INDIAN JOURNAL OF LEGAL REVIEW [IJLR – IF SCORE – 7.58]

VOLUME 5 AND ISSUE 8 OF 2025

APIS – 3920 - 0001 *(and)* ISSN - 2583-2344

Published by

Institute of Legal Education

https://iledu.in

SECTOR- SPECIFIC ANALYSIS OF PATENT PROTECTION IN INDIA

AUTHOR - ISHIKA HOODA, STUDENT AT AMITY LAW SCHOOL, NOIDA

BEST CITATION - ISHIKA HOODA, SECTOR- SPECIFIC ANALYSIS OF PATENT PROTECTION IN INDIA, INDIAN JOURNAL OF LEGAL REVIEW (IJLR), 5 (8) OF 2025, PG. 289-300, APIS – 3920 – 0001 & ISSN - 2583-2344.

ABSTRACT

This paper presents a comprehensive sector-specific analysis of India's patent protection framework, focusing on two critical sectors: pharmaceuticals and agricultural biotechnology. India's unique approach to patent protection represents a deliberate balancing act between fostering innovation and ensuring public access to essential goods.

In the pharmaceutical sector, the evolution from the process-patent system established by the 1970 Patents Act to the post-TRIPS product patent regime implemented in 2005 transformed India's position in the global pharmaceutical landscape.

The paper examines distinctive features of India's pharmaceutical patent system, including Section 3(d)'s anti-evergreening provision, compulsory licensing mechanisms, and the dual opposition system, analyzing landmark cases such as Novartis v. Union of India, Bayer v. Natco, and Roche v. Cipla. The impacts on various stakeholders—multinational pharmaceutical companies, domestic generic manufacturers, and patients—are evaluated, revealing how India's pharmaceutical sector has adapted to international obligations while maintaining access to medicines.

In the agricultural biotechnology sector, the paper traces the development of a multi-layered protection framework comprising the amended Patents Act, the Protection of Plant Varieties and Farmers' Rights Act (PPVFR), and the Biological Diversity Act. This integrated approach restricts patentability for plants and essentially biological processes while creating alternative protection mechanisms for plant varieties that preserve farmers' rights. The paper analyzes the patentability criteria for genetically modified organisms, genes, DNA sequences, and biotechnological processes, examining judicial interpretations in cases like Monsanto v. Nuziveedu Seeds. The research identifies persistent tensions between innovation incentives and access concerns, particularly regarding seed sovereignty and the relationship between private rights and public research. The paper concludes by examining emerging challenges from new breeding technologies and international harmonization pressures, offering policy recommendations to strengthen India's sector-specific patent protection framework while maintaining its distinct development priorities.

1. India's Pharmaceutical Patent System: Balancing Innovation and Public Health

1.1 Introduction

India's approach to pharmaceutical patents has become a blueprint for developing nations trying to walk the tightrope between protecting innovation and ensuring people can access life-saving medications. This paper explores how India's patent system evolved from the 1970s to today, examining key court cases and policies that shape how medicines are produced, priced, and distributed in the world's largest democracy.

As both "the pharmacy of the developing world" and an emerging centre for drug innovation, India plays a crucial role in the global healthcare landscape. With a domestic pharma market exceeding $42 billion annually and exports approaching $25 billion, understanding India's patent framework matters for everyone

from drug companies and policy makers to healthcare providers and patients worldwide.

1.2 How India's Patent System Evolved?

The 1970 Patents Act: A Bold New Direction

India's modern pharmaceutical story begins with the Patents Act of 1970, which marked a clean break from colonial-era patent laws. The 1970 Act made a strategic decision to recognize only process patents—not product patents—for pharmaceuticals, foods, and agricultural chemicals. This meant companies could produce the same drug as long as they developed a different manufacturing method.

This process-patent approach:

- Shortened pharmaceutical patent protection to just 7 years (compared to 14 years for other inventions)
- Allowed Indian companies to reverse-engineer existing medicines legally
- Required patent holders to manufacture products in India or risk losing exclusive rights

This framework gave rise to India's powerhouse generic drug industry, allowing companies like Cipla, Ranbaxy (now part of Sun Pharmaceutical), and Dr. Reddy's to develop manufacturing expertise while providing affordable medicines at home and to other developing countries.

