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

VOLUME 5 AND ISSUE 12 OF 2025

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

Published by

Institute of Legal Education

https://iledu.in

THE ROLE OF INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF BIOPRINTING TECHNOLOGY IN INDIA: CHALLENGES AND LIABILITIES

AUTHOR - MRS. DIPALI MOHAN KHALATE, LLM STUDENT AT MODERN LAW COLLEGE, SAVITRIBAI PHULE PUNE UNIVERSITY

BEST CITATION - MRS. DIPALI MOHAN KHALATE, THE ROLE OF INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF BIOPRINTING TECHNOLOGY IN INDIA: CHALLENGES AND LIABILITIES, *INDIAN JOURNAL OF LEGAL REVIEW (IJLR)*, 5 (12) OF 2025, PG. 1008-1019, APIS – 3920 – 0001 & ISSN - 2583-2344

Abstract

Bioprinting, an innovative combination of biotechnology and additive manufacturing, has emerged as a transformative technology in healthcare, enabling the fabrication of functional tissues, organs, and patient-specific implants. The implementation of the aforementioned, however, introduces unique intellectual property (IP) challenges that extend beyond conventional biotechnology. The study explores three critical areas of concern: IP protection for bioprinting hardware and bioinks, ownership and ethical management of digital files derived from biological data, and the implications of commercializing bioprinted tissues and organs. Employing a multidisciplinary approach, the paper analyzes existing IP frameworks, [1765]highlights their limitations when applied to bioprinting, and examines ethical dilemmas, such as ownership of bioprinted human tissues and the commodification of biological innovations. Findings suggest that current IP laws inadequately address the complexities of bioprinting, particularly in managing the intersection of proprietary technologies[1766] and ethical considerations. The study underscores the need for adaptive legal and ethical frameworks to balance innovation with equitable access and sustainability. Recommendations include the development of tailored IP policies for bioprinting and enhanced international collaboration to harmonize legal protections across jurisdictions. This work aims to provide a comprehensive foundation for stakeholders to navigate the rapidly evolving landscape of bioprinting IP. Keywords: bioprinting; intellectual property; bioinks; bioprinting hardware; digital design files; ethical considerations; patentability; regulatory frameworks; personalized medicine; regenerative medicine Introduction : Additive manufacturing, or 3D printing, constitutes a groundbreaking method of production that has the capacity to profoundly alter numerous[1767] industries. Fundamentally, 3D printing is the layer by-layer construction of three-dimensional objects from digital models, employing a diverse array of materials, including plastics, metals, ceramics, and even biological substances1. This technology has significantly evolved since its introduction in the 1980s, transforming from a specialized tool for rapid prototyping into a mainstream manufacturing process that facilitates the creation of complex geometries that would be challenging, if not impossible, to achieve with conventional subtractive manufacturing techniques2. The disruptive potential of 3D printing spans multiple sectors, including aerospace, automotive, healthcare, fashion, and construction, among others. In the aerospace sector,[1768] 3D printing enables the fabrication of lightweight components that improve fuel efficiency and minimize waste, as it permits the design of intricate structures that optimize strength-to-weight ratios 3. In the automotive sector, manufacturers are increasingly utilizing additive manufacturing for

[1765] Pratap Devarapalli & Dara Ajay, *The Impact of 3D Bioprinting Innovation on IP Ecosystem and Patent Law: An Indian and US Perspective*, in *Science, Technology and Innovation Ecosystem: An Indian and Global Perspective* (Springer, 2024) pp. 197–210

[1766] Dr. Soumya Kanti Ghosh & Unnat P. Pandit, *Patent Revolution in India*, *IPR Newsletter*, Intellectual Property India (Feb 2024) 1–6

[1767] Akshat Mehta & Nancy Saroha, *Traversing India's Intellectual Property Landscape: Insights from the International IP Index*, *Bar & Bench* (13 Apr 2024).

[1768] WIPO, *3D Printing and IP: Trends and Challenges*, World Intellectual Property Organization (2023).

