

# The Civil Law Positioning of Data Rights and Its Implementation Pathways in the Inheritance System

Wenqi Du\*

Hebei GEO University, Shijiazhuang City, 052161, China

\*Corresponding author: 18238921570@139.com

**Abstract:** *With the advancement of digital technology, data has evolved into a new form of interest that carries both personal and proprietary value. However, its ambiguous positioning within civil law has led to difficulties in applying relevant systems in inheritance contexts. This paper aims to systematically define the legal nature of data rights and interests as a comprehensive object of civil rights encompassing both personal and proprietary interests, clarifying the scope of their inheritability and the principle of "restricted inheritance." Furthermore, it analyzes the conflicts of authority between heirs and data platform controllers during the inheritance process, the boundaries of inheritance rights, and the balance between these rights and personal information protection. Finally, from both substantive and procedural dimensions, the study proposes a normative pathway for constructing an autonomy-of-will-oriented lifetime disposition mechanism, a categorized inheritance procedure, and improved liability and dispute resolution rules. This provides theoretical support and institutional design references for civil law systems to address the inheritance needs of digital legacies.*

**Keywords:** *Data Rights and Interests; Civil Law Positioning; Inheritance System; Object of Rights; Dual Nature of Personality and Property; Implementation Pathways*

## Introduction

In the digital era, individuals' life activities and social relationships are increasingly preserved in the form of data and generate economic value. This reality underscores the necessity for legal regulation regarding the ownership and disposition of data rights and interests after a natural person's death. The existing civil law system and inheritance institutions are primarily constructed around traditional tangible property and pure personality rights, making them difficult to apply directly to data rights and interests, which possess both personal and proprietary attributes. This legal lag results in multiple challenges for judicial practice, including unclear identification of the nature of rights, ambiguous scope of inheritance, and the absence of platform responsibilities. These obstacles hinder the orderly succession of property and the extended protection of personal dignity in the digital age. Consequently, this study is dedicated to clarifying the internal structure and legal nature of data rights and interests within the theoretical framework of civil law. It aims to analyze the special legal issues arising from their status as objects of inheritance and to systematically construct specific pathways for their integration into the current inheritance system. This research not only contributes to deepening the jurisprudential understanding of emerging civil rights and interests but also addresses the urgent theoretical need to improve the order of property inheritance in digital society and to balance data circulation with the protection of personality.

## 1. Basic Positioning and Attribute Definition of Data Rights and Interests in Civil Law

### 1.1 The Legal Attributes of Data Rights and Interests as a Novel Object of Civil Rights

Defining the legal attributes of data rights and interests constitutes the logical starting point for their integration into the civil law system. The primary debate within current theoretical circles focuses on whether data rights and interests should be categorized as a new type of "right" itself or as an "object" of rights. From the perspective of the civil law theory on the object of rights, data rights and interests are more appropriately understood as the object of a comprehensive legal interest that incorporates both personal elements and proprietary value. They themselves are not a singular, pre-existing statutory civil right. As the target of civil legal relationships, data rights and interests bear a series of legally protected

behavioral freedoms and legal interests enjoyed by the subject, such as control, utilization, and disposition. Their nature approximates that of an object of "quasi-property rights" or "framework rights and interests," providing a normative foundation for the subsequent creation and allocation of specific powers and functions.

The understanding of the legal attributes of data rights and interests must move beyond simplistic analogies to traditional objects of property rights or intellectual property. The object of data rights and interests possesses characteristics such as non-rivalry, infinite replicability, and a high degree of dependence on control mechanisms. These features necessitate an independent design of the legal relationships surrounding it, specifically regarding the separation of powers and functions, the modes of exercise, and the pathways for legal remedy. Its legal attributes should be defined as an independent type of object of civil interests. Its substantive content is concretely shaped through a dynamic process of interest balancing and layered allocation by law. This process considers the source of the data, the methods of processing, and the usage contexts, weighing and configuring the personal information rights, proprietary data interests, and the legitimate operational interests of data processors involved<sup>[1]</sup>.

