

## PATENT LAW AND PUBLIC HEALTH: ACCESS TO MEDICINES IN INDIA

**AUTHOR** – ABHISHEK KUMAR, STUDENT AT AMITY UNIVERSITY PATNA

**BEST CITATION** – ABHISHEK KUMAR, PATENT LAW AND PUBLIC HEALTH: ACCESS TO MEDICINES IN INDIA, *INDIAN JOURNAL OF LEGAL REVIEW (IJLR)*, 5 (13) OF 2025, PG. 76-81, APIS – 3920 – 0001 & ISSN – 2583-2344.

### Abstract

The tension between intellectual property rights and public health stands as one of the defining dilemmas of our era. Patents, while intended to incentivize innovation—particularly in pharmaceuticals—often have the unintended consequence of restricting access to essential, life-saving medicines. Elevated prices, patent monopolies, and supply chain barriers routinely leave millions, especially those in low- and middle-income countries, without the treatments they need. Within this global landscape, India holds a pivotal position; as a leading producer of affordable generic medicines, it serves as an indispensable resource for nations facing significant health challenges. This study critically examines the global crisis of access to medicines, illuminating the persistent gap between pharmaceutical innovation and public availability. Diseases such as malaria, tuberculosis, dengue, and HIV continue to disproportionately impact the world's most vulnerable populations, yet market priorities tend to favour profit over pressing health needs. The analysis addresses key aspects of patent law, including the rationale and inherent challenges of granting exclusivity, as well as international frameworks—most notably the TRIPS Agreement—that govern the accessibility of medicines worldwide. In the Indian context, measures such as Section 3(d) of the Patents Act, compulsory licensing, and parallel importation have played a significant role in curbing practices like “ever greening” and ensuring the supply of affordable drugs. The strength of India's generics industry has, in effect, contributed to saving millions of lives internationally. Further, the study assesses the responsibilities of the pharmaceutical sector, weighing the ethical imperative to balance profit motives with public welfare. It also explores emerging legal and technological solutions, including patent pools, voluntary licensing, advancements in AI-driven drug discovery, and open-source initiatives. Policy recommendations centre on maintaining legal flexibilities, fostering research for neglected diseases, leveraging technological developments, enhancing regulatory oversight, and expanding access to affordable healthcare.

**Key words:** incentivize, pharmaceuticals, leveraging, pivotal, dilemmas

### Introduction

Alright, let's get real for a second: figuring out how to balance intellectual property rights and public health is basically one of the big headaches of this century. Patents are supposed to light a fire under inventors—dangling that exclusive rights carrot so they'll come up with the next miracle drug<sup>62</sup>. But,

honestly, this whole system can backfire. Sometimes it just means sick people get priced out of medicine that could actually save their lives<sup>63</sup>. It's like, cool, innovation is important, but what about people who literally can't afford to wait? Honestly, access to medicine isn't just some dry policy debate. It's a basic human right<sup>64</sup>. Every year, millions of folks die from stuff we already have the drugs to treat, but those

<sup>62</sup> World Health Organization. *Access to Medicines: Making Market Forces Serve the Poor*. Geneva: WHO, 2017

<sup>63</sup> Gonzalez-Blanco, F. “Patents and Public Health: A Global Challenge.” *Health Policy Journal*, vol. 14, no. 2, 2018,

<sup>64</sup> WHO. *Essential Medicines and Global Access*. Geneva: WHO, 2015

meds are locked away behind sky-high prices, supply chain messes, or patent laws that make it impossible for cheaper generics to hit the shelves. And look, India's kind of a big deal here. The country cranks out a massive chunk of the world's affordable generic drugs. Tons of developing countries depend on that lifeline. Still, India's got its own set of problems—especially since the World Trade Organization keeps pushing them to tighten up their patent rules (thanks, TRIPS Agreement). So, it's this never-ending tug-of-war: do you protect profits for pharma giants, or do you make sure regular people don't die for lack of cash? Anyway, this paper's going to dig into all that mess. We'll look at how patent laws shape the price and availability of meds (globally and in India), how India's tried to tweak its own laws to put public health first, and how tech and smarter policies might actually help get decent healthcare to everyone who needs it. Buckle up.