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

VOLUME 5 AND ISSUE 12 OF 2025

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

Published by

Institute of Legal Education

https://iledu.in

both prototype and the production of customized components, thereby reducing lead times and costs associated with conventional manufacturing methods. Bioprinting, an emerging technology that integrates additive manufacturing with biological sciences, is positioned at the forefront of [1769]transformative innovations in healthcare and biomedical research . This process entails the precise, layer-by-layer deposition of bioinks—comprising living cells, biomaterials, and other biologically relevant substances utilized to fabricate complex, three dimensional tissue structures that emulate the morphology and functionality of native biological tissues

[1769] Vidhi Centre for Legal Policy, *Reimagining India's IP Framework for Emerging Technologies*, Policy Brief (2022)

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

VOLUME 5 AND ISSUE 12 OF 2025

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

Published by

Institute of Legal Education

https://iledu.in

INTRODUCTION

Bioprinting's capacity to directly print living cells onto scaffolds and fabricate functional tissues has offered new capabilities in regenerative medicine, drug development, and in vitro disease modeling, thereby significantly altering the sector of medical research and treatment. Bioprinting, as a distinct subset of biotechnology, [1770]differs significantly from other technologies utilizing human cells, such as CAR T cell therapy. While CAR T cell technology focuses on modifying immune cells for therapeutic purposes, bioprinting employs additive manufacturing techniques to fabricate complex, three-dimensional biological structures, including tissues and organs. This process integrates living cells, biomaterials, and bioactive substances in precise spatial arrangements to mimic the morphology and functionality of native tissues. The interdisciplinary nature of bioprinting, which combines expertise from engineering, materials science, and cell biology, presents unique challenges in determining ownership and patentability of innovations. Additionally, the layered and modular construction of bioprinted products introduces complexities that extend beyond the scope of traditional IP frameworks, necessitating nuanced approaches to address the interplay of biological and techno-logical components. The scope of bioprinting's impact extends beyond healthcare into multiple domains, including pharmaceutical research, diagnostics, and industries such as cosmetics and food. [1771]In the pharmaceutical sector, bioprinted tissues are being explored for their utility in drug discovery and toxicity testing, offering more accurate, human-relevant models than traditional in vitro systems. Moreover, bioprinted organs and tissues are being investigated for their potential application in transplantation, providing a viable solution to the global organ shortage crisis. However, despite its remarkable potential, bioprinting introduces a host of intellectual property (IP) challenges that require careful consideration. The rapid pace of technological advancement, coupled with the inherent complexity of bioprinted products, necessitates the development of robust IP frameworks to safeguard innovation while addressing ethical concerns and ensuring compliance with regulatory standards. The interdisciplinary nature of bioprinting—spanning 3D printing, materials science, cell biology, and engineering—can complicate the determination of inventorship when contributions from diverse fields overlap or are interdependent. While private law contracts provide mechanisms for assigning ownership, they may not fully address the nuanced challenges posed by the convergence of biological and technological innovations in bioprinting.5 LITERATURE REVIEW: Advancements in Bioprinting: - Recent trends in 3D bioprinting focus on biomaterials, technological advances, and resolution attained across various bioprinting technologies. - Bioprinting techniques have improved, enabling the creation of complex tissue-like structures with enhanced customization and scalability. - Volumetric bioprinting allows for rapid fabrication of cell-laden constructs with diverse sizes and intricate architectures. - Challenges and Limitations Each bioprinting [1772]technique has inherent limitations, impacting efficiency, resolution, and suitability for creating viable tissues. - Vascularization, scalability, and post-printing editing are significant challenges in bioprinting. - Developing biomaterials with improved biocompatibility, mechanical strength, and printability is essential.6 Applications and Future Directions: - Bioprinting has potential applications in regenerative medicine, drug testing, organ transplantation, and prosthodontics. - Tissue-specific bioinks are being developed for fabricating bone, skin, liver, and cartilage constructs. - Further research is needed to enhance the speed, versatility, and

[1770] Ministry of Science & Technology, *Biotechnology Vision Document 2025*, Government of India (2020)

[1771] ICMR, *Ethical Guidelines for Biomedical Research Involving Human Participants*, Indian Council of Medical Research (2017)

[1772] IP India, *Annual Report 2023–24*, Controller General of Patents, Designs & Trademarks

material compatibility of bioprinting technology.7 5 Antreas Kantaros, Theodore Ganetsos, Bioprinting and Intellectual Property: Challenges, Opportunities, and the Road Ahead, January 2025 6 Yue Ma, Bo Deng, Advancements of 3D bioprinting in regenerative medicine: Exploring cell sources for organ fabrication, Volume 10, Issue 3, February 15, 2024, 7 Harshavardhan Budharaju, Rajendra K Singh, Hae-Won Kim, Bioprinting for drug screening: A path toward reducing animal testing or redefining preclinical research?, Article, Jul 15 2025.