### ***1.2 Analysis of the Dual-Structure of Personal Interests and Property Interests within Data Rights and Interests***

The core characteristic of data rights and interests lies in their inherent dual-structure of interests: the personal interests underpinning human dignity and free development, and the property interests potentially generated through commercial utilization. Personal interests primarily originate from the identifiable association between data and a specific natural person, reflecting the need to safeguard individual autonomy and privacy. Their legal basis is grounded in the general right of personality or the right to informational self-determination. Property interests, on the other hand, arise from the derivative value formed through the aggregation, analysis, and processing of massive datasets. They manifest as the exchange value and use value of data products. Their legal foundation rests upon the legitimate operational interests generated from labor and capital investment.

Personal interests and property interests within data rights and interests are not distinctly separate; instead, they exist in a state of interweaving and interaction. The process of commercially utilizing personal information essentially involves the release of the proprietary value embedded within personal interests. Conversely, the excessive expansion of data property interests may constitute an erosion of personal interests. This dual structure dictates that no single rights model—whether a purely personality rights approach or an absolute property rights approach—can adequately protect data rights and interests in their entirety. Therefore, it is imperative to construct a dynamic balancing mechanism within specific legal rules. This mechanism should identify the dominant interest in different scenarios and establish corresponding consent rules, anonymization requirements, and possibilities for benefit-sharing to achieve the coordinated coexistence of both types of interests.

### ***1.3 The Connection and Demarcation between Data Rights and Interests and the Traditional Civil Rights System***

Incorporating data rights and interests into the civil law system is not intended to overturn the existing classification of rights or the established theoretical framework, but rather to seek an organic connection and integration. On the level of connection, the concept of exclusive control from property law can provide inspiration for constructing a right to control data; the principle of freedom of contract from the law of obligations provides the primary instrument for data circulation and licensed use; and the rules on compensation for moral damage under personality rights law can serve as a reference for remedying personal interests infringed in data-related violations. This approach to connection aims to utilize mature legal tools, thereby reducing the institutional costs of protecting data rights and interests and ensuring the stability and continuity of the legal system<sup>[2]</sup>.

However, what is more crucial is to establish a clear demarcation. Data rights and interests differ fundamentally from traditional property rights, intellectual property rights, and pure personality rights in terms of the form of their object, the modes of utilization, and the realization of their value. The intangibility and non-consumptive nature of their object, "data," distinguish them from corporeal property. Their lack of a requirement for originality and a protective focus on preventing improper acquisition and use rather than encouraging public disclosure distinguish them from copyrights and patents. Their inherent dimension of property distinguishes them from personality rights, which possess only spiritual value. Therefore, civil law must, based on an acknowledgment of the uniqueness of data

rights and interests, develop an independent set of rules. This necessitates innovative design aligned with their intrinsic characteristics, particularly regarding the acquisition of rights, the content of powers and functions, the boundaries of rights, duration, and the constitutive elements of tort liability. The goal is to achieve complementarity with, rather than substitution for, the traditional rights system.

## **2. Eligibility and Specific Issues Regarding Data Rights and Interests as an Object of Inheritance**

### ***2.1 The Inheritability of Data Rights and Interests and the Determination of the Scope of Their Object***

Determining the inheritability of data rights and interests requires a return to the basic legal principles concerning the scope of the inheritance estate within the civil law inheritance system. The core characteristics of an inheritance estate are its proprietary nature and transferability. The proprietary interests inherent in data rights and interests—such as the right to operational revenue generated from data processing, the licensed use rights to data products, and virtual property interests possessing market exchange value—possess economic value and can, in principle, be freely disposed of by the rights holder. These characteristics fulfill the substantive requirements of an inheritance estate and should therefore be included within the scope of inheritable objects. This determination represents an inevitable response of the civil law system to emerging forms of digital wealth. Its purpose is to ensure the orderly transfer of property among civil subjects and to prevent data rights and interests with economic value from falling into a legal void upon the death of the rights holder.

