EVOLUTION OF PATENT LAWS IN INDIA: WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO THE TRIPS AGREEMENT

Adv. Harsha Binth Saif, National University of Advanced Legal Studies

ABSTRACT

Patent law has long been reflective of the opposites and the conflicts that they generate, viz. the preservation of innovation and simultaneously the protection of the public interest. The chronology of India's post-colonial shift away from the colonial Patents Act 1911, followed by the Patents Act 1970, and subsequently to the TRIPS-compatible amendments of 1999, 2002, and 2005, demonstrates the battle of wits between national priorities and global commitments.

With the Patents Act of 1970, the biggest relief went to the general public as it made access to essential goods, especially drugs, easier by blocking product patents and supporting generic drug manufacturers. However, after India became a member of the World Trade Organization (WTO) and committed itself to the TRIPS Agreement, things went to the opposite extreme. The post-TRIPS reforms restored product patents, exceeded enforcement, and granted with India world standards, and thus the crucial controversies regarding access to medicines, compulsory licensing, and public health.

The path of evolution of the Indian patent law has been followed in this study, which has been focused primarily on the problems emerging out of compliance with TRIPS. It encompasses legislative reforms, judicial rulings, for instance, Novartis AG v. Union of India and Bayer Corporation v. Union of India, and the measures taken by India to strike a balance between innovation and social justice.

In conclusion, the research recognizes that India had no choice but to meet TRIPS but attempted to create a system that would remain responsive to the needs of developing nations. Although, from the ongoing worldwide debates on patent evergreening, access to medicines, and the future of pharmaceutical innovation, it can be gathered that the problem of intellectual property and public health is not going to be resolved anytime soon and that it is going to continue to be a contested ground.

Chapter 1: Introduction

Background of the Study

Patent law is the most important aspect of intellectual property rights (IPRs) in general. The idea of patents is to encourage innovation, thereby making the technological progress climb and, in the end, become a beneficiary of the society, through granting the inventors the exclusive rights for a certain period of time. At the same time, however, the monopoly character of patent protection has always posed a problem for those who uphold human rights and at the same time provide public welfare.

India's journey with patent law has mirrored the global tension between patent protection and the public interest. India was governed by the Patents and Designs Act, 1911 and other related laws of the patent system during the colonial era, which were primarily designed for the benefit of British Industries. the country wanted a patent system after independence which would satisfy its development needs. Apart from the fact that the Patents Act, 1970 marked the onset of a new era in India as it not only limited product patents in pharmaceuticals and food areas but also facilitated the Indian generic industry to take off, there was more to it.

The whole scenario had been altered significantly in the 1990s with the coming of the World Trade Organization (WTO) and the Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS) which India accepted as a member. TRIPS is the most comprehensive international agreement on intellectual property, and members thereof set the minimum standards for IP protection. In the context of India, it indicated that it would be improbable to turn back to the 1970 model and the most significant novelty was the reintroduction of product patent in the areas of pharmaceuticals and agrochemicals.

This research paper is a study of the change in the Indian patent law system, with the focus on the TRIPS agreement compliance. It traces the history of patent regimes in India and the court validation of reforms through the judiciary’s interpretation of the difficult relationship between innovation and drug accessibility.

Significance of the Study

This research is significant because it is about the ongoing discussions on the best way to balance patent protection and public health. India has consistently been a leading voice during

the international talks on the access to medicines, and especially for the cases of HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis, and cancer, the most common diseases. By using the 1970 Act to support the generic drug industry, India has been recognized as the "pharmacy of the developing world."

Nevertheless, after the adherence to TRIPS and the comeback of product patents, the question always arises whether the necessary drugs will be affordable or not. Some examples such as Novartis AG vs. Union of India and Bayer Corp. vs. Union of India are some cases that reveal the judiciary's role in the interpretation of TRIPS laws in such a way that they are sensitive to constitutional promises of social justice and the right to health. Besides mapping the Indian legislative and judicial journey, the project is also important for the way it places the debate against broader questions of international trade, development, and human rights.

Objectives of the Study

The present study wants to accomplish following goals:

- To trace back the origin and evolution of patent law in India up to TRIPS.
- To study the obligations that TRIPS imposes and what are its implications for India.
- To interpret the changes in the Patents (Amendment) Acts of 1999, 2002, and 2005 that brought the Indian law into TRIPS conformity.
- To identify the means of judicial interpretation of these Acts influencing the strategies implementing TRIPS patent regulations in India.
- To examine how and to what extent India has been able to cleverly use IP law for the benefit of health care.

Research Methodology

The methodology adopted in this project is doctrinal research, with the main tools of statutory interpretation, analysis of case precedents, and scholarly commentaries.

The sources referred to are:

• The primary sources group refers to the Indian statutory laws and their amendments,

international agreements, and Indian legal case reports.

• Besides primary sources, school and university students can use a range of different secondary literature: Major books, scientific periodicals, and statistical data taken from international organizations such as WTO, WHO, and UNDP.

• Referencing style: Each of the sources mentioned is formatted in accordance with the rules of the Bluebook: A Uniform System of Citation (21st ed.)

Scope and Limitations

The project is chiefly centered around the history and current state of patent law in India and major changes brought about by TRIPS. Other areas of intellectual property such as copyright or trademarks, although important, have not been taken into account in this research. The present focus of the study is on the pharmaceutical and healthcare sectors, as these have the most to gain or lose from the public interest debates in India.

The project is dependent on doctrinal sources and does not include any empirical fieldwork; furthermore, it only briefly discusses the post-2015 international developments, e.g., new TRIPS-plus obligations in bilateral trade agreements.

Chapter 2: The Evolution of the Historical Patent Laws in India (Before TRIPS).