Current Research Landscape: - A comprehensive literature review of 3D bioprinting research between 2013 and 2023 highlights the current research landscape and advancements in the field. - Clinical trials and observational studies are being conducted to assess the safety and efficacy of bioprinted tissues and organs. One of the primary areas involves the bioprinting hardware and materials used in the production of biological structures. The development of specialized 3D printers capable of handling bioinks, along with the innovation of biocompatible materials and scaffolds, is a key component of bioprinting technology. IP protection for these hardware and material innovations often takes the form of patents, which safeguard novel technologies and manufacturing processes. This area also extends to the development of bioinks composed of living cells, growth factors, and other bioactive components, where proprietary rights may be claimed for new formulations and methods of synthesis, bioprinter mechanisms, such as those responsible for the precision placement of cells or the control of the printing environment (temperature, humidity, etc.), may be patented if they introduce new technological features that enhance the printing process or improve the quality of bioprinted tissues. The patenting of such hardware innovations encourages further technological advancement, as it provides inventors with exclusive rights to their inventions for a set period, thereby promoting investment in research and development. However, the complexity of bioprinting hardware may lead to disputes over the novelty and patentability of incremental improvements, as bioprinting is an interdisciplinary field involving advances from 3D printing, robotics, and biotechnology. Proprietary materials, particularly bioinks, also present significant IP challenges in bioprinting. Bioinks are critical to the success of bioprinting technologies, as they must not only support the structural integrity of printed tissues but also ensure cell viability, growth, and differentiation. As such, bioinks may consist of living cells, extracellular matrices, growth factors, and other biomaterials, each of which may have unique compositions or formulations. Patenting bioinks is a complex process, as it requires demonstrating the novelty and utility of a particular composition or method of creating the ink. Innovations in bioink formulations, such as those that improve cell encapsulation or optimize cell proliferation, can be patented as long as they meet the criteria of novelty and non-obviousness. However, the patenting of biological materials, especially when they involve living organisms or human-derived cells, raises unique ethical and legal concerns, particularly in relation to ownership and access to these materials. The commercialization of bioinks further complicates IP issues, as companies must navigate patent protection for both the materials themselves and the methods used to create them.9 In addition to patenting bioinks, material IP extends to the methods of production, manipulation, and delivery of these materials. Patent protection may cover the process of synthesizing bioinks, such as novel techniques for incorporating cells into hydrogels or developing biodegradable scaffolds that promote tissue regeneration. These methods may also be patentable if they offer a more efficient or effective approach than existing technologies. However, the interdisciplinary nature of bioprinting, which blends biotechnology, chemistry, and materials science, poses challenges in determining the rightful ownership of innovations. For example,

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

VOLUME 5 AND ISSUE 12 OF 2025

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

Published by

Institute of Legal Education

https://iledu.in

the question of whether an improvement to a bioink's formulation or a method for creating a more efficient bioprinting process is patentable can lead to legal disputes, particularly if multiple parties are involved in the development of different components of the bioprinting system. As the field continues to evolve, patenting strategies will need to address these complexities, ensuring that both hardware and material innovations are adequately protected while fostering collaboration and further development in bioprinting technologies. These challenges necessitate the development of hybrid intellectual property frameworks that reconcile the principles of open access with adequate protections for innovation. Such frameworks could involve licensing mechanisms that allow for collaborative development while retaining safeguards for the intellectual contributions of individual stakeholders. For example, open-source licenses tailored to bioprinting could specify conditions under which shared designs or formulations can be used, modified, or commercialized, ensuring that contributors receive appropriate recognition and benefits. Moreover, fostering an environment of trust among open-source collaborators is 9 X.B. Chen, A. Fazel Anvari-Yazdi, X. Duan, A. Zimmerling, Bioactive Materials - Biomaterials / bioinks and extrusion bioprinting, Article, Volume 28, October 2023 essential for addressing these IP concerns. Trust can be facilitated by implementing clear guidelines for crediting contributions, establishing transparent governance structures for opensource projects, and creating incentives that align with the ethos of open access while providing tangible benefits for innovators. In this context, the field of bioprinting has seen relatively few legal cases specifically addressing hardware or material-related intellectual property disputes. However, relevant precedents can be drawn from broader 3D printing and biotechnology industries, which often intersect with bioprinting technologies. One notable case involves Amgen Inc.