However, determining the scope of inheritable rights requires precise identification and delineation. Not all data associated with the deceased are inheritable. The criterion lies in whether the data rights and interests have been sufficiently detached from or stand independent of the core of the individual's personality, thereby possessing an independent property value. Data that serve purely as an extension of personality, such as records of private correspondence or unpublished intimate diaries, are typically not considered inheritable property due to their inseparability from personal dignity and privacy. Conversely, the proprietary powers and functions contained within anonymized datasets, the operational rights of an online store, the ownership of digital artworks, and the operational rights of a social media account that has already generated economic revenue should be defined as inheritable objects. Inheritance law must, therefore, establish a set of identification rules to distinguish between the "traces of personality" and the "property value" within data carriers<sup>[3]</sup>.

### ***2.2 The Principle of Restricted Inheritance Concerning Personal Elements in the Inheritance of Data Rights and Interests***

Even if data rights and interests are inheritable as a whole, the rights acquired by the heir are not a complete and unrestricted replica of the original rights. The personal elements within them, such as personal information, private content, and persona closely linked to the deceased's identity, are subject to the "principle of restricted inheritance." Although the heir may inherit control over the data carriers containing these elements, their exercise of these personal elements—particularly the rights of disclosure, utilization, or licensing for commercial use by others—is strictly limited. The legal basis for this principle stems from the exclusive nature of personality rights, meaning that personal interests cease to exist upon the death of the subject and cannot become the object of inheritance. The protection of these interests, however, extends beyond death.

This restriction is concretely reflected in the purposes and manner of exercise. The heir's management of data rights and interests containing personal elements should primarily aim to uphold the deceased's personal dignity, protect the deceased's privacy, and fulfill the deceased's reasonably inferable wishes during their lifetime, such as maintaining private preservation or non-public family commemoration. If any form of public disclosure or commercial utilization is involved, it must undergo review through special mechanisms. This includes inferring the deceased's explicit or reasonably presumed consent, or ensuring that the manner of utilization complies with public order and good morals, and does not cause improper harm to the personality interests of the deceased's close relatives. This essentially establishes a form of "inheritance burdened with negative obligations," meaning that while inheriting the proprietary interests, the heir also bears the legal duty to respect and protect the residual personal imprints contained within them.

### ***2.3 Differential Treatment of Data Rights and Interests and Other Digital Assets in Inheritance***

Within the domain of digital inheritance, systematically distinguishing between data rights and interests and other types of digital assets is a prerequisite for constructing precise inheritance rules. The term "digital assets" serves as a broader concept encompassing at least three categories of objects with distinctly different legal natures: first, composite objects centered on data rights and interests; second, purely proprietary digital assets represented by items such as virtual currency and in-game equipment, whose legal nature is closer to property rights or creditor's rights; and third, digitized forms of traditional asset certificates, such as electronic deposits and securities accounts, where inheritance essentially pertains to the underlying financial claims, with data merely serving as the representational form. Confusing the legal application of these categories will lead to a misalignment of rules.

The inheritance treatment of data rights and interests is unique, fundamentally due to their aforementioned dual structure of personality and property. For purely proprietary digital assets, inheritance rules can refer to those for traditional movable property or creditor's rights, focusing primarily on resolving technical and contractual issues related to identity verification and rights transfer. Regarding data rights and interests, however, the core difficulty and focus of inheritance rules lie in managing the complex interweaving of personality and property elements. Therefore, the inheritance system must design an independent set of rules specifically for data rights and interests. This series of rules must address special issues such as the assessment of inheritability, restrictions on personal elements, platform cooperation obligations, and the internal distribution of rights and interests among heirs. It cannot simply apply the transfer or account takeover procedures designed for other digital assets. This differential treatment reflects the law's respect for the essential differences between various objects and is an inevitable requirement for achieving the precision and fairness of the inheritance system<sup>[4]</sup>.