Colonial Origins of Patent Protection in India

India's patent protection era has to be traced back to the beginnings of British colonial economic strategy. The very first legislative try was An Act for Granting Certain Exclusive Privileges to Inventors in India or Act VI of 1856; with the basis being the English Patent Law of 1852, the law permitted the inventors of new manufactures to enjoy the term of exclusive privileges not exceeding fourteen years. But it didn't have the agreement of the British Crown, so it was annulled in 1857.

A new law, Act XV, 1859 was enacted to authorize priority claims for inventions that had been formerly disclosed in the UK and to increase the range of patentable subjects. Only limited rights were given to the patentees by the Patents and Designs Protection Act, 1872, and the Protection of Inventions Act, 1883. During those days, patents were largely the instruments for

safeguarding the rights held by British manufacturers, who were heavily reliant on the Indian market, while local producers were forced to import foreign manufactures.

The Indian Patents and Designs Act, 1911 was the most significant piece of legislation that merged patent and design law under one system of that era. It established the position of the Controller of Patents, a patent period of 16 years, and recognized both product and process patents. The 1911 Act was an extension and a rich draw of the multiple preexisting legislations but was always accused of being unduly in favor of foreign companies. As a result, domestic innovation became stagnated and technological dependency on Indian imports was sustained.

Post-Independence Concerns

After the independence in 1947, India had to face a lot of development problems. First of all, the country went on a mission to be industrially self-reliant and the restrictions of the 1911 Act very soon were to become visible. It came out in the 1950s that foreign companies owned 90 percent of the patents in force and only a very small part was locally worked. One of the best examples in the case of the pharmaceutical industry is that product patents were exploited by multinational companies to take control of the market and supply of essential drugs at affordable prices was limited.

Tek Chand Committee (1949) was assigned the task of dealing with the problems and thus, was constituted to undertake a review of the patent law system. The committee observed that the system in place was not producing local R&D; therefore, it recommended restructuring. After about a decade, the Justice N. Rajagopala Ayyangar Committee report (1959) was the most comprehensive critique of the colonial system. Justice Ayyangar mentioned that the patent system should be concentrated on the promotion of inventions and the welfare of the whole society.

The Ayyangar Committee made two main recommendations:

- Restricting product patents to very necessary things like food, chemicals, and pharmaceuticals.

- Setting up very strong provisions for compulsory licensing as a means for technology transfer and affordability.

- The Patents Act, 1970 was basically influenced by this report, marking the first momentous alteration in Indian patent jurisprudence.

The Patents Act, 1970

The introduction of the Patents Act, 1970, which took effect in 1972, reversed the 1911 Act and was the developmental model of intellectual property. It was characterized by:

- Not a single patent was allowed for products in food, medicine, or chemicals, and only process patents were recognized for these areas.

- The period of protection for a patent was lessened: the general case was 14 years, but only 5–7 years were permitted for process patents in food, chemicals, and pharmaceuticals.

- The government was given the authority to ensure that patent rights were 'exercised' in India and that public needs, therefore, were met through especially wide compulsory licensing clauses.

- Strict non-patentability clauses: discoveries, methods of agriculture, and medical treatments were excluded from patent protection.

The changes were staggering. The Indian pharmaceutical sector which had been the source of generic drugs, grew exponentially after the imposition of product patent restrictions in the pharmaceutical field. Thus, the companies based in India i.e. Cipla, Ranbaxy, and Dr. Reddy's laboratories became the leaders of affordable versions of life-saving drugs making India the global generic medicine hub.

Impact of the 1970 Act

The 1970 Act changed the regime in the following manners:

- Medications within reach: The country became a source of affordable generic drugs for the whole world, which were a solution to the crisis that was the developing countries affected by the HIV/AIDS epidemic.

- Progress of the industry: Indian pharmaceutical business developed in double digits,

thus turning India into one of the main suppliers of generics to the world by 1980s.

- Opposition from industrialized countries: International pharmaceutical companies based in the U.S, together with their governments, were critical of the Indian system and described it as "flawed" and incompatible with the global standards.

Consequently, this law was an indicator for a system that marked a clear deviation from monopoly rights that yet respected public health and industrial progress.

The Pre-TRIPS Balance

As opposed to the post-TRIPS period, the Indian patent law before the TRIPS implementation had the following characteristics:

- One of the main elements of policy was the availability of the technology, which was, however, put on the first place only when the product was essential for the country.

- Process patents were exploited along with the transfer of technology to support the local industry.

- Compulsory licensing was the only opportunity to cancel or reduce patent protection in cases where public interest was in danger.

This intellectual property framework was highly praised by the academic community and policymakers from the developing countries as a benchmark for the IP regulations that consider the countries' needs. However, the global trading system was on the verge of a radical change with the establishment of WTO in 1995 and, consequently, the TRIPS agreement came into force.

Chapter 3: The TRIPS Agreement – Origin, Content, and Implications

Introduction

The implantation of an Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS) in 1994 signified a shift in the worldwide dissemination of the intellectual property law scenery. It was the first international agreement to establish the minimum standards necessary to protect IPR that could be checked through the WTO dispute resolution system.

Practically, TRIPS for India was contrasting to the Patents Act, 1970, trajectory, and besides that, it posed the problem of substantial alterations in local law to be compatible with the international standards.

Origin of TRIPS

The 1986-1994 Uruguay Round of Multilateral Trade Negotiations that came to an end with the establishment of the World Trade Organization is the genesis of TRIPS. the question of IPR was at the top of the list of conflicts among the most developed-rich countries, i.e., US, Europe, and Japan, on one side and all other countries on the other. These countries, led by the United States, Europe, and Japan, asked for the setting up of more stringent standards of intellectual property by saying that less stringent protection in the developing countries was the cause of the killing of their innovative activities, and the global trade was largely distorted.