The TRIPS Era: Adapting to Global Standards

When India joined the World Trade Organization in 1995, it agreed to align with the Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS). This meant significant changes to its patent approach, especially for pharmaceuticals. India implemented these changes in three phases:

The first phase includes **First Amendment (1999)** which created a "mailbox" system to collect product patent applications until the full TRIPS implementation and established exclusive marketing rights. This gave pipeline protection until product patents would be granted.

The Second stage includes **Second Amendment (2002)** which extended patent terms from 7-14 years to a uniform 20 years and modified compulsory licensing provisions.

While, the Third stage includes **Third Amendment (2005)** which was the game-changer that introduced product patents for pharmaceuticals, while cleverly incorporating safeguards like Section 3(d) to prevent "evergreening" (extending patents through minor modifications).

The 2005 amendment fundamentally transformed India's pharmaceutical landscape, ending the era when companies could freely copy patented drugs. However, India built in several safeguards that later became subjects of major legal battles.

1.3 India's Patent System is different due to variety of reasons due to variety of provisions:

1.3.1 Section 3(d): The Anti-Evergreening Provision

Section 3(d) represents India's most distinctive and controversial patent provision. Added during the 2005 amendment, it states that you can't patent:

"The mere discovery of a new form of a known substance which does not result in the enhancement of the known efficacy of that substance or the mere discovery of any new property or new use for a known substance..."

This means that the Drug companies can't just patent a slightly different form of an existing drug. They must prove the new version works significantly better as a treatment. Simply discovering new properties or new uses for existing compounds isn't enough.

This provision directly targets "evergreening"—the practice where companies make minor tweaks to existing drugs to extend their monopoly. While multinational pharmaceutical companies criticize this as going beyond TRIPS requirements, defenders say it pushes companies to develop truly innovative

treatments rather than gaming the patent system.

Compulsory Licensing: The Emergency Valve

India's patent system includes provisions allowing the government to authorize a company to produce a patented drug without the patent holder's permission under certain conditions.

Under **Section 84**, a company can apply for a compulsory license after three years from patent grant if: first, the patent holder isn't meeting public needs, second the drug isn't available at a reasonable price and the third the patented invention isn't being manufactured in India

Additionally, **Section 92** allows compulsory licenses during national emergencies or for public non-commercial use.

While India has used this power sparingly, the mere threat has pushed drug companies to reconsider their pricing and licensing strategies in the country.

Double Opposition System

India allows patent challenges through both pre-grant and post-grant opposition procedures. This means that in **Pre-grant opposition**, anyone can object before a patent is granted while in the **post-grant opposition**, challenges can be filed within one year after a patent is published.

This dual system increases scrutiny of pharmaceutical patents and has been actively used by patient advocacy groups and generic manufacturers to challenge patents they believe don't meet India's criteria.

1.3.2 Some Landmark Legal Battles related to Patents in Pharmaceuticals are listed here:

a) **Novartis vs. Union of India: Defining "Enhanced Efficacy"**

The Novartis case represents the most significant pharmaceutical patent dispute in India's history. It centered on Novartis's cancer drug imatinib mesylate (marketed as Gleevec/Glivec), specifically their attempt to patent a beta crystalline form of the compound.

The Timeline:

- 1993: Novartis filed a U.S. patent covering imatinib and its salts
- 1998: Novartis filed an Indian patent application for the beta crystalline form
- 2006: Indian Patent Office rejected the application
- 2013: After multiple appeals, India's Supreme Court upheld the rejection.

The Court's Reasoning: The Supreme Court determined that: The beta crystalline form was indeed a new form of a known substance (imatinib); "Efficacy" in Section 3(d) specifically means therapeutic efficacy for medicines; Better physical properties (flow, stability, etc.) don't count as enhanced therapeutic efficacy; Even improved bioavailability isn't enough without proof of better treatment outcomes

This landmark decision set a high bar for pharmaceutical patents, requiring companies to demonstrate actual therapeutic improvements—not just better manufacturing or physical characteristics—to patent new forms of existing drugs.

b) **Bayer vs. Natco: India's First Pharmaceutical Compulsory License**

In 2012, India issued its first compulsory license for a patented pharmaceutical, establishing important precedents for when such licenses can be granted.