(Thousand **Oaks, CA, USA) v. Sanofi (Paris, France) (2019),** which highlighted the complexities of patenting biological innovations. The dispute revolved around the sufficiency of patent descriptions, emphasizing the need for clear and detailed claims when seeking protection for biological materials. This principle applies equally to bioinks, where the specificity of formulations or the methods for embedding living cells into scaffolds can be contested. In terms of hardware, parallels can be drawn with cases such as Stratasys (Rehovot, Israel) v. Microboards Technology (Chanhassen, MN, USA) (2015), which focused on the infringement of 3D printing technologies. While not specific to bioprinting, the decision underscored the importance of safeguarding novel mechanisms in printer designs, including precision controls and multi material deposition technologies. As bioprinting incorporates even more specialized hardware, disputes over incremental improvements and overlapping patents are likely to emerge. Additionally, the patenting of bioinks and bioprinting processes raises ethical and legal challenges akin to those in the Association for Molecular Pathology v. Myriad Genetics, Inc. (Salt Lake City, UT, USA) (2013) case, which addressed the patentability of naturally occurring genetic sequences. Similarly, questions of whether biological elements within bio-inks—such as human derived cells or growth factors—can be patented continue to pose unresolved dilemmas. These precedents offer a foundation for understanding how courts may address future bioprinting disputes, though the specificities of the field will require new legal interpretations. 10 Laura Patiño, Intellectual Property And Open Innovation: The Key Alliance For Sustainability, August 27, 2024 Open-source practices have begun to influence bioprinting, particularly in academic and non profit research environments, where collaboration is key to advancing the field. Open-source platforms, such as the NIH 3D Print Exchange or initiatives like Open Bioprinting, aim to democratize access to bioprinting technologies

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

VOLUME 5 AND ISSUE 12 OF 2025

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

Published by

Institute of Legal Education

https://iledu.in

by sharing designs for hardware, software, and sometimes even bioink formulations. While open-source practices foster innovation by allowing researchers and developers to build upon shared knowledge, they also complicate the traditional IP landscape. Licensing models, such as Creative Commons or GNU General Public Licenses (GPL), are often adapted to bioprinting to ensure shared contributions remain accessible while recognizing contributors' efforts. However, these licenses may lack the specificity needed to address the unique challenges of bioprinting, such as ensuring the ethical use of bioink formulations containing human cells. One prominent example is the use of open-source bioprinters, such as the INKREDIBLE by CELLINK, whose design philosophy blends open collaboration with proprietary components. This hybrid approach highlights the tension between protecting IP and fostering community-driven innovation. While some groups advocate for entirely open designs to accelerate discovery, others argue that proprietary elements are necessary to sustain commercial viability and fund further research. To address these tensions, the bioprinting community may benefit from tailored open-source licenses that explicitly define permissible uses of shared designs, particularly when bioinks or scaffolding materials are involved. These licenses could include clauses on non-commercial use, attribution requirements, or ethical guidelines for working with human-derived materials, ensuring that the open source movement supports both innovation and accountability. Ultimately, addressing these challenges is critical for realizing the full potential of open-source bioprinting. Balancing the advantages of open collaboration with the need to protect intellectual assets ensures an environment where innovation can thrive without undermining the communal exchange of knowledge and resources. By harmonizing these priorities, the open-source movement can continue to drive transformative advancements in bioprinting, expanding its impact across fields such as personalized medicine, drug discovery, and regenerative therapies. IP Challenges in Bioprinted Tissues and Organ Replication : Bioprinted tissues and products, particularly those designed for medical applications, present unique intellectual property (IP) challenges. As these innovations often involve proprietary techniques, materials, and designs, questions about the ownership, protection, and replication of bioprinted tissues are becoming increasingly significant. For instance, companies and researchers invest heavily in developing methods to arrange cells in specific structures that mimic natural tissues or improve functionality. These proprietary arrangements, encoded in bio-CAD files or derived through patented processes, are critical assets, yet their replication raises complex IP concerns. One significant issue involves the enforceability of patents on bioprinted tissues. While processes and materials used in bioprinting, such as bioinks or printing method-ologies, are generally patentable, the tissues themselves may fall into a legal grey area. If bioprinted tissues closely replicate naturally occurring structures, they may not meet the novelty requirement under patent law. However, tissues that incorporate enhancements—such as synthetic scaffolds, unique cellular arrangements, or functional modifications—are more likely to be eligible for patent protection. The challenge lies in distinguishing between what constitutes an unpatentable "product of nature" and an innovation that qualifies for IP rights. Moreover, as bioprinting technology evolves, the ease with which proprietary tissues can be replicated by third parties using the same or slightly modified processes increases the risk of IP infringement. Ethical and legal concerns further complicate the landscape, especially in the context of bioprinted human tissues for personalized medical applications. Ownership of bioprinted tissues raises profound ethical questions. If a tissue is derived from a patient's cells and designed specifically for their use, should the patient retain any ownership rights over the bioprinted product? While