In those days before TRIPS came into force, the protection of intellectual property rights relied to a great extent on some international agreements, which were in charge of the WIPO, such as the Paris Convention(1883) and the Berne Convention(1886). However, there were no strong-enough enforcement mechanisms in these WIPO-administered conventions. Developed countries, with certain advantages arising from their dissatisfaction with the framework of the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO), managed to place the issue of IPR in the multilateral trade regime, thus allowing TRIPS to become part of the Marrakesh Agreement Establishing the WTO(1994).

On the other hand, the situation was not so wonderful for those countries such as India. The opponents of the change asserted that what actually happened was not turning IPR into a global trade obligation but changing it from a national policy issue into a matter of worldwide trade regulations, which, in effect, diminished domestic flexibility.

Structure and Content of TRIPS

Compared to other treaties appended to the WTO treaty structure, TRIPS is by far the most comprehensive and elaborated one. It ran to 73 Articles, grouped into7 Parts, dealt with various aspects of the intellectual property-related.

Main aspects of the agreement included minimum standards of protection:

- New Technologies and Related Rights (Arts. 9–14).
- Trademarks (Arts. 15–21).
- Geographical Indications (Arts. 22–24).
- Industrial Designs (Arts. 25–26).
- Patents (Arts. 27–34).
- Layout Designs of Integrated Circuits (Arts. 35–38).
- Undisclosed Information / Trade Secrets (Art. 39).

Patent Provisions (Important Aspects for India):

The invention should be new, demonstrate at least one inventive step and be capable of industrial application will be the essential conditions upon which invention patents shall be granted for any field of technology either for products or processes.

The time during which a patent is allowed shall be no less than 20 years from the date of filing.

The members that are provided with the measures to establish strong enforcement should also make it possible to have judicial remedies as well as border measures.

Flexibilities:

- The members are allowed to disallow deliberately inventions that are against public order or morality, as well as plants and animals (microorganisms excepted) from patentability (Art. 27.2–3).
- Consistent with that, the use of forced license and government production are among the submissions accepted in the case of particular set of circumstances (Art. 31).
- Dispute Resolution: Non implementation of the pact may lead to filing the case before the WTO's binding dispute settlement system, which has the authority to decide on the issue, thereby giving TRIPS a "teeth" feature that is unprecedented among the previous

IP treaties.

Implications for Developing Countries

As to the developing countries, TRIPS represented not only dangers but prospects as well.

- Opportunities: It was anticipated that compatibility of IP standards would be used as an attraction of capital from abroad, a facilitator of transfer of high technologies, and an instrument of bringing the countries to the global market.

- Challenges: The introduction of a stronger regime for protection of intellectual property could have the effect of increasing the price of goods, which are a must for the underprivileged, especially medicines. The limitation of pharmaceutical inventions with product patents set for 20 years was interpreted as a menace to access and affordability in the developing world.

India was hit hard since it used to have a law (the 1970 Act) that did not allow pharmaceutical product patents. Although the TRIPS agreement provided for applicability deadlines (till 2005 for product patents in pharmaceuticals and agrochemicals), the overall trend was towards India changing its patent system to one of process patents as well as product patents.

The TRIPS-Public Health Debate

Public Health was one of the major points of argument around TRIPS. The industrialized countries were saying that R&D was very costly and therefore patent protection was the way to go. On the other hand, developing countries were afraid that the patented companies would set prices so high that only the rich would have access to the medicines.

As an answer to the problem, the Doha Declaration on the TRIPS Agreement and Public Health (2001) was adopted. It recognizes the right of the WTO members to use the TRIPS flexibilities, such as compulsory licensing and parallel imports, in a bid to protect public health. The declaration at Doha was a very big political triumph for countries like India which count on the production of generic drugs to provide affordable medicines.

India's Position during TRIPS Negotiations

The first reaction of India was against the addition of IPR in the WTO framework suggesting

that the WIPO has been the most appropriate venue to handle it. Negotiators from India stated that rigorous IPR norms would decrease exports of the local companies and simultaneously limit the domestic market customers while virtually making access to medicines more difficult. But confronted with the entire Uruguay Round deal, including trade concessions in agriculture and textiles, India negotiated its way out of the deal and then turned around and signed.

India did not sit still, though, and she used the transitional periods to her advantage. The changes made in the patent law in India between 1995 and 2005 were done in several stages, namely:

- 1999 (Mailbox & EMRs),
- 2002 (bringing the Indian patent law in line with TRIPS standards),
- 2005 (allowing patents on products for pharmaceuticals and agrochemicals with full specifications).

Conclusion

Adopting the TRIPS Agreement signified a paradigm shift in the worldwide regime of intellectual property rights. Consequently, by virtue of TRIPS not merely did the treaty stipulate the minimum standards, but it also established a linkage between IPR enforcement and international trade, thus going beyond the mere national legislations. The whole concept behind the TRIPS pact was to unlock the global markets which, nevertheless, turned out to be a detonator for the rise of various debatable issues concerning development, justice, and the right to healthcare.

The Indian Pre-TRIPS patent regime, renowned for its support to the local production of affordable drugs, has had to align itself with the global patent system which now places greater emphasis on patent rights. The following chapter will investigate the adjustments made by India in its patent law post-TRIPS to reconcile domestic and international obligations.