## **3. Institutional Obstacles and Analysis of Legal Relationships in the Inheritance of Data Rights and Interests**

### ***3.1 Conflicts of Authority Between Rights Holders and Platform Controllers in the Inheritance of Data Rights and Interests***

The core institutional obstacle faced in the inheritance of data rights and interests manifests as the complex conflict of authority between the original subject of data rights and their heirs on one side, and the controllers of data service platforms on the other. Based on their service agreements and technical architecture, platforms typically claim extensive rights over user data, including management, backup, deletion, and usage for service purposes. These contractual rights, combined with the de facto control established through technical measures, readily evolve into exclusive domination over the data after the user's death. The rights claimed by heirs under inheritance law directly oppose the legal claims made by platforms, which are based on standard-form contracts, the principle of technological neutrality, and the maintenance of operational order and data security.

The essence of this conflict is the clash between the logic of property inheritance, the logic of privity in network service contracts, and the logic of data security management. Platforms often refuse to acknowledge or facilitate inheritance requests on grounds such as the absence of inheritance clauses in their user agreements, the need to protect the deceased's privacy, or the prevention of account security risks. From the perspective of legal relationships, the basis for a platform's rights over user data primarily stems from contractual authorization and legitimate operational interests. Such rights cannot automatically negate the portions of the data that embody the user's personal and property interests. Therefore, legal intervention is required to clarify the legal status of platforms in inheritance events. They should be positioned as data controllers and custodians with specific cooperation obligations, rather than the ultimate arbiters of data rights. This demarcates a clear boundary between the right of inheritance and the legitimate interests of the platform.

### ***3.2 The Content and Boundaries of Exercising the Data Rights and Interests Acquired by Heirs***

The data rights and interests acquired by an heir through inheritance do not constitute a direct and complete succession of the original rights in terms of content, but rather a derivative bundle of rights subject to multiple restrictions. This bundle primarily includes the right to access the data carriers, the right to obtain copies, the right to necessary processing for maintenance and management purposes, and

the right to enjoy purely proprietary benefits derived therefrom. However, the boundaries of its exercise are jointly constrained by the deceased's wishes during their lifetime, the protection of personal interests, the rights and interests of third parties, and the reasonable technical limitations imposed by platforms. For example, an heir has no right to arbitrarily disclose the deceased's private diaries or use their social media identity to publish new content, unless such actions can be clearly aligned with the deceased's reasonably inferable intentions<sup>[5]</sup>.

Furthermore, the exercise of an heir's rights exhibits distinct hierarchical and context-dependent characteristics. For data that is highly integrated with personality, the heir may only exercise "negative management rights," focusing primarily on preservation and protection. For data products where the property attributes are prominent, the heir may exercise "positive utilization rights," including continued operation, transfer, or licensing. Determining the boundaries of exercise requires case-by-case evaluation, with the core criteria being whether the exercise demonstrates respect for the deceased's personal dignity, whether it infringes upon the legitimate rights and interests of others possibly involved in the data, and whether it exceeds the purposes that the inheritance system is designed to fulfill—namely, property succession and the maintenance of family bonds. This necessitates a non-uniform allocation of the heir's rights by law, rather than granting the full bundle of ownership rights across the board.

### ***3.3 The Inherent Balancing Mechanism Between Data Rights and Interests Inheritance and Personal Information Protection***

The process of inheriting data rights and interests intrinsically involves the subsequent processing of the deceased's personal information, thereby triggering the application of personal information protection rules. Although the personal information of the deceased is no longer directly covered by the subjective personal information rights and interests, it remains protected by law to uphold human dignity, social ethics, and the potential interests of living persons that may be connected. Therefore, the inheritance system must embed a mechanism that balances the principles of personal information protection. This mechanism is not a simple prohibition of processing, but rather establishes stringent requirements regarding the purpose, scope, and security safeguards for such processing, while acknowledging the legitimate interests served by inheritance.