The facts: Bayer held an Indian patent for sorafenib tosylate (Nexavar), used for liver and kidney cancer. It then priced the drug at around Rs. 280,000 ($5,500) per month. Natco Pharma applied to produce a generic version at Rs. 8,800 ($175) per month.

The Decision: The Patent Controller granted the compulsory license because: Less than 2% of eligible patients could access the drug; The

price was unaffordable for most Indian patients; Importing without local manufacturing constituted failure to "work the patent".

The compulsory license required Natco to: Pay 6% royalties to Bayer, sell the drug at the lower price and to provide the medicine in free to some of the patients.

This case established that high prices can constitute failure to meet public needs, significant price differences can show lack of "reasonable affordability," and patent holders may need local manufacturing to satisfy working requirements.

c) Roche vs. Cipla: Balancing Patents and Public Health

This case involved Roche's lung cancer drug erlotinib (Tarceva) and established important principles for analyzing pharmaceutical patent infringement.

The Facts: Roche held an Indian patent on erlotinib hydrochloride. Cipla launched a generic version at about one-third of Roche's price. Roche sued for patent infringement. Cipla claimed the patent was invalid.

The Court's Findings are that both structural and functionality similarity matter on comparing patented compounds with alleged copies. It also held that public interest and pricing are relevant factors in pharmaceutical patent cases and that the minor variations in form may not constitute infringement.

This decision highlighted how Indian courts balance patent enforcement against public health considerations, establishing that price differences and access concerns may influence decisions about stopping alleged infringement.

1.3.3 How Different Stakeholders Have Been Affected

a. Multinational Pharmaceutical Companies

The 2005 introduction of product patents improved protection for multinational drug companies, but challenges remain. **The Positives** includes that Patents on truly innovative compounds are generally respected; this brings more predictable patent examination and enforcement; and their exists growing recognition of patents' role in encouraging innovation. While at the same time **the Challenges** includes strict interpretation of section 3(d) which limits patents on incremental improvements, major risk of compulsory licensing for expensive medications and it further involves and includes the active opposition from competitors and advocacy groups.

Although in response, multinational companies have now started focusing patent applications on genuinely innovative compounds rather than just combining the older ones. They have developed India-specific pricing strategies and now, entered voluntary licensing agreements to prevent compulsory licenses. These Companies have now established R&D centres in India to engage with local innovation.

b. Indian Generic Pharmaceutical Industry

The 2005 amendments initially challenged India's generic industry but also drove strategic adaptation in terms of how this industry have changed in various ways**:** they have increased R&D investments (from about 2% to 5-8% of revenue for larger companies), now greater focus is on regulated markets (US, Europe) requiring patent compliance. Now, sophisticated patent challenge strategies are being developed. Alos, the pre-grant opposition is strategically is to delay competitor patents.

Evolution of Business Models lead the Partnership with original developers through voluntary licensing; development of non-infringing processes and formulations; Investment in biological manufacturing and biosimilar development and further increased the focus on complex generics with higher barriers to entry.

Notable examples include Dr. Reddy's shift from pure generics to innovative drug discovery, Sun Pharmaceutical's global expansion through acquisitions like Ranbaxy, and Cipla's

development of innovative formulations and delivery systems.

Some Real-World Examples to highlight this point are- HIV/AIDS medications since, the Indian generics reduced annual treatment costs from over $10,000 to under $100. Multiple patent challenges have resulted in earlier generic entry in their cancer treatments. Voluntary licensing agreements for sofosbuvir reduced treatment costs by over 95%-case of Hepatitis C.

However, some newer patented medications remain unaffordable without insurance or patient assistance programs, highlighting the ongoing tension between innovation incentives and access concerns.

1.3.4 Recent Developments and Future Direction

International Pressures and Responses

India continues to face international pressure regarding its pharmaceutical patent policies whwre external Pressures remains about India's Regular appearance on the US Trade Representative's "Priority Watch List". Also, how India constantly tries to do Bilateral trade negotiations in order to push stricter patent protection. And, it also includes Threats of investor-state disputes from pharmaceutical companies

India's Responses to the same includes- Maintaining TRIPS-compliant but health-oriented patent standards; constantly, engaging in multilateral forums to defend TRIPS flexibilities. Also, developing case laws that clarifies but largely maintains existing standards; Expanding government medicine purchasing to address access concerns.