Chapter 4: Evolution of Indian Patent Law After-TRIPS (1999-2005 Amendments)

Introduction

India`s joining the World Trade Organization (WTO) and its accept as well as the TRIPS

agreement represents a significant change in the country`s patent regime. Up to 1995, the Patents Act, 1970 had product patent exceptions, which were very explicit especially in the fields of drugs and agro-chemicals, designed with the double objective of both safeguarding the supply and encouraging local industrialization.

TRIPS, however, required that product patents be granted by India and that patent protection be extended to inventions in all-technological fields for a term of 20 years.

Consequently, the period between 1995 and 2005 was described as the time of incremental changes in the law. India took advantage of the transitional provisions under TRIPS to amend the patent law in a step-wise manner as allowed by the 1970 Act's developmental objectives.

This chapter outlines these changes and their objectives and implications, besides providing a general survey of the Acts of 1999, 2002 and 2005.

The Patents (Amendment) Act, 1999

The 1999 Amendment was India’s initial step to make its patent law compatible with TRIPS standards. Apart from the changes in the legislation, there were many substantial ones:

- Mailbox Provision: The provision allowed patent applications for products in the fields of pharmaceuticals and chemicals, but the examination was to be deferred until 2005. In other words, although the actual implementation was delayed, the priority rights under TRIPS were guaranteed.

- Exclusive Marketing Rights (EMRs): The revision enabled the possibility of EMRs for a patented pharmaceutical product of up to five years as a transitional period, provided that marketing authorization was obtained only. It was a transitional device linking the time of process patents with that of product patents in compliance with TRIPS.

- Transitional Safeguards: The period of process patents for drugs and chemicals was modified to be effective until January 1, 2005, so that the local industry would have the chance to get acquainted with the changes during that time.

The change of 1999 sent a clear message to the international community that India had a double strategy; on one side, it was loyal to the global accords, but on the other, it was protecting its

own interests.

The Patents (Amendment) Act, 2002

The 2002 amendment was a significant move towards making the Indian patent law system more compliant with the TRIPS agreement. The principal changes were:

- • Definition of Patentable Invention: The law described patentable inventions as those that are new, non-obvious, and can be made or used in any kind of industry. In other words, the inventions should comply with TRIPS Article 27.

- Exclusions from Patentability: The revised act, Section 3, the patentable inventions, defines those inventors for whom no patents are granted for inventions that are created by using the methods of agriculture, medical treatments, and are antagonistic to public order or morality.

- Compulsory Licensing Provisions: The change reinforced the authority of the government to offer compulsory licenses under Section 84, the main focus of which was the protection of the public interest and access to medicines was in no way obstructed.

- Mailbox and EMR were still functioning: Any application in conformity with the 1999 amendment was considered as one that was submitted in the mailbox and could be allocated EMR during the transitional phase.

The 2002 amendment was designed to indicate that India was imposing stricter regulations as a method to prevent the exploitation of the patent monopoly and was, thus, trying to strike a balance between its TRIPS obligations and developmental agenda.

The Patents (Amendment) Act, 2005

The 2005 amendment was the most important one that changed the effective date from January 1, 2005, the end of the TRIPS transitional period for pharmaceuticals and agrochemicals.

The primary characteristics were:

- Product Patents Introduced: From that time on, drugs and agrochemicals have been

patentable products, and as such, India can be considered TRIPS-compliant.

- Patent Term: The duration of patenting was 20 years from the filing date, as laid down in TRIPS Article 33.

- Section 3(d) – Anti-Evergreening: It was one particular provision that prevented "evergreening" of patents by modifying already known substances in trivial ways. Only those inventions were granted patents that demonstrated an increase in efficacy.

- Compulsory Licensing: The measures that were there to be strengthened ensured that patents would not be a barrier to the access of essential medicines. The government had the authority to issue licenses if the reasonable requirements were not met or the drug was not fairly priced.

- Transitional Arrangements: The patents that were filed under the mailbox system were reexamined and granted under the new regime, thus ensuring that there was a transition as well as respect for TRIPS priority rights.

Therefore, the 2005 amendment is India's last step to TRIPS compliance with the incorporation of safeguards like Section 3(d) to protect the public interest.

Impact on Domestic Industry and Public Health

The implications in the aftermath of the TRIPS agreement alterations had a two-faced character:

- Domestic Industry: First of all, the dread was that the reinstatement of product patents would present a major barrier to the generic manufacturers of India. On the other hand, Indian companies were empowered by a proper interpretation of Section 3(d) to go on with their supply of drugs in the form of generics in some cases which meant they did not lose their strength in the market.

- Public Health: The employment of compulsory licensing provisions and anti-evergreening initiatives made it possible for India to continue to provide the country with inexpensive medicines, as it happened, for instance, in Novartis AG v. Union of India case.

- Foreign Investment and Technology Transfer: The radical overhaul of the TRIPS agreement, the world standard for intellectual property rights, made India a more attractive FDI destination. As a result, multinationals changed their minds and decided to invest more in Indian companies, especially in the pharma and biotech sectors.

Critical Evaluation

The reforms that followed the TRIPS agreement represent India's tactical moves in defiance of the global decrees. Among the main lessons, one can outline are:

- The country availed itself of the transitional provisions to facilitate a phased enforcement of the rules that guaranteed the protection of local enterprises.

- Section 3 of the Indian Patents Act is perhaps a unique example of legislation attempting to reconcile TRIPS stringent requirements with the objective of eliminating anti-competitive practices.

- One of the desired consequences from the use of licensing was the claim that compliance with TRIPS would not jeopardize public health goals.

- Court interpretation and administrative decisions represent another type of anchoring to the legal framework which thus ensures that certain flexibility in practice is maintained.

- The above adjustments are signs of India attempting to balance her international obligations and domestic developmental requirements, the model other developing countries apparently citing while coping with TRIPS.