The realization of this balance relies on the design of specific rules. The principle of purpose limitation requires that the heir's processing activities concerning the deceased's data must be strictly confined to the necessary scope directly related to inheritance matters, such as estate inventory, division, and the realization of property value. The principle of data minimization requires processing only the dataset directly relevant to that purpose, avoiding indiscriminate comprehensive access or collection. Furthermore, when the data involves the personal information of a third party, the heir's right to exercise control stops there, unless separate consent is obtained from that third party or other legal grounds exist. This inherent balancing mechanism signifies that the inheritance of data rights and interests is not a mere event of rights transfer, but rather a comprehensive legal process conducted within a legally established framework that accommodates property circulation, respect for personality, and information security interests.

## **4. Normative Construction and Implementation Pathways for Data Rights and Interests within the Inheritance System**

### ***4.1 Designing an Autonomy-of-Will-Oriented Lifetime Disposition Mechanism for Data Rights and Interests***

Within the normative system for the inheritance of data rights and interests, the priority lies in establishing a lifetime disposition mechanism centered on autonomy of will. This serves as a foundational solution for reconciling the protection of personal dignity with the free flow of property. The legal legitimacy of this mechanism originates from the civil subject's right to self-determination over their own affairs, including the disposition of their posthumous digital assets. This extends beyond the freedom to dispose of the proprietary interests within the data, reaching the freedom to choose the posthumous handling of personal data. It aims to realize the civil law expression of "posthumous autonomy" in the digital age. The core of the institutional design lies in innovating legal instruments to recognize and regulate the legal effect of "digital wills" or "advance directives for data assets." These would serve as special forms, independent of or supplementary to traditional wills, allowing individuals

to make legally binding advance arrangements regarding specific matters. These matters include the transfer of access rights to particular data clusters, content deletion, conditional commercial exploitation, or permanent preservation<sup>[6]</sup>.

To ensure the effectiveness and security of the lifetime disposition mechanism, it is essential to construct supporting formal requirements and enforcement guarantee rules. Regarding formal requirements, given the complexity and susceptibility to tampering of data rights and interests, advance directives concerning them should adopt strict formal acts. For instance, the use of a reliable electronic signature meeting statutory standards could be required, or establishment and storage could be mandated through multi-factor authentication on a specific, certified digital legacy management platform. The content of the directive must achieve sufficient clarity and specificity. It must clearly describe the scope of the involved data rights and interests (e.g., account identifiers, data types), the designated heir or trustee, and specific, executable disposition instructions to avoid ambiguity in interpretation. At the enforcement level, the law must confer mandatory enforceability upon such validly established advance directives. It must explicitly stipulate that data controllers, such as network service providers, bear a statutory obligation to cooperate in execution upon receiving a verified valid directive. Any unilateral exclusion clauses within their contractual terms cannot contravene this legally imposed mandatory obligation.

The deeper value of this mechanism lies in minimizing disputes over ownership and ethical conflicts after inheritance occurs through advance rights planning. It allows individuals to make differentiated arrangements for data closely tied to personality and data with significant property value according to their own values, thereby preemptively resolving potential tensions between personal and property interests at the time of inheritance. From the perspective of institutional innovation, this represents not merely an extension of inheritance law rules but also an expansion of the "informed consent" principle from personal information protection law into the temporal dimension—that is, the institutionalization of "consent extending beyond death." By constructing a secure, convenient, and legally guaranteed channel for lifetime dispositions, civil law can more fully realize the spirit of private autonomy in the digital realm and provide individuals with a predictable legal framework concerning the ultimate disposition of their digital footprint.