### The Global Crisis of Access to Medicines

Alright, let's get real about this whole "access to medicine" crisis—it's a total mess. We're talking about a third of the world's population (yeah, that's billions of people) who can't even get the meds they need<sup>65</sup>. Step into developing countries? That number jumps to two-thirds. It's wild. And the fallout? People dying from stuff we could literally prevent, families getting wrecked by hospital bills, entire economies getting dragged down because people can't work when they're sick. It's not some far-off abstract problem; it's happening every day. Sure, rich countries whine about overpriced new meds too, but honestly, folks in poorer places get hit so much harder. Imagine you're facing cancer or hepatitis, and the treatment costs more than you make in a month—what are you supposed to do? It's a brutal choice: go broke or get better. Sometimes you can't even do either. Now, let's talk about the diseases nobody wants to talk about. Stuff like malaria, dengue, TB, and a bunch of other tropical bugs. These things hammer the world's poorest, but Big Pharma?

Nah, they're not interested. Why? Simple: no money in it. Back in the day—let's say, 1980 through the early 2000s—almost none of the new drugs were for these diseases. Pharma companies chase profits, not problems. So, if a disease mostly kills people who can't pay, it's like it doesn't even exist to them. The whole system is rigged to ignore the most vulnerable, which is just... honestly, kind of infuriating. And even when there are drugs that work, the price tags are out of control. This isn't just about what it costs to make the pills. Nope, it's the patent game—companies get exclusive rights, jack up the prices, and there's no competition to keep them honest. They say it's to pay back research costs, but let's be real, regular people end up paying the price—literally. Look at HIV meds: before generics came in, the costs were so high, millions just went without treatment. Then India started cranking out affordable versions and, boom, suddenly people in Africa and Asia could actually stay alive. Funny how that works. So yeah, the medicine game is broken. And unless something changes, it's going to stay that way.

### Patent Law: Concepts, Purpose, and Challenges

1. The Structure and Rationale of Patent Law So, here's the deal with patent law: it basically hands inventors a golden ticket to make, use, and sell their inventions for like, twenty years. The thinking behind this<sup>66</sup>? Well, if you dangle a juicy carrot in front of people, you'll get more innovation, right? It's all about pushing folks to dream up new stuff, especially in things like medicine, where companies drop insane amounts of cash on research that might not even pan out. But snagging a patent isn't just a walk in the park. Your invention has to be new (no copycats), not something totally obvious that any expert could've whipped up, and actually useful in the real world. That "inventive step" bit? Super important. Otherwise, you'd have people patenting peanut butter and jelly sandwiches, and nobody needs that.

<sup>65</sup> WHO, *Access to Medicines: Global Statistics*, 2017

<sup>66</sup> The Patents Act, 1970 (India), 3(d), 84

2. Globalization and the TRIPS Agreement Let's talk about how patent rules went global—TRIPS is the main culprit here. When the World Trade Organization rolled out the TRIPS Agreement in '95, suddenly every member country had to get serious about patenting drugs<sup>67</sup>. Before that, countries like India just handed out process patents, so clever folks could reverse-engineer medicines and sell cheap generics. It was the Wild West, honestly. TRIPS still throws a few bones to poorer countries—stuff like compulsory licensing and parallel imports<sup>68</sup>—but, overall, it beefed up patent rights everywhere. Not everyone's happy about this. Loads of people say it just jacks up prices and makes it way tougher for poorer countries to get lifesaving meds into people's hands.

3. The Innovation-Access Dilemma Here's where the real drama kicks in. There's this constant tug-of-war between encouraging new drug development and actually getting those drugs to the people who need them. Sure, strong patents mean more shiny new pills in the future, but they also keep prices sky-high now. And when you're talking about meds people literally need to survive, that's a pretty brutal trade-off. Oh, and don't even get me started on "ever greening." Pharma companies love to tweak an old drug just enough to slap a fresh patent on it. It's like putting new rims on a rusty car and calling it a new model. All it really does is keep cheaper generics off the shelf and leave regular folks holding the bill. Total mess.