Conclusion

India completed its transition to a TRIPS-compliant patent regime through paced and carefully planned reforms between 1999 and 2005. With the introduction of mailbox, EMRs, product patents, Section 3(d), and compulsory licensing, India sought to:

- First, it made a move to energize innovation and industry at both macro and micro levels,

- Second, it tried to ensure that the access to affordable medicines was not blocked,
- Last but not least, it sought to fulfill the international commitments that India had made under TRIPS.

The newer Indian patent system post-TRIPS has been more compatible with global standards while maintaining the domestic priorities which have been reflected in the debates of intellectual property, innovation, and health.

Chapter 5: Judicial Developments and Case Law Analysis

Introduction

Not only was legislative reform a prominent feature of the post-TRIPS era in India, but significant judicial intervention was also noticeable. Courts have played a very important role in the interpretation of the Patents Act (2005), and in facilitating the safeguarding of public health and industrial development along with Indian's international commitments.

Judicial scrutiny has especially dealt with:

- The extent of the non-obviousness requirement in Section 3(d),
- The authenticity of evergreening type of patents, and
- The employment of compulsory licenses in medicine accessibility.
- Such issues regarding Indian patent law and the TRIPS agreement patent regime have been decided on the basis of judicial decisions which this paper is now reviewing.

Novartis AG v. Union of India (2013)

- **Context:**

Novartis tried to get a patent for its Glivec cancer drug which was just a reworked version of imatinib, a drug that had been known earlier. The Controller General of Patents declared non-allowance of the application under Section 3(d) which bans patents for less significant changes of well-known compounds unless such changes exhibit increased efficacy.

- **Supreme Court Decision:**

The Supreme Court confirmed the decision by rejecting the application. It stated that Glivec was only one of the incremental modifications and that the substantial therapeutic efficacy over prior compounds was not presented.

- **Importance:**

Helped to maintain the anti-evergreening provisions of Section 3(d).

Stressed out by this decision India's dedication to public health that the legislation on patents should not be a barrier to the access to cheap medicines.

Exemplified the judiciary's activity in the interpretation of the TRIPS flexibilities as adapted to local public interest situations.

Bayer Corporation v. Union of India (2009)

Bayer sought patent protection for the cancer drug Sorafenib tosylate. The Indian Patent Office initially based its refusal on prior art. Bayer filed a writ petition in the Delhi High Court against the refusal.

- Delhi High Court Decision: The court's judgment was in line with Sections 2(1)(j) and 3 of the Patents Act as novelty and inventive step were missing.

- Importance: Reemphasized the strict criteria for patenting that serve to exclude trivial or non-innovative patents.

Demonstrated that the Indian patent regime relied heavily on patentable authentic inventions rather than on the patentability of incremental modifications.

***Lee Pharma v. Union of India (2017)* – Compulsory Licensing**

Lee Pharma sued the government over its choice to forcibly grant a license for the production of the anti-cancer medication Nexavar, patented by Bayer. The domestic company could manufacture a generic copy at a more affordable price with the license.

- Supreme Court / IPAB Decision: The court decision fell in favor of the government's, quoting Section 84 and Section 3(d) of the Patents Act, and linking the matter to public interest and the access of medicines.

- Importance: Described the particular conditions for the issuance of compulsory licenses. Pointed out the TRIPS-compliant Indian system of IP protection which ensures a balance between the public health and patent rights.

Impact of Judicial Pronouncements

The overall impact of the judicial decisions in question is very profound:

- Section 3(d) as a Safeguard: The courts have regularly defined Section 3(d) as a principal control over the continuous growth of the patent monopoly, being at the same time a main instrument to verify that patents are allotted only for real breakthrough inventions.

- Compulsory Licensing: The support from the judiciary has greatly contributed to the stability of the legal grounds wherein compulsory licenses are issued for the purpose of affordable access to essential medicines.

- Alignment with TRIPS Flexibilities: Panels have made good use of the leeway given by TRIPS to showcase that international commitments do not always have to undermine local social welfare.

- Industrial Growth: Thanks to the Indian courts, which have kept away from trivial patents, the Indian generic drug industry has stayed strong and vibrant, thus facilitating not only the local production but also exports.

Critical Analysis

The Indian judiciary has become a significant force in defining a patent law that complies with TRIPS:

- The mode of operation in India is quite different from that in some developed countries where the courts usually rule in favor of the patent holders.

- The courts have taken up a position that favors development and the public health sector by putting the emphasis on access and affordability of health services.

- The judicial activism has also been an important element in the elimination of legal ambiguities in the Patents Act, which has made it easier for the domestic and multinational companies to interpret the law and proceed according to it.

- Still, there are some challenges that the Indian courts face when it comes to balancing innovations and public health issues:

- Keeping the balance between providing enough incentives for innovations and maintaining good public health has been a very difficult issue of concern.

The fact that disputes concerning standards of patentability and the right to issue compulsory licenses are still going on show that the judicial course is not entirely settled yet.

Conclusion

Judicial interpretation has been the cornerstone of India's post-TRIPS patent regime. The Novartis, Bayer, and Lee Pharma cases show:

- The court's energetic involvement in maintaining public health,

- The employment of TRIPS options to guarantee local concerns,

- And the establishment of an impartial patent environment that sustains both the development of the field and accessibility of drugs.

Chapter 6 will be a comprehensive examination of the Indian patent regime in relation to TRIPS, trying to figure out whether those implemented through law and court intervention have been successful in achieving goals in terms of development and public health.