current legal frameworks typically grant ownership to the entity that created the product, such as a bioprinting company or research institution, this approach may conflict with patients' moral claims to their biological material. For instance, the patient's contribution of cells or genetic data is integral to the bioprinting process, making it ethically contentious to exclude them from ownership discussions. Figure 3 depicts pictures of 3D bioprinted tissues in a 12-well transwell plate showing reproducible tissue shape from well to well. Additionally, the commercialization of bioprinted tissues introduces concerns about accessibility and equity. High costs associated with proprietary bioprinting technologies and products may limit their availability to wealthy individuals or well-funded healthcare systems, exacerbating existing disparities in medical care. Licensing agreements for bioprinted tissues must therefore consider not only the rights of creators but also the broader societal implications of restricting access to life-saving technologies.11 Another critical aspect is the potential for exploitation of vulnerable populations. For example, individuals in resource-limited settings may feel compelled to donate biological materials for research or commercial purposes, only to see the resulting bioprinted products patented and sold without any benefit to their communities. Ethical guidelines and legal safeguards must be in place to ensure that contributions are fairly acknowledged and that the benefits of bioprinting are distributed equitably. To address these challenges, the bioprinting community must adopt IP frameworks that balance innovation incentives with ethical considerations and societal needs. This includes redefining ownership models for bioprinted tissues, incorporating patients' rights into licensing agreements, and establishing international guidelines to harmonize IP protections. Patented biological structures present a complex issue in bioprinting, particularly when it comes to bioprinted organ structures that replicate patented designs or techniques. Patent law has traditionally protected inventions that are novel, non-obvious, and useful, and this framework extends to bioprinting technologies. However, the application of these rules becomes more nuanced when considering biological constructs, such as tissues or organs, that might closely resemble naturally occurring structures or previous patented works. One of the primary legal challenges in bioprinting involves determining whether a bioprinted organ or tissue can be considered a new invention or an infringement on existing patents. For instance, if a researcher uses patented techniques to arrange cells or apply certain biomaterials to produce a bioprinted organ, questions arise regarding whether the resulting product is sufficiently novel to warrant its own patent or whether it falls under the scope of the original patent. If the bioprinted organ structure replicates a patented design or uses a patented method to create a certain tissue arrangement, this could lead to legal disputes over patent infringement. The issue becomes particularly complex when the bioprinted organ incorporates aspects of existing biological structures that are already patented, such as specific cell arrangements or methods for scaffolding. For example, a patent holder might claim the proprietary right to a specific method 11 Mihalis Kritikos, 3D bio-printing for medical and enhancement purposes: Legal and ethical aspects, July 2018, European Parliamentary Research Service. of creating vascular structures within bioprinted organs. If another bioprinter or researcher uses a similar method without permission, they could be infringing on the original patent. The challenge in these cases lies in determining whether the bioprinted organ involves an innovative enough modification to be exempt from infringement or whether it constitutes a derivative work that falls within the scope of the existing patent.12 The legal landscape for patenting biological structures, such as organs and tissues, is still evolving. Courts will need to balance the goals of fostering innovation with the need to avoid