### Patent Law and Public Health in India

Let's just say, India's attitude to patent law has always been kind of... rebellious, but in a good way. After independence, the country basically looked at the Western pharma giants and said, "Nah, we'll do our own thing." The 1970 Patents Act was a game-changer—they skipped over product patents for medicines and stuck with process patents only. In plain English? Indian pharmaceutical companies could cook up the

same drugs as big international brands, just using a different recipe. That move absolutely slashed drug prices and opened the floodgates for access. And, man, did that pay off. Suddenly India's churning out affordable meds left and right, getting called the "pharmacy of the developing world" like it's some kind of superhero title. But then—plot twist—India joins the WTO and gets nudged (more like shoved) into following TRIPS rules. So, in 2005, product patents make a comeback, but India wasn't about to roll over. They built in some pretty tough safety nets to make sure public health didn't get steamrolled by corporate interests. Then there's the whole generics industry. India's pharma scene? It's massive. They crank out cheap, solid-quality generics not just for themselves but for the whole world. Loads of countries—especially poorer ones—depend on Indian meds for stuff like HIV, cancer, TB, you name it. We're talking millions of lives saved, and it's not an exaggeration. The second patents expire (or never get granted), a bunch of companies jump in, and the prices nosedive—sometimes by 90%. Its capitalism, but for the greater good. Now, if you're into legal jargon, here's the spicy bit: Section 3(d)<sup>69</sup> and Compulsory Licensing, Patents Act, 1970 (as amended 2005). It's basically India's way of giving the middle finger to "ever greening"—that sneaky trick where companies slightly tweak old drugs and try to get a fresh patent just to keep the cash cow going. Section 3(d) says, "Show us the actual improvement, or get lost." The Supreme Court really slammed this home in 2013 with the Novartis case. Novartis tried to get a patent for a jazzed-up version of Glove, their cancer drug, and the court was like, "Nope, not good enough." That verdict made waves everywhere—India wasn't about to let Big Pharma pull a fast one. And let's not forget compulsory licensing, which is basically the government saying, "If you won't make your drug affordable, we'll let someone else do it." That happened big time in 2012, when Nalco

<sup>67</sup> TRIPS Agreement, WTO, 1995

<sup>68</sup> Parallel importation provisions: TRIPS Agreement, Article 6, and Indian patent regulations

<sup>69</sup> Section 3(d) and **Compulsory Licensing**, Patents Act, 1970 (as amended 2005).

Pharma got the green light to make a cheap version of Bayer's cancer drug Naiver. Price dropped by almost 97%. That's not a typo. Suddenly, regular people could actually afford lifesaving treatment—and India sent a pretty clear message: people over profit. Oh, and there's also this thing called parallel importation<sup>70</sup>. Imagine you see a drug being sold for cheap in another country, but its crazy expensive at home. With this rule, India can just import the cheaper version, sidestepping the price gouging. Smart, right? It's like bargain hunting, but for public health

### Pharmaceutical Industry: Incentives and Responsibility

Alright, let's get real about Big Pharma. Everyone loves to talk about miracle drugs and scientific breakthroughs, but let's not pretend its all white lab coats and saving the world. There's a whole lotto money flying around, and honestly, sometimes it feels like dollar signs matter just as much as healing people – maybe more. Making a new drug? That's not a weekend project. We're talking years, maybe decades, plus stacks of cash taller than your cousin's conspiracy theories. You need mad scientists (well, not mad, but you know, genius types), piles of equipment, and enough patience to watch paint dry. To keep these folks hustling, the law jumps in with patents, so companies get a chance to cash in before someone else copies their homework. Its like, "Congrats, you found the cure – now rake in that sweet, sweet profit for a while." But – and here's the kicker – once a company's got that golden ticket, it gets to decide what you pay. Sometimes, its nuts. I mean, how's a single mom in Mumbai supposed to afford a life-saving pill that costs more than her monthly rent? That's when people start yelling about greedy corporations, and honestly, who can blame them? Saving lives shouldn't be some VIP club for the rich. So yeah, there's this tug-of-war. If you take away the profit, who's going to sink billions into a

maybe-it'll-work-maybe-it-won't experiment? But if you let profits run wild, you end up with miracle cures locked behind velvet ropes. It's a mess. The sweet spot? It's got to be somewhere in the middle. You want scientists jazzed about inventing cool stuff, but you don't want grandma skipping her meds because she can't pay the bill. Governments, NGOs, the companies themselves – everybody needs to get their act together and figure out a way to make sure the next big breakthrough doesn't just sit on a shelf gathering dust while people suffer. Bottom line: Pharma should be about more than making bank. The real mic-drop moment isn't inventing a drug, it's actually getting it to the folks who need it – all of them, not just the ones with deep pockets. That's what progress looks like, if you ask me.