India has largely resisted pressure to adopt stricter pharmaceutical patent standards while gradually improving administrative processes.

2. Biotechnology and Agricultural Patents: Protection Framework in India

2.1 Introduction

Agricultural biotechnology represents a critical frontier in addressing global food security challenges, with innovations ranging from genetically modified crops to advanced breeding techniques. The manipulation of living organisms and biological systems has revolutionized farming practices, enabling higher yields, improved resistance to pests and diseases, and adaptation to adverse environmental conditions.[355]However, the intellectual property (IP) protection of these innovations presents complex legal, ethical, and economic questions, particularly for developing nations like India where agriculture remains central to livelihoods and food security.

India's approach to agricultural biotechnology patents has evolved significantly since independence, reflecting tensions between international IP commitments and domestic socioeconomic priorities. As a founding member of the World Trade Organization (WTO) and signatory to the Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS), India has reformed its patent system while implementing distinctive safeguards to protect public interest concerns.

The Indian experience with Bt cotton demonstrates both the transformative potential of agricultural biotechnology and the complexities of its governance. While this genetically modified crop has increased yields and reduced pesticide usage, it has simultaneously raised concerns about ecological risks, socioeconomic implications for small-scale farmers, and ethical questions regarding the patenting of life forms[356]. These tensions underscore the need for a carefully calibrated legal framework that promotes

[355] Parayil, G. (2003). Mapping Technological Trajectories of the Green Revolution and the Gene Revolution from Modernization to Globalization. Research Policy, 32(6), 971-990.
[356] Choudhary, B., & Gaur, K. (2015). Biotech Cotton in India: A Country Profile. ISAAA Brief No. 49. ISAAA, Ithaca, NY.

innovation while protecting biodiversity and farmers' rights.

2.2 Historical Evolution of Agricultural Patent Protection in India

Pre-TRIPS Era (1947-1995)

India's post-independence patent system was established with the Patents Act of 1970, which deliberately excluded agricultural methods and food products from patentability. This exclusion reflected policy priorities focused on self-sufficiency and food security rather than commercial IP protection. During this period, agricultural innovation was primarily driven by public institutions without significant IP barriers[357].

The 1970 Act specifically excluded methods of agriculture or horticulture from patent protection. It also excluded any process for the medicinal, surgical, curative, prophylactic, or other treatment of human beings, animals, or plants. Plants and animals in whole or any part thereof other than microorganisms were also excluded from patentability. This approach facilitated open access to agricultural technologies and supported the Green Revolution in India without patent restrictions on seeds or farming methods.

TRIPS Compliance and Amendments (1995-2005)

India's accession to the WTO in 1995 necessitated alignment with TRIPS provisions, requiring significant reforms to the patent regime. For agricultural biotechnology, the most relevant TRIPS provision was Article 27.3(b), which mandated member countries to provide protection for plant varieties either through patents or an effective sui generis system.

India implemented these commitments through a three-phase amendment process. The Patents (Amendment) Act of 1999 established mailbox provisions for patent applications. The Patents (Amendment) Act of 2002 extended the patent term from 7 to 20 years and modified patentability criteria. Finally, the Patents (Amendment) Act of 2005 introduced product patents for all fields of technology, including agricultural biotechnology.[358]

Rather than extending conventional patent protection to plant varieties, India opted for a sui generis system through the Protection of Plant Varieties and Farmers' Rights (PPVFR) Act, 2001, which created a distinct protection framework balancing breeders' rights with farmers' traditional privileges. This legislative choice reflected India's careful navigation of international obligations while preserving policy space for domestic priorities.

2.3 Current Legal Framework for Agricultural Biotechnology Patents

The Patents Act, 1970 (as amended)

The current Patents Act defines the scope of patentable subject matter for biotechnological inventions. Section 3 specifies exclusions from patentability that significantly affect agricultural biotechnology. Section 3(c) excludes "the mere discovery of a scientific principle or the formulation of an abstract theory or discovery of any living thing or non-living substance occurring in nature." Section 3(h) excludes "a method of agriculture or horticulture." Additionally, Section 3(j) excludes "plants and animals in whole or any part thereof other than microorganisms but including seeds, varieties and species and essentially biological processes for production or propagation of plants and animals."[359]

These provisions effectively limit patent protection for many agricultural biotechnology innovations, particularly those involving whole plants or traditional breeding methods. However, genetically modified microorganisms, DNA sequences, and non-biological processes may qualify for protection if they meet the

[357] Dhar, B., & Rao, C. N. (2002). Plant Breeders' Rights in India: Pressures and Options. Economic and Political Weekly, 37(35), 3632-3642.