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

VOLUME 5 AND ISSUE 12 OF 2025

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

Published by

Institute of Legal Education

https://iledu.in

unjust monopolies over fundamental biological processes. Further complicating matters is the concept of "natural products," which patent law traditionally excludes. As bioprinting becomes more sophisticated, it is likely that new legal precedents will emerge that address the intersection of patent law with the unique nature of bioprinted biological materials. Liability and responsibility for intellectual property (IP) infringement in the context of bioprinted products can be equally complex. Determining who is responsible when a bioprinted organ or tissue infringes on a patent is an ongoing debate, and several parties may share in the liability.Typically, patent infringement liability lies with the entity or individual that directly engages in the act of infringing, such as the designer of the bioprinted structure, the bioprinter manufacturer, or the healthcare provider using the bioprinted product. The designer or researcher who develops the bioprinted organ might be held liable if they knowingly use patented techniques or designs without permission. However, responsibility may also extend to the bioprinter manufacturer, particularly if the device is marketed or used in a way that facilitates infringement. For example, if the printer itself is designed to reproduce patented organ structures or uses proprietary software that enables the creation of patented designs, the printer manufacturer could be liable for patent infringement. Healthcare providers using bioprinted tissues or organs may also face legal challenges. If a healthcare provider knowingly uses a bioprinted organ that infringes on a patent, they could be seen as complicit in the infringement, particularly if they are aware of the patent and continue to use the product. However, in many cases, healthcare providers may not have the technical expertise to evaluate the underlying patents or products used in bioprinting. This raises questions about whether 12 Adél Hinsenkamp, Zoltán Benyó, István Hornyák, Overview of Tissue Engineering Patent Strategies and Patents from 2010 to 2020, Including Outcomes, June 2021, Tissue Engineering Part B Reviews 28(3) the burden of responsibility should fall on the provider or the manufacturer of the bioprinted products.13 Regulatory Frameworks and Ethical Considerations : The development of bioprinting technologies introduces numerous challenges related to intellectual property (IP) laws, particularly as they intersect with biotechnology and medical device regulations. Existing legal frameworks for biotech and medical devices, which have traditionally governed the patentability of biological innovations and the regulation of medical devices, are being tested by the emergence of bioprinting . The applicability of these laws to bioprinting depends on how these technologies are classified, whether as medical devices, biotechnology, or a hybrid of both, and how they are used in various contexts, such as research, clinical settings, and commercial applications. In terms of intellectual property, the existing framework for biotechnology generally provides protection for novel biological inventions, including genetically modified organisms, biopharmaceuticals, and biotech processes. Patent laws, including those under the U.S. Patent Act and European Patent Convention, typically grant protection to novel biotechnological processes, products, and materials if they meet the criteria of novelty, non-obviousness, and utility Bioprinting, particularly the use of 3D printing technologies to create complex tissue structures, can be covered by these frameworks if the printed tissue or organ involves an innovative process or material composition. However, challenges arise in determining the patentability of the tissues themselves, as natural biological structures are often excluded from patent protection unless they are significantly modified or enhanced through human intervention. This issue is particularly pronounced in the case of human tissues and organs, which, while novel in their bioprinted form, might still be argued to be "products of nature" and thus outside the scope of traditional patent protection.14 Bioprinting technologies also intersect with medical device

regulations, especially in the context of bioprinted products intended for clinical use. Medical devices are regulated by agencies like the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) or the European Medicines Agency (EMA), which require 13 Essenese Obhan, Dr. Joyita Deb, Patenting 3d Bioprinting In India, Orban & Associates, May 17, 2022 14 Dr. Monica Mahajan, Prof. (Dr.) Shweta Dhand, Ms. Tavinderjeet Kaur, Intellectual Property Rights And Patents In Biotechnology, Bhumi Publishing, June 2025 rigorous testing and validation to ensure safety and efficacy. Bioprinted products that are used for therapeutic or diagnostic purposes are likely to be subject to these medical device regulations. For instance, bioprinted scaffolds or tissues used in regenerative medicine would be classified as medical devices and subject to regulatory oversight under frameworks such as the FDA's 21st Century Cures Act. However, given the rapid pace of technological advancements in bioprinting, current regulations may not fully address the complexities of these innovations, necessitating the development of new guidelines that explicitly account for the unique characteristics of bioprinted tissues and organs.15 On an international level, IP protection for bioprinting technologies varies significantly across countries. While countries like the United States and European Union members have relatively established patent frameworks for biotechnology, other jurisdictions are still developing their approaches. For example, the United States has a robust framework for protecting biotechnology related innovations, including bioprinted products, under the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO). The European Union also offers similar protections, though there is an ongoing debate in Europe about the patentability of bioprinted human tissues, especially those created for medical applications. In contrast, countries with less established IP laws for biotechnology, such as some emerging economies, may offer weaker protections for bioprinting innovations, creating challenges for multinational collaborations and commercial ventures. Furthermore, cross-disciplinary perspectives add additional layers of complexity. For instance, the intersection of biotechnology, medical device regulations, and digital technologies like 3D printing requires an interdisciplinary approach to IP protection. The bioprinting field involves contributions from fields such as materials science, bioengineering, and computer-aided design (CAD), each of which has its own IP protocols. This complexity is further exacerbated when considering the application of bioprinted products in healthcare, where patient rights, public health considerations, and access to innovative treatments must be balanced against the protection of commercial interests. In countries with strong IP protections, bioprinting innovations are likely to face fewer barriers to commercialization, but in regions where IP enforcement is weaker, the risks of patent infringement and misappropriation of bioprinted technologies are higher. An essential aspect of addressing cross-border IP challenges in bioprinting lies in the harmonization of regulatory frameworks across jurisdictions with varying levels of technological and economic development. 15 Arpana Parihar, Dipesh Singh Parihar, 3D bioprinting for drug development and screening: Recent trends towards personalized medicine, Hybrid Advances, Volume 7, December 2024 While international collaboration is often highlighted as a solution, significant practical barriers must be acknowledged. For instance, conflicting national laws, disparities in technological infrastructure, and eco-nomic inequalities can hinder the effective implementation of unified frameworks. In particular, researchers in developing countries face unique challenges, including limited access to advanced bioprinting technologies, restrictive funding environments, and reduced participation in global policymaking efforts. Addressing these disparities will require targeted measures, such as capacity-building initiatives, equitable access to shared resources, and international agreements that consider the diverse needs of stakeholders across the global scientific