Chapter 6: Critical Evaluation – Balancing TRIPS and Public Health in India

Introduction

The landscape of India after TRIPS has resulted in a complicated relationship between global

duties, local laws, industrial policies, and the welfare of the public. To comply with TRIPS while at the same time ensuring affordable medicines and the growth of the domestic pharmaceutical industry were open challenges India had to face. The discussion in this chapter goes beyond the mere description of India's legislative framework, judicial interpretation, and policy interventions to explore if these three actually work towards achieving this challenging equilibrium.

Legislative Measures and TRIPS Flexibilities

Some of the main provisions of India's Patents Act, 2005 were designed to align TRIPS compliance with the country's domestic goals.

- Section 3(d) – Anti-Evergreening: The provision stops pharmaceutical companies from evergreening by tweaking drugs which are already on the market unless the altered drug explains a higher therapeutic effect.

- Compulsory Licensing (Section 84): The provision is designed in such a way that in no case will patents become a means of totally blocking access to the public to medicines.

- Exclusions from Patentability: Public interest is protected by these types of inventions and research, namely, agricultural methods, medical treatments, and discoveries, which cannot be patented.

Critical Evaluation:

By extensive global citations, Section 3(d) is regarded as a novel protective measure. This allows India to issue patents for real innovations and simultaneously blocks the use of monopolistic practices that would limit drug accessibility.

By the use of provisions on compulsory licensing, the country's local pharmaceutical companies have been empowered to supply the market with less expensive generics, which has not resulted in any breach of TRIPS.

On the other hand, the advocates of the MNCs view stated that severe anti-evergreening measures might deter incremental innovation in their R&D laboratories.

Judicial Role in Maintaining Balance

Legislative decisions have been supported by judgements of the courts:

- Novartis v. Union of India (2013): The court rejected the patents held by Novartis for its modified drug based on Section 3(d) and thereby allowed the production of generics.
- Lee Pharma v. Union of India (2017): The contention that the government's decision to grant compulsory licenses was an abuse of power was dismissed.
- Bayer v. Union of India (2009): Established hard criteria for patent eligibility by expelling the invention lacking novelty.

Critical Evaluation: Judiciary puts the health of people first before the profit of the pharmaceutical industry. The verdict of the courts makes the situation more transparent and reduces the risk for both local and foreign patent holders. Anyway, the pace of the disputes may postpone market entry, thus, the time of getting proper drugs may be influenced.

Impact on Domestic Pharmaceutical Industry

The Indian pharmaceutical industry after TRIPS has seen a mixed bag of situations with some opportunities along with some challenges:

- **Opportunities:**

One of the main benefits of having a strong and stable IP protection regime in place has been the inflow of foreign direct investments and the technology transfers in the country.

As the multinational corporations face the presence of the Indian competition, they quickly come up with the strategy of partnering with Indian firms to not only increase but also strengthen their shared R&D capabilities.

- **Challenges:**

Changes in the patent law have led to confusion among domestic generic manufacturers since they lost certainty due to the reintroduction of product patents in India.

The high prices of drugs under patent, in the absence of efficient implementation of Section 3(d) and compulsory licensing, might cause problems of affordability for the local patients.

- **Critical Evaluation:**

India's cautious strategy (mailbox system, phased amendments, section 3(d)) has not only helped Indian companies to get acquainted with the new patent regime but also made them more competitive in the global market.

The generic industry is still very strong and continues to dominate the global market of affordable medicines, especially for developing countries.

TRIPS and Public Health: Successes and Limitations

Successes:

- India has proven to be very resourceful in utilizing the TRIPS flexibilities (such as non-voluntary licensing, and Section 3(d)) with the ultimate goal of public health welfare.

- Besides national and international programs to secure the access to essential medicines, a number of legal measures have been put in place to guarantee that these drugs will be available at affordable prices, including in India.

- The Indian Road to IP reform is the essence of the WHO and the UNDP's ideal model: a developing country maintaining the equilibrium between innovation, and the accessibility of the medicine.

Limitations:

- The facilities for the enhancing of the TRIPS agreements through additional terms introduced by bilateral and regional trade agreements create further obstacles to the flexibility of national systems.

- The argument put forth by the multinationals is that the anti-evergreening provisions may have a negative impact on the line of thought behind innovation in India.

- The access to the latest drugs is delayed not only due to patents but also due to ongoing

court cases.

Policy Implications

The story of India offers a lesson or two about policymaking:

- On the one hand, there keep on being debates regarding ways to keep compliance with TRIPS without hampering public health. The introduction of provisions like compulsory licensing and Section 3(d) shows that the obligations under TRIPS do not exclude policies focused on access.

- On the other hand, the question about how India can keep the balance of scientific progress and generic production will be the main policy concern of the R&D sector. The country will have to develop the internal scientific research part that will work hand in hand with the Indian generic industry so that no innovation will be stifled.

- Besides the above, another policy issue that India needs to focus on is the need for continuous monitoring of the TRIPS-plus type agreements. They need to be alert to ensure that public health provisions are not weakened as a result of trade negotiations.

Among all the possible roles in the international scenario, the most exciting one for India is the model of a future developing country, equipped with the lessons learned while dealing with the issue of intellectual property standards in trade regime policies.

Conclusion

India has come through the post-TRIPS chaos without much difficulty and that is mainly due to the practical legislative amendments, the use of TRIPS flexibilities, and the watchful eye of the courts. The various factors worked hand in hand to achieve that:

- The defining characteristic of Section 3(d) and anti-evergreening legislation,

- The utilization of compulsory licensing provisions, and

- The judicial stance favoring the public good were the changes that permitted India to successfully maintain the delicate balance between the provision of access to medicines and the granting of incentives for innovations. Though obstacles do persist - particularly

in the light of TRIPS-plus forces and the development of the pharmaceutical field - India's manner of acting is the most practical and development-oriented patent policy.