[358] Basheer, S., & Kochupillai, M. (2008). The 'Glivec' Patent Saga: A 3D Perspective on Indian Patent Policy and TRIPS Compliance. NUJS Law Review, 1, 337-384.

[359] The Patents Act, 1970 (as amended up to Patents (Amendment) Act, 2005).

standard patentability criteria of novelty, inventive step, and industrial applicability.

The exclusions under Section 3 reflect India's reluctance to allow patents on life forms and its desire to protect traditional knowledge and farmers' rights. This approach distinguishes India's patent regime from more permissive systems like the United States, where utility patents can be obtained for plants and biotechnological innovations with fewer restrictions.

Protection of Plant Varieties and Farmers' Rights Act, 2001

The PPVFR Act established India's sui generis system for plant variety protection, creating a framework distinct from conventional patent protection. The Act requires registration based on novelty, distinctiveness, uniformity, and stability for plant varieties. It provides a shorter protection period (15-18 years) compared to patents. The Act recognizes farmers' varieties through a simplified registration system and upholds farmers' rights to save, use, exchange, and sell farm-saved seeds. It includes benefit-sharing mechanisms when commercial varieties are developed from farmers' varieties, as well as compulsory licensing provisions to ensure reasonable seed prices and availability.[360]

Unlike the International Union for the Protection of New Varieties of Plants (UPOV) system, which primarily emphasizes breeders' rights, the PPVFR Act explicitly recognizes farmers as cultivators, conservers, and breeders in their own right. This recognition translates into concrete legal protections that preserve traditional agricultural practices while still providing incentives for commercial breeding innovations.

This dual-track system allows for IP protection of improved plant varieties while preserving farmers' traditional practices and preventing monopolistic control of the seed market.

Biological Diversity Act, 2002

The Biological Diversity Act complements the patent and plant variety protection systems by regulating access to India's genetic resources. The Act requires prior approval from the National Biodiversity Authority for patent applications based on biological resources or traditional knowledge obtained from India. It also requires approval for the transfer of research results based on biological resources to non-Indian entities and for commercial utilization of biological resources.[361]

These provisions aim to prevent biopiracy and ensure equitable benefit-sharing when indigenous genetic resources contribute to patentable inventions. The Biological Diversity Act aligns with the principles of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) and the Nagoya Protocol, which emphasize sovereign rights over biological resources and fair distribution of benefits arising from their utilization.

Together, these three legislative pillars—the Patents Act, the PPVFR Act, and the Biological Diversity Act—form an integrated regulatory ecosystem for agricultural biotechnology innovations in India. This multi-layered approach seeks to balance various competing interests while maintaining consistency with international obligations.

2.4 Patentability of Agricultural Biotechnology Innovations

Genetically Modified Organisms

Indian patent law permits the patenting of genetically modified microorganisms that demonstrate human intervention and industrial applicability. However, the patentability of transgenic plants remains limited. The genetic modification process may be patentable if it involves significant human intervention, and gene constructs and transformation methods can qualify for patent protection. However, the resulting transgenic plant as a whole is excluded from patentability under Section 3(j),

[360] Ramanna, A. (2006). Farmers' Rights in India: A Case Study. The Fridtjof Nansen Institute.

[361] Sagar, R. (2005). Intellectual Property, Benefit-Sharing and Traditional Knowledge: How Effective is the Indian Biological Diversity Act, 2002? The Journal of World Intellectual Property, 8(3), 383-400.

and plant varieties must seek protection under the PPVFR Act rather than patent law.[362]

This approach limits the monopolistic control that can be exercised over genetically modified crops, as patent protection applies to the technology but not to the plant itself. The division of rights between different intellectual property regimes creates a complex landscape that biotechnology companies must navigate when seeking protection for their innovations in India.