#### ***4.2 Procedural Construction for Heir Qualification Review and the Categorized Inheritance of Data Rights and Interests***

When the deceased leaves no valid lifetime disposition, the initiation of statutory inheritance depends on a meticulously designed non-contentious procedure. The core of this procedure lies in the substantive review of heir qualifications and the scientific classification of data rights and interests within the estate. The formal review of identity documents and kinship relationships common in traditional inheritance is insufficient. Inheriting data rights and interests necessitates introducing a verification procedure. This procedure is to be conducted by a neutral institution (such as a notary public or a specialized digital inheritance court/tribunal) or by the primary data controller under strict legal regulations. It must not only verify the heir's identity and legal eligibility but also preliminarily assess the nature and sensitivity of the data rights and interests involved in the inheritance request. The aim is to prevent fraudulent inheritance at the procedural entry point and to proactively protect the deceased's privacy, communication confidentiality, and the potential data rights and interests of third parties.

The key innovation in procedural construction lies in implementing the logic of "categorized inheritance." This necessitates establishing a standardized methodology for assessing and classifying data rights and interests within the estate. The estate administrator, a designated institution, or the platform, assisted by technical experts, should preliminarily categorize the data into three basic types based on its content, context of generation, usage history, and degree of association with the deceased. First, core personality data (e.g., private communications, health records, unpublished diaries), the inheritance of which should be subject to the strictest limitations. Second, manifested property data (e.g., tradable digital collectibles, revenue-generating self-media accounts, data products), which can be handled by referencing inheritance rules for movable property. Third, mixed-interest data (e.g., social media accounts containing both social records and commercial value). This classification is not a final adjudication but forms the basis for subsequent differentiated processing procedures. It determines the level of access rights the heir may obtain—ranging from only receiving deeply anonymized copies of metadata to fully taking over and operating an account with all its attendant powers and functions.

Building upon the aforementioned classification, the procedure should establish differentiated

pathways for rights delivery and corresponding checks and balances. For core personality data, the procedure should prioritize preservation and sealing. The heir may only be granted the right to "know of the data's existence" or receive strictly filtered commemorative content, rather than the data itself. For manifested property data, the procedure should focus on valuation and equitable division, potentially necessitating the introduction of auditing or market valuation mechanisms. For the most complex mixed-interest data, the procedure could implement a "cooling-off period" or "restrictive delivery." For instance, account management rights might be initially transferred to the heir, but a temporary injunction could be placed on sensitive operations such as posting new content or changing privacy settings until a more comprehensive ethical and legal review is completed. This refined, process-oriented procedural construction aims to transform the substantive law principle of "restricted inheritance" into operational and superviseable procedural steps, thereby ensuring the legality and reasonableness of the inheritance rights realization process itself.

#### ***4.3 Improving Liability Allocation and Dispute Resolution Rules in the Inheritance of Data Rights and Interests***

Clear and reasonable liability allocation is essential for the smooth operation of the inheritance system for data rights and interests. Within the internal legal relationship of inheritance, heirs, upon acquiring data rights and interests, also assume a series of concomitant obligations. The core of their liability lies in the "fiduciary duty of care" and the "duty of reasonable care." This means they must handle the inherited data, especially its personal content, in a manner consistent with the deceased's wishes (if any), public order and good morals, and legal stipulations. If an heir abuses these rights—for instance, by improperly disclosing the deceased's privacy, maliciously altering data, or using the deceased's identity for fraud—they may not only infringe upon the deceased's personal legacy but also violate the rights and interests of third parties. In such cases, they must bear corresponding liability for tort damages, with the scope of compensation covering both property losses and emotional distress.

As a key collaborator, the data controller (platform) bears responsibilities that fall under the statutory "obligation to assist in execution" and the "duty of care as a prudent manager." On one hand, upon receiving a lawful inheritance request or a valid lifetime directive, the platform is obligated to respond promptly, conduct verification, and cooperate with the execution in accordance with laws and regulations. Refusing, delaying, or imposing unreasonable obstacles without just cause should render the platform liable for any losses incurred by the heir as a result. On the other hand, during the processes of data custody and transfer, the platform must implement security measures commensurate with the technical standards to prevent data leakage, damage, or loss. The law should establish "safe harbor" rules for platforms. This means that if they have followed the statutory review procedures and security standards, they may be exempted from or their liability may be reduced concerning certain disputes arising from executing inheritance operations (e.g., judgment errors regarding the authenticity of a directive within reasonable limits). This aims to balance their liability risks with their willingness to cooperate<sup>[7]</sup>.