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

VOLUME 5 AND ISSUE 12 OF 2025

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

Published by

Institute of Legal Education

https://iledu.in

community. Intellectual property (IP) protection for bioprinting technology varies significantly across regions, with distinct challenges and approaches in countries across Asia and Africa. In Asia, countries like Japan and South Korea have robust IP frameworks that integrate biotechnological innovations, including bioprinting. Japan, for instance, has established specific patent protections for bioprinting technologies such as bioinks and 3D printing hardware, promoting innovation while ensuring the protection of proprietary technologies. Similarly, South Korea's IP laws support bioprinting by allowing the patenting of genetically modified tissues and organs, though there is ongoing debate regarding the ethical implications of patenting biological materials. In contrast, many African countries face a more fragmented approach to IP protection for bioprinting.

Limited legal infrastructure and resources often result in inconsistent enforcement of IP rights, posing significant challenges for innovators. Countries such as South Africa are making strides by adapting their patent laws to account for biotechnological developments, but many African nations still lack comprehensive regulations specifically addressing bioprinting. This disparity underscores the need for greater international collaboration and the development of region-specific IP frameworks to foster innovation and protect bioprinting advancements globally.16 One of the primary ethical dilemmas is the potential for cloning. The ability to print tissues and organs that closely replicate the biological structures of a human body, particularly using stem cells or genetic material, sparks debates over whether this constitutes a form of human cloning. While bioprinting in its current form does not involve the creation of fully cloned humans, the possibility of replicating tissues that are genetically identical to an individual's own raises concerns about identity and personhood. If bioprinted organs or tissues are created from a person's own cells, questions 16 Joseph Wong, Uyen Quach, South Korean biotechnology — a rising industrial and scientific powerhouse, January 2005, Nature Biotechnology emerge about the potential for creating duplicate biological material that could be used for unintended purposes, including identity theft, reproduction, or unauthorized enhancements. The ethical debate on cloning extends to the concern of whether bioprinting could be a stepping stone to reproductive cloning or the creation of genetically modified embryos.

Statutory Interpretation : The Indian Patents Act of 1970 sets strict requirements for patentability, including novelty, non obviousness, and industrial applicability. However, the Act also contains notable exclusions that limit the patenting of bioprinted products. Sections 2(1)(j) and 3(j) effectively bar the patenting of plants, animals, and their essential biological processes. This is justified by the need to preserve harmony between moral, cultural, and scientific values. The Act's definition of "invention" excludes living organisms created through bioprinting, as they are considered products of essentially biological processes. Section 3(j) further reinforces this, prohibiting the patenting of plants, animals, and their propagation. The legislature has prioritized ethical considerations over unfettered patenting of biotechnological advancements. This statutory landscape poses significant challenges for the bioprinting industry, requiring careful navigation of the Act's exclusions and their underlying rationale of preserving moral and cultural values. Indian Patents Act, 1970 :

Patentability Criteria : The Act outlines the conditions that an invention must meet to be eligible for a patent. These typically include novelty, non-obviousness (inventive step), and industrial applicability.