Genes and DNA Sequences

The patentability of genetic material has evolved through judicial interpretation and patent office practice. Current standards generally require that the sequence must be isolated or synthesized through human intervention. The mere discovery of naturally occurring sequences is not patentable under Section 3(c). The application must demonstrate specific industrial application beyond theoretical function, and full disclosure of the sequence and its utility is required.[363]

Notable patents granted in this category include modified Bt genes for insect resistance and herbicide tolerance genes, though these remain subject to the limitations of Section 3(j) when incorporated into plants. India's approach to gene patentability has become more restrictive over time, reflecting global trends as seen in decisions like the U.S. Supreme Court's ruling in Association for Molecular Pathology v. Myriad Genetics, which limited the patentability of naturally occurring DNA sequences.

Breeding Methods and Biotechnological Processes

The patentability of agricultural processes follows general principles where "essentially biological processes" are excluded from patentability under Section 3(j). Non-biological and microbiological processes may qualify for patent protection, and advanced breeding techniques involving significant technical intervention may be patentable. Process patents extend to direct products of the patented process, but not to subsequent generations.[364]

This creates a nuanced landscape where certain biotechnological methods receive protection while traditional breeding approaches remain in the public domain. The distinction between essentially biological processes and patentable biotechnological processes continues to evolve as new breeding technologies emerge, creating ongoing interpretive challenges for patent examiners and courts.

2.5 Judicial Interpretations and Landmark Cases

Monsanto Technology LLC v. Nuziveedu Seeds Ltd. (2018)

This landmark case before the Supreme Court of India addressed the patentability of Bt cotton technology. The dispute centered on Monsanto's patent covering a method of inserting the Cry2Ab gene into cotton plants to confer resistance against bollworms. The court acknowledged that Monsanto's Bt gene construct and transformation method were valid subjects for patent protection. It confirmed that the transgenic plant itself could not be patented under Section 3(j) and recognized the role of the PPVFR Act in protecting plant varieties. The court also clarified the relationship between patent licenses and trait value.[365]

The case exemplified the delicate balance between patent protection for biotechnological innovations and the exclusion of plants from patentability, establishing important precedent for future agricultural biotechnology patent disputes. The court's interpretation reinforced India's distinctive approach to biotechnology patents while providing some clarity on the

[362] Kochupillai, M. (2016). Promoting Sustainable Innovations in Plant Varieties. Springer.
[363] Srinivas, K. R. (2006). Intellectual Property Rights and Biological Resources: An Overview of Research and Development, Traditional Knowledge and Benefit Sharing in India. Journal of World Intellectual Property, 9(6), 646-680.
[364] Oguamanam, C. (2006). International Law and Indigenous Knowledge: Intellectual Property, Plant Biodiversity, and Traditional Medicine. University of Toronto Press.
[365] Monsanto Technology LLC v. Nuziveedu Seeds Ltd., (2019) 3 SCC 381.

boundaries between different forms of intellectual property protection.

Other Significant Cases

Several other judicial decisions have shaped the contours of agricultural biotechnology patent protection. Emergent Genetics India v. Shailendra Shivam (2011) addressed the distinction between patent protection for genetic modification techniques and plant variety protection. Prabhat Agri Biotech Ltd. v. Controller of Patents (2012) clarified standards for novelty and inventive step in biotechnological patent applications. Natco Pharma v. Bayer Corporation (2012), while not specific to agricultural biotechnology, established important precedent for compulsory licensing that could apply to essential agricultural technologies.[366]

These cases collectively demonstrate the judiciary's role in shaping a balanced interpretation of India's agricultural biotechnology IP system. Through these decisions, Indian courts have provided nuanced guidance on the application of statutory provisions to complex technological innovations, often navigating between competing policy objectives.

2.6 Challenges and Controversies in Agricultural Biotechnology Patenting

Access to Technology and Seed Sovereignty

One of the most significant tensions in India's agricultural biotechnology patent system is balancing innovation incentives with agricultural communities' access to technology. High licensing fees for patented technologies can increase seed costs, potentially excluding small and marginal farmers from accessing improved varieties. This creates ongoing debate about appropriate royalty rates and licensing terms for agricultural biotechnologies.[367]

The concept of seed sovereignty—farmers' right to save, use, exchange, and sell farm-saved seeds—also presents challenges to the enforcement of intellectual property rights. While the PPVFR Act protects farmers' traditional practices, tensions arise when these practices intersect with proprietary technologies, as seen in disputes over Bt cotton seed savings. The resolution of these tensions requires careful consideration of both commercial interests and livelihood concerns.