Given the highly specialized, cross-jurisdictional, and digitally-evidenced nature of disputes over the inheritance of data rights and interests, it is essential to construct a diversified and efficient dispute resolution system. At the litigation level, exploring the establishment of specialized collegiate panels and formulating special rules of evidence and standards of proof is necessary. This includes adopting rules for the admissibility of electronic evidence that facilitate demonstrating data flows and changes in access rights. Regarding the burden of proof, an heir claiming rights bears the initial responsibility to demonstrate their inheritance eligibility and the property value of the data rights and interests. Conversely, a platform seeking exemption from liability must prove it has fulfilled its duties of diligent review and security safeguards. Alternative dispute resolution mechanisms outside litigation are particularly important. Efforts can be made to establish specialized arbitration or mediation centers involving internet industry organizations, legal experts, and technical professionals, leveraging their expertise for swift dispute resolution. Furthermore, exploring solutions based on blockchain technology for smart contract execution and evidence preservation could be beneficial. This involves codifying certain inheritance rules to reduce performance disputes at their source. By constructing this multi-layered framework for liability and dispute resolution, which integrates both preventive and remedial measures, the inheritance system for data rights and interests can be transformed from written rules into stable social expectations and practice.

## Conclusion

The proper resolution of inheritance issues concerning data rights and interests, as a novel object of civil interests, relies on a clear positioning of their legal attributes and the innovative design of inheritance rules. This study demonstrates the fundamental impact of the dual structure of personality and property inherent in data rights and interests on the inheritance system. It establishes the basic principle that their proprietary interests are inheritable, while being strictly constrained by the "principle of restricted inheritance" applied to personal elements. To overcome institutional obstacles such as conflicts with platform authority, ambiguous boundaries of heir rights, and the need for personal information protection, future institutional construction should prioritize respect for individual autonomy. This can be achieved by establishing lifetime disposition mechanisms such as "digital wills," coupled with refined procedures for heir qualification review and the categorized inheritance of data, thereby translating abstract rights into operable norms. Simultaneously, clarifying the responsibilities of all parties involved in inheritance and developing compatible dispute resolution mechanisms are key to realizing the orderly inheritance of data rights and interests. Future research could focus on designing inheritance specifics for various types of data rights and interests (e.g., social media accounts, virtual assets), as well as exploring collaborative governance models that integrate inheritance procedures with data security technologies, in order to address the continuously evolving digital ecosystem.

## References

- [1] XU Zhongyuan. "The Shift in Positioning of the Civil Code from Autonomy Law to Governance Law and Its Impact: From the Perspective of Constructing an Independent Knowledge System of Chinese Civil Law." *Law Science (Journal of Northwest University of Political Science and Law)* 43.05 (2025): 52-64.
- [2] ZHANG Zhanfeng, and ZHU Yuan. "On the Civil Law Positioning and Rights Protection of Digital Identity." *China New Telecommunications* 27.04 (2025): 24-26+29.
- [3] HU Qiaoli, and LIU Zhengfeng. "The Systematic Positioning and Typological Differentiation of Algorithmic Explanation in Civil Law." *Finance and Economics Law* .04 (2022): 67-82.
- [4] LIN Chuanlin, and SONG Zongyu. "The Civil Law Positioning and Path Selection of Personal Information Protection." *Gansu Social Sciences* .04 (2021): 206-213.
- [5] WANG Zhijian. "The Application and Positioning of Data in the Civil Law System." *Legal System Expo* .06 (2021): 95-96.
- [6] LI Haimin. "The Nature, Attributes, and Civil Law Positioning of Data: Based on an Analysis of the Relationship Between Data and Information." *Internet Law Review* 22.02 (2017): 3-18.