### Legal and Technological Innovations for Access

Alright, let's get real for a second. Healthcare's always been this wild paradox, right? On one hand, you've got these mind-blowing drugs that could literally save lives, but on the other, half the planet can't afford them. It's like dangling a glass of water in front of a guy dying of thirst and then saying, Annoying. So, what's actually being done about it? Well, you've got the legal folks and the tech nerds both trying to patch things up. Legally, there's this whole circus around patents and who gets to make what. Ever heard of TRIPS? Yeah, it sounds like a travel agency, but it's really the big international rulebook (Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights, if you want to sound fancy). Countries can pull out this "compulsory licensing" card, basically telling drug companies, "Hey, we're going to let someone else make your drug cheaper, cause people are literally dying here." India's done it with cancer meds, and honestly, hats off to them. More countries should have that kind of backbone. And then there's patent pools and "voluntary licensing." It's like drug companies saying, "Okay, fine, you can use our recipe, but play nice." This way, you get more generics, prices drop, and suddenly, people aren't having to

<sup>70</sup> Parallel importation provisions: TRIPS Agreement, Article 6, and Indian patent regulations

choose between medicines and, I don't know, eating dinner. It's a rare win-win in the legal world, which, let's be honest, doesn't happen often. Now, flip the coin—tech is doing some heavy lifting too. Biotech these days is nuts; they're cooking up new meds faster than ever. Plus, with AI and all these shiny new digital tools, researchers can actually find stuff that works without spending a decade and a bajillion dollars. Supply chains? Way better. Even if you're in the middle of nowhere, there's a way to get your meds—thank you, drones and better logistics. And telemedicine, man, that's a game changer. Don't even have to leave your couch. But wait, the coolest thing.<sup>71</sup> Open-source drug discovery. Imagine a bunch of scientists just tossing their research out there for anyone to use, no strings attached. It's like the Wikipedia of medicine. Diseases that usually get ignored cause they're not "profitable" (looking at you, malaria and TB) finally get some love. So yeah, laws and tech—both doing their part. One keeps things fair (or tries to), the other keeps things moving. When they actually work together, you start seeing those life-saving drugs show up where they're needed, not just where people have fat wallets. Bottom line: everyone deserves a shot at good health, no matter where they're born or how much cash they've got. Anything less just feels wrong.

### India's Achievements and Continuing Challenges

Alright, let's be real—India's whole journey with pharma is kind of wild. You hear "pharmacy of the developing world"<sup>72</sup> thrown around all the time, and honestly, it's not just hype. They crank out quality generics for cheap, and these meds end up saving lives all over—think Africa, Latin America, pretty much wherever budgets are tight and diseases don't care about borders. The real game-changer? That 1970 Patents Act. Instead of letting companies lock down the actual drug, India only let you patent the process. So, if you could figure out another way