Balancing Private Rights and Public Research

The relationship between proprietary rights and the public research sector is particularly important in agricultural biotechnology, where public institutions historically drove innovation in India. Patent thickets and fragmented ownership of complementary technologies can impede research and development. While the Patents Act includes research exemptions, navigating the complex landscape of patent rights can be challenging for public sector researchers.

Collaborative models such as public-private partnerships and open innovation initiatives have emerged as potential solutions to these tensions, allowing for shared research infrastructure while respecting proprietary interests. These collaborative approaches may offer pathways for more inclusive innovation systems that distribute benefits more equitably.

2.7 Future Directions in Agricultural Biotechnology IP Protection

Emerging Technologies and Regulatory Challenges

New breeding technologies such as CRISPR-Cas9 gene editing are raising novel questions about the boundaries of patent protection. The classification of gene-edited organisms in India's regulatory framework remains unclear, with significant implications for their patentability. These technologies may blur the distinction between "essentially biological processes" and patentable biotechnological

[366] Natco Pharma Ltd. v. Bayer Corporation, Compulsory License Application No. 1/2011.
[367] Kochupillai, M. (2016). Promoting Sustainable Innovations in Plant Varieties. Springer.

interventions, potentially requiring reconsideration of existing legal boundaries.[368]

India's patent office and regulatory agencies face the challenge of developing appropriate examination guidelines for these evolving technologies while maintaining alignment with the country's broader policy objectives. This will require not only legal expertise but also technical understanding of the scientific principles underlying these innovations.

International Harmonization and Trade Pressures

India continues to face international pressure to strengthen intellectual property protection for agricultural biotechnologies, particularly through bilateral trade agreements and diplomatic channels. Navigating these pressures while maintaining policy space for domestic priorities represents an ongoing challenge for Indian policymakers.[369]

The country's stance in international forums such as the WTO, the International Union for the Protection of New Varieties of Plants (UPOV), and the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO) will shape the future evolution of global norms for agricultural biotechnology patents. India's experiences and approaches may provide valuable lessons for other developing countries seeking to craft balanced IP systems.

Policy Recommendations

Based on the analysis presented in this paper, several policy recommendations emerge for strengthening India's agricultural biotechnology patent system:

First, greater clarity is needed in the examination guidelines for agricultural biotechnology patents, particularly regarding the boundaries between patentable and non-patentable subject matter. The Indian Patent Office should develop sector-specific examination protocols that provide predictability while preserving the exclusions mandated by law.

Second, strengthening institutional coordination between the Patent Office, the Protection of Plant Varieties and Farmers' Rights Authority, and the National Biodiversity Authority would improve consistency in the application of India's multi-layered IP system for agricultural innovations.

Third, exploring alternative innovation funding models, such as prize systems or open-source licensing frameworks, could complement the existing patent system and address areas where traditional patent protection may be suboptimal for India's agricultural development goals.

Fourth, enhancing transparency in technology licensing and benefit-sharing arrangements would help ensure that farmers and indigenous communities receive equitable compensation when their genetic resources or knowledge contribute to patented innovations.[370]

REFERENCES

1. Abrol, D. (2014). Post-TRIPS Technological Behaviour of the Pharmaceutical Industry in India. *Science, Technology and Society*, 19(3), 419-438.
2. Basheer, S. (2013). The Novartis Judgment: Balancing Access and Innovation. *Journal of Intellectual Property Rights*, 18(3), 389-397.
3. Basheer, S., & Reddy, P. (2008). The 'Efficacy' of Indian Patent Law: Ironing out the Creases in Section 3(d). *SCRIPTed: A Journal of Law, Technology & Society*, 5(2), 232-266.
4. Basheer, S., & Kochupillai, M. (2012). The 'Compulsory Licence' Regime in India: Past, Present and Future. *Queen Mary School of Law Legal Studies Research Paper*, No. 107/2012.