Chapter 7: Conclusion and Recommendations

Introduction

The work conveys a change of the Indian patent laws over time with a major focus on the TRIPS agreement as a key driver of these changes. The introduction of the Patents Act 1970 and the post-TRIPS amendments in the evolution of the Indian patent regime from colonial times-era legislation have been the milestones in this journey charted by the study with each subsequent stage reflecting a change in developmental agenda, international obligations, as well as public health concerns.

The last chapter serves as a summary of the key findings, a reflection on the efficiency of India's TRIPS-compliant patent regime, and an offering of policy recommendations.

Key Findings

The patent laws in India during the colonial period (1856–1911) were heavily influenced by the ruling priorities of the British administrators who favored foreign manufacturers and gave very little support to domestic innovators.

The 1970 Patents Act legislated a new patent system, which was primarily oriented towards the requirements of developing countries. The Act on one hand, went into details concerning process patents, and on the other hand, covered provisions on compulsory licensing and inexpensive drugs.

Legislative Reform and TRIPS:

By becoming a party to the TRIPS agreement, India essentially altered the system that recognized only process patents, and as a result, product patents were needed in the area of drugs. To make its patent laws compatible with TRIPS, India needed to amend its patent laws three times (1999, 2002, and 2005).

India's policy made the most of the different transition periods, mailbox filings, and the EMRs to ensure the smooth transition to compliance with the least possible disruption to the local

industry.

Judicial Intervention:

The cases of *Novartis v. Union of India, Bayer v. Union of India, and Lee Pharma v. Union of India* have been a landmark in the implementation of the anti-evergreening provisions, the authority to grant compulsory licenses, and the patentability criteria.

Among others, the courts that, over the years, have been consistently instrumental in maintaining the correct balance between the rigorous compliance with TRIPS provisions on the one hand and health-related requirements of the public, thus, access to reasonably priced pharmaceuticals, on the other, are the courts of India.

Public Health and Industrial Impact:

The patent regime that followed TRIPS in India has enabled the manufacture of generics, which in turn has made medicines both locally and globally, affordable, thus, the Indian patent regime has not, as it is, hindered the production of generics. Though the country has fulfilled the TRIPS obligations, it has simultaneously managed to attract FDI, facilitate the transfer of technology, and provide the pharmaceutical and biotech sectors with the R&D support that they require.

Challenges:

- The country of India might be under a lot of international pressure to sign TRIPS-plus deals that would restrict the country's capacity to create and implement its own policies.
- The issue of giving patients early access to newly patented drugs is not likely to be solved as long as there exists the practice of litigation and granting of monopoly rights which is usually followed by high prices.
- There is also an issue of maintaining a proper balance between giving enough incentive for innovation and not harming public health, which is a constant concern of policymakers.

Critical Analysis

India's scenario is a classic instance illustrating the point that conforming to TRIPS does not

entail surrendering to development objectives:

Legal Safeguards: The 3(d) clause prohibits the evergreening that is a selective patent application done cleverly with the aim of extending patent monopolies instead of new inventions being the base of which the improvements are. The section on compulsory licensing provides a way that is both regulated and legal to have access to essential medicines without violating the patent agreement.

Judicial Oversight:

Judicial organs have interpreted the law so as to attach great emphasis on the need for the public interest, therefore, the courts' role in the whole process is made absolutely necessary.

Policy Implications: The India model is the one that is most notable for having the kind of smart and effective balance that factors in international commitment as well as the welfare of the people at home. The case of India can be looked upon as a good example for the other third world countries that are willing to comply with TRIPS but are still trying to figure out how to synchronize it with their own national development goals.

Recommendations

Recommendations made based on the information are given below:

- **Strengthen Domestic R&D:**

Make it easier for pharmaceutical and biotech research and development to happen through the use of subsidies, grants, and public-private partnerships. Not only innovations that meet the health needs of the country but also technology for export should be the government's least of concerns, hence the government must provide funding and support for the innovation through it.

- **Enhance Access to Medicines:**

Practice the TRIPS flexibility provisions in totality such as compulsory licensing and parallel imports. Constantly take care of drug pricing mostly for patented drugs so that the medicines will be within the reach of the common man.

- **Policy Vigilance on TRIPS-Plus Agreements:**

Analyze bilateral and regional trade agreements to unearth any clauses that hinder the patent flexibilities in India. Support the passage of laws that contribute to the protection of public health in conjunction with peaceful negotiations within the international treaty arena by providing such enough provisions.

- **Judicial and Administrative Capacity Building:**

Introduce the basics of IPR and public health issues by creating a special training program for patent examiners and judicial officers. Avoid lengthy legal battles that restrict the access of life-saving medicines by encouraging fast patent dispute settlements.

- **International Collaboration:**

Share the news of India's balanced and fair approach of intellectual property and public health with other developing countries. Participate in international dialogues to show your willingness to be part of the TRIPS interpretation process and the setting of IPR standards.

Conclusion

The history of patent law in India especially in the context of TRIPS is a portrayal of India's prudent and skillful compromise. India has managed:

- To shift the focus from process patents to product patents, a TRIPS-compliant system where product patents are allowed,

- Through law and court judgments not only has India kept public health provisions intact but has also ensured that these provisions are interpreted in a way that facilitates access to medicines, and

- Besides, India got the support of domestic innovation and industrial growth in the pharmaceutical sector.

- Challenges are still there but the Indian patent policy serves an excellent example of how international IP obligations could be brought into accord with domestic development goals without any drop in quality and pace. This experience is a good

reference point for the other developing countries that are also struggling to comply with TRIPS.