Rights of Patent Holders : 17 Kirillova, A., Bushev, S., Abubakirov, A., & Sukikh, G., Bioethical and legal issues in 3D bioprinting, 2020, International Journal of Bioprinting The Act defines the rights conferred upon a patent holder, including the exclusive right to make, use, sell, and import the patented invention.

Procedures for Patents : It specifies the procedures for applying for a patent, including the application process, examination, and grant of patents.

Enforcement of Patents : The Act also addresses the enforcement of patent rights, providing mechanisms for addressing infringement and other patent-related disputes. Compulsory Licensing : A key feature of the Act is the provision for compulsory licensing, allowing the government to grant licenses for patented inventions in certain situations, such as public interest or national emergency, even without the patent holder's consent. Amendments : The Act has been amended several times, most notably by the Patents (Amendment) Act, 2005, which brought India's patent laws in line with World Trade Organization (WTO) agreements, particularly the Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS).

CONCLUSION

Judicial Interpretation: Distinguishing Discoveries and Inventions : The legal and ethical challenges around bioprinting stem from the fundamental question of whether bioprinted products can be considered true "inventions" eligible for patent protection. As the excerpt notes, the use of human tissues and cells, particularly embryonic stem cells, in bioprinting raises deep moral and ethical concerns. 18 Manual Of Patent Office Practice And Procedure, Published By: The Office Of Controller General Of Patents, Designs & Trademarks, Version 3.0, Nov 26, 2019 Courts have grappled with this issue of distinguishing between patentable inventions and unpatentable discoveries of natural phenomena.

In the landmark U.S. Supreme Court case Association for Molecular Pathology v. Myriad, the court ruled that isolated human genes are not patentable, even if they have been extracted and purified, because they represent a discovery of a natural substance rather than a human-made invention. This precedent suggests that bioprinted tissues and organs composed of natural human cells and materials may face similar challenges in meeting the patent eligibility criteria. The extraction and manipulation of these fundamental building blocks of life, despite their potential medical applications, may be viewed as mere discoveries rather than inventions deserving of patent protection. Navigating this fine line between discovery and invention remains a central judicial consideration in the bioprinting space. Conclusions and Future Directions : Bioprinting represents a transformative intersection of additive manufacturing and biotechnology, with significant potential to revolutionize healthcare, pharmaceuticals, and regenerative medicine. However, the integration of intellectual property (IP) frameworks into this rapidly evolving field exposes critical legal, ethical, and technical challenges that demand practical and actionable solutions. Traditional IP systems, while foundational, are inadequate to address the unique complexities of bioprinting, particularly those related to the ownership and patentability of bioinks, bioprinting hardware, and digital design files derived from biological data. Furthermore, the commodification of bioprinted tissues and organs raises profound ethical dilemmas that complicate the establishment of comprehensive regulatory frameworks. To address these challenges, future efforts must prioritize the development of hybrid IP systems that balance open innovation with mechanisms for safeguarding proprietary technologies. For instance, the successful implementation of tailored licensing frameworks in related fields, such as biotechnology, offers a useful model for fostering collaborative innovation while ensuring adequate protection for contributors. Such frameworks should draw from real-world case studies to establish best practices for harmonizing open access with proprietary rights. Moreover, international legal harmonization is essential to mitigate jurisdictional disparities and enable the equitable development and regulation of

bioprinting technologies. A comparative analysis of existing global IP frameworks can provide valuable insights into the practical steps required to achieve such harmonization. Ethical oversight must also become a cornerstone of the IP landscape in bioprinting. Independent review boards, modeled after those in clinical research, could play a critical role in ensuring the responsible use of biological materials and adherence to principles of equity and transparency. Drawing on examples from fields such as genomics, the integration of dynamic consent models could provide a flexible and ethical approach to managing patient-derived biological data, safeguarding privacy while enabling innovation. Additionally, addressing implementation challenges, such as conflicting regulatory standards and economic disparities, is crucial for ensuring that ethical guidelines are not only conceptual but also actionable and impactful. In conclusion, the progress of bioprinting depends on promoting interdisciplinary collaboration among legal, technical, and ethical experts to build an IP framework that addresses the identified challenges with concrete solutions. By explicitly aligning recommendations with real-world precedents and implementation strategies, stakeholders can develop an IP system that supports innovation while addressing ethical and societal concerns. Proactively addressing these challenges will enable bioprinting to realize its full potential in the area of personalized medicine, drug development, and organ transplantation, ensuring that its benefits are distributed sustainably and equitably across global communities.