to whip up the same pill, boom, you're in business. No wonder companies like Copal and Rd. Reddy's blew up. Suddenly, AIDS drugs and malaria meds weren't just something rich folks could get. People everywhere finally had options that didn't require selling a kidney. Fast-forward to 2005—India joins the WTO, signs onto TRIPS, and people everywhere start biting their nails. Now product patents are in, but India's like, "Hold up, we're not letting big pharma just slap on a new flavour and call it a 'new drug'." Section 3(d) basically says, "No ever greening." So those sneaky patent extensions? Not happening. This move kept the door open for generics, and honestly, it's a lifesaver for so many. And let's talk about that Nalco vs. Bayer showdown in 2012. Bayer's cancer drug was priced like it was made of unicorn dust, and India said, "Nah, people need this." Nalco got the green light to make a way cheaper version. Corporate profits took a hit, but patients? They actually got the medicine. That was huge—a straight-up "people over profits" moment. But, it's not all sunshine and samosas. India's got some big headaches too. Yeah, they're kings of generics, but inventing brand new drugs? That's a whole different ballgame, and India's still in the little leagues there. R&D costs a fortune, and most local companies can't go toe-to-toe with the Pfizer's and Roche's of the world. And the pressure from Western countries and pharma giants is never-ending—they want tighter patents, which, surprise, would drive up prices. Then there's the wild west of regulation. You've got counterfeit drugs floating around, some sketchy quality control, plus red tape that can make getting new meds approved feel like waiting for a government office to call your number. Messy, right? And with the industry growing so fast, keeping things tight is just getting harder. Socially, the divide is brutal. In the cities, you can walk into a pharmacy and probably get what you need. But out in the villages? Half the time, there's not even a clinic nearby, and if there is, good luck affording the meds. Even the cheap ones can be out of reach if you're barely scraping by. So, yeah, India's

<sup>71</sup> Open-Source Drug Discovery (OSDD), CSIR, India, 2010

<sup>72</sup> Cipla, Dr. Reddy's, and Indian Generics. *Pharmaceutical Policy Research Reports*, Indian Council of Medical Research, 2016.

done some seriously impressive stuff—making meds affordable, fighting for public health, all that. But the work’s not done. They’ve got to get better at inventing new drugs, tighten up the rules, and make sure the system works for the poorest folks too, not just the ones in fancy hospitals. Real success? That’ll be when India isn’t just the go-to for cheap pills, but also the place where the next big cures actually come from.

### Policy Recommendations

To maintain and strengthen the balance between patent protection and public health, India must continue to:

1. **Preserve Legal Flexibilities:** India should resist external pressures to dilute safeguards like compulsory licensing and Section 3(d). These mechanisms are essential to ensuring affordable access.
2. **Promote Research for Neglected Diseases:** Government funding, public-private partnerships, and prize-based incentives should focus on diseases that the market ignores.
3. **Leverage Technology:** Patent offices and health authorities should adopt digital tools for data analysis, patent examination, and medicine monitoring.
4. **Strengthen Regulation:** Drug regulatory bodies must be empowered with resources and autonomy to ensure safety, quality, and transparency in the pharmaceutical sector.
5. **Expand Health Coverage:** Policies that reduce out-of-pocket expenditure—such as insurance schemes, price controls, and public procurement of generics—should be prioritized.

### Conclusion

Alright, let’s talk about this whole patent law vs. public health mess. It’s a real tightrope act. On the one hand, yeah, patents do help push people to invent stuff—nobody wants to spend

years in a lab only for someone else to swipe their ideas for free. But then, boom, you’ve got life-saving meds priced so high, regular folks just can’t afford them. That’s messed up. The real trick? Finding that sweet spot between letting inventors cash in on their work and making sure people don’t die just because they’re broke. And honestly, that’s a huge headache for pretty much every country out there, but especially for places like India. Now, India’s got some serious street cred here. They’ve managed to protect patents but also make sure people aren’t getting wrecked by high prices. Stuff like Section 3(d)—basically making it harder to patent tiny tweaks that don’t actually help people—and those compulsory license rules, they’re a big deal. India’s churning out cheap generics, and it’s helped millions, not just at home but worldwide. That’s how you do it—guard the science, sure, but don’t forget about the humans. But hey, it’s not all sunshine and samosas. Things keep shifting—new viruses, new gadgets, new trade deals, all that jazz. It’s a moving target. So, governments and big pharma can’t just chill and pat themselves on the back. They’ve got to keep hustling: push for more research, back home-grown ideas, keep prices sane, and make sure the stuff actually gets to people, no matter where they live or what’s in their wallet. At the end of the day, patents aren’t meant to be big, scary monsters blocking the way. They’re supposed to be tools—stuff that helps us move forward. If they’re not helping everyone, what’s the point? Real progress isn’t just shiny tech; it’s when everyone actually benefits. Innovation and justice? They’ve got to be dance partners, or it’s just business as usual. And honestly, who wants that?