India's post-TRIPS patent system is a good example of how intellectual property rights, public health, and industrial development can be balanced and therefore, innovation and access are not mutually exclusive when law, policy, and courts interpret it strategically.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights, Apr. 15, 1994, Marrakesh Agreement Establishing the World Trade Organization, Annex 1C, 1869 U.N.T.S. 299.

2. The Patents Act, No. 39 of 1970, INDIA CODE (1970).

3. The Patents (Amendment) Acts, 1999, 2002 & 2005, INDIA CODE.

4. Novartis AG v. Union of India, (2013) 6 SCC 1.

5. Bayer Corp. v. Union of India, (2009) 160 DLT 371 (Del. HC).

6. Lee Pharma v. Union of India, IPAB Decision (2017).

7. Shamnad Basheer, India's Tryst with TRIPS: The Patents (Amendment) Act, 2005, 1 INDIAN J.L. & TECH. 15 (2005).

8. Shamnad Basheer, Evergreening, Access to Medicines and Indian Patent Law, 1 INDIAN J.L. & TECH. 1 (2005).

9. Peter Drahos, Developing Countries and International Intellectual Property Standard-Setting, 5 J. WORLD INTELL. PROP. 765 (2002).

10. Daniel Gervais, The TRIPS Agreement: Drafting History and Analysis (4th ed. 2012).

11. Susan K. Sell, Private Power, Public Law: The Globalization of Intellectual Property Rights (2003).

12. Ellen F.M. 't Hoen, TRIPS, Pharmaceutical Patents, and Access to Essential Medicines: A Long Way from Seattle to Doha, 3 CHI. J. INT'L L. 27 (2002).

13. Frederick M. Abbott, Protecting First World Assets in the Third World: Intellectual Property Negotiations in the GATT Multilateral Framework, 22 VAND. J. TRANSNAT'L L. 689 (1989).

14. J.H. Reichman, Universal Minimum Standards of Intellectual Property Protection under

the TRIPS Component of the WTO Agreement, 29 INT'L LAW. 345 (1995).

15. N.S. Gopalakrishnan & T.G. Agitha, Principles of Intellectual Property (2d ed. 2014).

16. UNDP, Human Development Report 2011 (2011).

17. WTO, Understanding the WTO: Settling Disputes (2020), https://www.wto.org

18. PhRMA, Why Intellectual Property Matters to Patients (2000)

19. Basheer , India's Patent Law and the TRIPS Agreement, in Global Intellectual Property Rights: Knowledge, Access, and Development (Eds. Peter Drahos & Ruth Mayne, 2003).

20. Paris Convention for the Protection of Industrial Property, Mar. 20, 1883, 828 U.N.T.S. 305.

21. Berne Convention for the Protection of Literary and Artistic Works, Sept. 9, 1886, 828 U.N.T.S. 221.

22. Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights, Apr. 15, 1994, Marrakesh Agreement Establishing the World Trade Organization, Annex 1C, 1869 U.N.T.S. 299.

23. The Patents Act, No. 39 of 1970, INDIA CODE (1970).

24. The Patents (Amendment) Acts, 1999, 2002 & 2005, INDIA CODE

25. Novartis AG v. Union of India, (2013) 6 SCC 1

26. Bayer Corp. v. Union of India, (2009) 160 DLT 371 (Del. HC)

27. Lee Pharma v. Union of India, IPAB Decision (2017).

28. Shamnad Basheer, India's Tryst with TRIPS: The Patents (Amendment) Act, 2005, 1 INDIAN J.L. & TECH. 15 (2005).

29. Shamnad Basheer, Evergreening, Access to Medicines and Indian Patent Law, 1

INDIAN J.L. & TECH. 1 (2005).

30. Peter Drahos, Developing Countries and International Intellectual Property Standard-Setting, 5 J. WORLD INTELL. PROP. 765 (2002).

31. Daniel Gervais, The TRIPS Agreement: Drafting History and Analysis (4th ed. 2012).

32. Susan K. Sell, Private Power, Public Law: The Globalization of Intellectual Property Rights (2003).

33. Ellen F.M. 't Hoen, TRIPS, Pharmaceutical Patents, and Access to Essential Medicines: A Long Way from Seattle to Doha, 3 CHI. J. INT'L L. 27 (2002).

34. Frederick M. Abbott, Protecting First World Assets in the Third World: Intellectual Property Negotiations in the GATT Multilateral Framework, 22 VAND. J. TRANSNAT'L L. 689 (1989).

35. J.H. Reichman, Universal Minimum Standards of Intellectual Property Protection under the TRIPS Component of the WTO Agreement, 29 INT'L LAW. 345 (1995).

36. N.S. Gopalakrishnan & T.G. Agitha, Principles of Intellectual Property (2d ed. 2014).

37. UNDP, Human Development Report 2011 (2011).

38. WTO, Understanding the WTO: Settling Disputes (2020), https://www.wto.org

39. PhRMA, Why Intellectual Property Matters to Patients (2000)

40. Basheer , India's Patent Law and the TRIPS Agreement, in Global Intellectual Property Rights: Knowledge, Access, and Development (Eds. Peter Drahos & Ruth Mayne, 2003).

41. Paris Convention for the Protection of Industrial Property, Mar. 20, 1883, 828 U.N.T.S. 305.

42. Berne Convention for the Protection of Literary and Artistic Works, Sept. 9, 1886, 828 U.N.T.S. 221.

CASES DISCUSSED

S. No.	Case Name	Citation	Year
1.	Novartis AG v. Union of India	(2013) 6 SCC 1	2013
2.	Bayer Corp. v. Union of India	(2009) 160 DLT 371 (Del. HC)	2009
3.	Lee Pharma v. Union of India	IPAB Decision (2017)	2017