[368] Mgbeoji, I. (2006). Global Biopiracy: Patents, Plants, and Indigenous Knowledge. UBC Press.
[369] Ramanna, A. (2006). Farmers' Rights in India: A Case Study. The Fridtjof Nansen Institute.
[370] Sagar, R. (2005). Intellectual Property, Benefit-Sharing and Traditional Knowledge: How Effective is the Indian Biological Diversity Act, 2002? The Journal of World Intellectual Property, 8(3), 383-400.

5. Chaudhuri, S. (2013). The Larger Implications of the Novartis-Glivec Judgment. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 48(17), 10-12.
6. Correa, C. M. (2013). Is Section 3(d) of the Indian Patents Act Compatible with TRIPS? *Economic and Political Weekly*, 48(32), 50-57.
7. Dhar, B., & Joseph, R. K. (2012). Foreign Direct Investment, Intellectual Property Rights and Technology Transfer: The North-South and the South-South Dimension. *UNCTAD Background Paper No. RVC5*.
8. Gopakumar, K. M. (2013). The Need to Protect Public Health Safeguards in Indian Patent Law. *Journal of Generic Medicines*, 10(2), 95-100.
9. Gupta, V. K. (2016). Indian Patent Law and Its Impact on the Pharmaceutical Industry: What Can China Learn from India? *Journal of World Intellectual Property*, 19(5-6), 274-287.
10. James, T. C. (2009). Patent Protection and Innovation: Section 3(d) of the Patents Act and Indian Pharmaceutical Industry. *Indian Council for Research on International Economic Relations*.
11. Kapczynski, A. (2013). Engineered in India: Patent Law 2.0. *New England Journal of Medicine*, 369(6), 497-499.
12. Kochupillai, M. (2016). Promoting Sustainable Innovations in Plant Varieties. *Springer Berlin Heidelberg*.
13. Kochupillai, M. (2010). The Indian PPV&FR Act, 2001: Historical and Implementation Perspectives. *Journal of Intellectual Property Rights*, 15(2), 89-101.
14. Lalitha, N. (2008). Doha Declaration and Public Health Issues. *Journal of Intellectual Property Rights*, 13(5), 401-413.
15. Lanjouw, J. O. (1998). The Introduction of Pharmaceutical Product Patents in India: Heartless Exploitation of the Poor and Suffering? *NBER Working Paper No. 6366*.
16. Madhavan, G., et al. (2016). *Biomedical Innovation and Entrepreneurship in India*. Oxford University Press.
17. Mueller, J. M. (2007). The Tiger Awakens: The Tumultuous Transformation of India's Patent System and the Rise of Indian Pharmaceutical Innovation. *University of Pittsburgh Law Review*, 68(3), 491-641.
18. Nair, G. G., & Fernandes, A. (2014). Patent Policies and Provisions Relating to Pharmaceuticals in India. *Journal of Intellectual Property Rights*, 19(1), 7-17.
19. Narayanan, P. (2019). *Patent Law*. Eastern Law House, 5th Edition.
20. Ragavan, S. (2006). Of the Inequals of the Uruguay Round. *Marquette Intellectual Property Law Review*, 10(2), 273-304.
21. Rai, J. (2013). Patent Law in India: A Review. *Journal of Scientific Research*, 57, 187-217.
22. Ramanna, A. (2006). Farmers' Rights in India: A Case Study. *The Fridtjof Nansen Institute*.
23. Sampat, B. N., & Shadlen, K. C. (2018). Indian Pharmaceutical Patent Prosecution: The Changing Role of Section 3(d). *PLOS ONE*, 13(4), e0194714.
24. Srinivas, K. R. (2012). Protecting Traditional Knowledge Holders' Interests and Preventing Misappropriation—Traditional Knowledge Commons and Biocultural Protocols: Necessary but Not Sufficient? *International Journal of Cultural Property*, 19(3), 401-422.
25. Sundaram, J. (2014). India's Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights Compliant Pharmaceutical Patent

Laws: What Lessons for India and Other Developing Countries? *Information & Communications Technology Law*, 23(1), 1-30.

26. Thambisetty, S. (2014). Novartis v Union of India and the Person Skilled in the Art: A Missed Opportunity. *Queen Mary Journal of Intellectual Property*, 4(1), 79-94.

27. Thomas, J. R. (2014). Compulsory Licensing of Patented Pharmaceuticals: The Supreme Court of India's Decision in Novartis v Union of India. *Congressional Research Service Report R43750*.