**Materials and methods.** Data now fuels growth, efficiency, and unprecedented levels of innovation in both private and public sectors. It enables everything from predictive analytics in

healthcare, to artificial intelligence in autonomous vehicles, to personalized marketing in social media and beyond. Businesses are increasingly defined by their ability to collect, process, interpret, and monetize vast reservoirs of information about clients, consumers, trends, and behaviors. Governments and civic organizations rely on data to make public services smarter, more responsive, and more effective. However, the value of data arises directly from its unique qualities. Unlike physical commodities, data is not inherently scarce. It can be duplicated endlessly, aggregated, or divided in new ways. Multiple entities can derive independent value from the same raw information. These features make data a strategic asset but also pose acute challenges for the design of ownership regimes. The concept of "exclusive dominion"—the right to use, exclude others, and dispose of property at will—cannot be easily translated to an environment where duplication is effortless and boundaries are porous [1].

The composition of data further complicates the landscape. Not all data is created identically. Some data is raw and unstructured; some is processed and curated. Some is private and sensitive, while other types are non-personal or even potentially public. Data may originate from individuals, emerge from automated sensors, be collated through customer interactions, or result from proprietary computations. Understanding these differences is crucial for developing effective and fair ownership and governance structures. The stakes involved in defining data ownership are high and diverse. In economic terms, control over data drives competition, market concentration, and value creation. For individuals, data ownership relates directly to autonomy, dignity, and privacy. For governments and societies, questions of data inclusion, access, and stewardship are increasingly critical to democratic governance, public health, social equity, and security [2].

Control over data determines who can gain insight, who can take action, and who can benefit. The party that owns, or effectively controls, key datasets holds strategic leverage—not only to profit but to shape markets, exercise influence, and set the terms of engagement for others. This power dynamic has become especially visible in the rise of platform monopolies and the growing tension between data-rich corporations and those who supply the data—often unwittingly or without meaningful consent. The absence of clear and enforceable rules of ownership undermines trust, impedes innovation, and allows for the abuse of power. It can also lead to widespread alienation, as individuals feel increasingly used by systems that extract, process, and monetize their activity without transparency or meaningful compensation.

**Results and Discussion.** Classical property law is ill-suited to address the unique characteristics of data. Property law developed around tangible goods: land, houses, objects, and, later, certain forms of intellectual creation. The law is built on notions of exclusivity and scarcity. It prescribes a bundle of rights, including the right to possess, use, transfer, modify, and exclude others from the asset. In contrast, data's intangibility, endless replicability, and multi-origin nature mean that strict, exclusive ownership claims are practically unenforceable and normatively undesirable. Ownership regimes built solely on property law risk privileging initial collectors or aggregators of data, giving them disproportionate leverage over individuals and society at large. They may lock data behind "walled gardens," impeding research, scientific advancement, public accountability, and market competition. This is particularly problematic given that much value from data arises not from its exclusive use but from pooling, analyzing, and recombining diverse sources. In practice, ownership and control over data are largely managed through contractual agreements. Corporations, institutions, and platforms routinely deploy terms and conditions, privacy policies, licenses, and bespoke contracts that specify how data may be collected, processed, used, shared, stored, or sold. These contracts establish "practical ownership"—apportioning control, benefit, and liability according to negotiated terms [3].

This contractualization of data rights offers a measure of flexibility. It allows parties to tailor arrangements to fit technological realities and business models. Service providers may license data use to third parties. Collaborative ventures may pool datasets for shared projects. Customers and users are often required to consent to policies before receiving digital services. Yet this contract-based regime also has profound drawbacks. Most consumers, end users, and often smaller businesses have no real bargaining power to negotiate terms. The terms are set unilaterally by data-

rich, powerful entities. These "contracts of adhesion" tend to favor the interests of platforms over individuals, often allowing broad data extraction for unclear, distant, or commercially motivated purposes. Transparency is limited, as users rarely read or understand the scope of their agreements, leading to widespread "consent fatigue." Another limitation is that contractual rights and obligations generally bind only the parties to the contract, leaving third-party actors outside its scope, and offering little recourse for individuals whose data is repurposed, resold, or misused downstream [4].

With mounting public anxiety over surveillance, profiling, identity theft, and loss of control, privacy and data protection law have emerged as essential components of the legal landscape governing data. The European General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) is widely regarded as the most comprehensive and influential global standard, prompting significant legal reforms internationally. Rather than positioning individuals as "owners" of their data in a property sense, privacy law recognizes individuals as "data subjects" with specific rights—access, rectification, erasure, portability, and objection. Controllers and processors of data are subject to duties of fairness, lawfulness, transparency, data minimization, and security. Consent is redefined as meaningful, informed, and freely given, rather than a formality hidden in contractual fine print. Despite its strengths, privacy law is not without its critics. Some argue that it still places an excessive responsibility on individuals to manage their own risks, an overwhelming challenge in the digital age. Others contend that it leaves control effectively in the hands of powerful controllers, who can interpret, enforce, or evade standards according to their interests. Moreover, the law focuses narrowly on personal data and may not address broader questions of public interest, innovation, and non-personal or anonymized [6].

Transnational corporations must increasingly navigate a "patchwork" of legal standards. Conflicts can arise, for example, between American-style market-driven regulation and European-style rights-based regimes, or between states that prioritize national security over civil liberties. Trade negotiations, international data treaties, and standard-setting play a growing role in shaping the actual experience of data ownership across societiesnnGlobal disparities also reinforce inequalities in economic, technological, and legal capacity, risking a "digital divide" between countries that control data infrastructure and those that supply raw information or lack regulatory leverage.

**Conclusion.** The debate over data ownership is as complex as it is urgent. The exponential growth of digital information challenges established legal, economic, and ethical frameworks. Exclusive reliance on property law does not account for the unique nature of data or the realities of its use. Contract-based regimes are flexible but risk perpetuating power imbalances. Privacy law secures important individual rights but may leave collective interests and non-personal data unaddressed. New stewardship and governance models offer hope for more equitable and sustainable solutions, but they require wide adoption, social trust, and ongoing adaptation.

## References

1. Boyd, D., & Crawford, K. (2012). Critical Questions for Big Data: Provocations for a Cultural, Technological, and Scholarly Phenomenon. Information, Communication & Society.

2. Graef, I., Verschakelen, J., & Valcke, P. (2013). Putting the 'Fair' into 'Fair Use': Market Failure and Protecting User Rights. International Journal of Law and Information Technology.

3. Kuner, C. (2017). Data Nationalism and Its Discontents. Emory Law Journal.

4. Mayer-Schönberger, V., & Cukier, K. (2013). Big Data: A Revolution That Will Transform How We Live, Work, and Think. John Murray.

5. Samuelson, P. (2000). Privacy as Intellectual Property. Stanford Law Review.

6. Zuboff, S. (2019). The Age of Surveillance Capitalism. PublicAffairs.

7. Gorwa, R. (2019). The Platform Governance Triangle: Conceptualising the Informal Regulation of Online Content. Internet Policy Review.