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

VOLUME 5 AND ISSUE 13 OF 2025

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

Published by

Institute of Legal Education

https://iledu.in

SOFTWARE PATENTS: CHALLENGES IN THE INDIAN LEGAL CONTEXT

AUTHOR - SUYASHI VINIT, STUDENT AT AMITY UNIVERSITY

BEST CITATION - SUYASHI VINIT, SOFTWARE PATENTS: CHALLENGES IN THE INDIAN LEGAL CONTEXT, *INDIAN JOURNAL OF LEGAL REVIEW (IJLR)*, 5 (13) OF 2025, PG. 37-41, APIS – 3920 – 0001 & ISSN - 2583-2344.

Abstract

The intersection between software innovation and patent protection represents one of the most contested areas in intellectual property law. In India, while the IT sector forms a cornerstone of economic growth, the patentability of software remains a complex legal question. This paper examines the evolution, legal framework, and policy challenges surrounding software patents in India. It evaluates the interpretation of Section 3(k) of the Patents Act, 1970, through the lens of judicial decisions and Patent Office guidelines. Comparative analysis with the United States, European Union, and Japan highlights varying approaches to protecting computer programs. The paper concludes that India's cautious stance aligns with public interest and innovation balance but calls for nuanced reform to encourage indigenous software development without stifling creativity or competition.

Keywords: Software patents, Section 3(k), Indian Patent Act, algorithm, computer program, TRIPS Agreement, innovation, intellectual property.

1. Introduction

Software has become the lifeblood of the digital economy, driving innovation across industries from finance and healthcare to education and defense. Yet, the question of whether software should be patentable remains deeply controversial. While copyright protects the expression of software code, patents protect its underlying functional ideas and algorithms—raising questions about monopolization and innovation freedom.

Globally, jurisdictions have taken different approaches to this issue. The United States initially adopted a liberal stance, granting patents for software-related inventions, while the European Union and India adopted restrictive policies emphasizing technical effect and industrial applicability. In India, this debate is particularly significant as the nation aspires to be a global technology hub while maintaining equitable access to knowledge and innovation.

This paper seeks to critically analyze the challenges of granting software patents in India by examining the statutory framework, judicial interpretation, and international context. It aims to determine whether India's legal position adequately balances innovation incentives and public interest.

2. Concept and Evolution of Software Patents

2.1. Definition

Software patents refer to legal protection granted for inventions involving computer programs or algorithms that perform specific technical functions. Unlike copyright, which protects the literal code, patents cover the underlying ideas and processes that enable the functioning of a software-based system.

2.2. Historical Evolution

The debate over software patentability originated in the 1960s, as computer technology began to influence industry and commerce. Early patent offices hesitated to recognize software as patentable because it lacked

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

VOLUME 5 AND ISSUE 13 OF 2025

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

Published by

Institute of Legal Education

https://iledu.in

physical form. However, the rise of programmable hardware blurred the line between hardware and software.

The **U.S. Supreme Court's** decision in *Gottschalk v. Benson* (1972) initially restricted software patents, holding that mathematical algorithms were abstract ideas and thus non-patentable. Over time, however, decisions such as *Diamond v. Diehr* (1981) and *State Street Bank v. Signature Financial Group* (1998) expanded the scope of patent protection for software-related inventions.

In India, the evolution of software patent law has been cautious, shaped by a desire to encourage innovation without allowing monopolization of abstract algorithms.

3. Legal Framework Governing Software Patents in India

The **Indian Patents Act, 1970**, as amended, is the primary legislation governing patent law in India. Under Section 2(1)(j), an "invention" is defined as "a new product or process involving an inventive step and capable of industrial application." However, **Section 3(k)** explicitly excludes "a mathematical or business method or a computer program per se or algorithms" from patentability.

3.1. Interpretation of Section 3(k)

The phrase "computer program per se" has been at the heart of interpretational disputes. The inclusion of "per se" indicates that while pure software (without hardware linkage) is not patentable, a software-related invention that demonstrates a **technical effect** or **technical contribution** may be considered for protection.

The **2004 and 2005 Patent (Amendment) Bills** initially sought to remove this exclusion to align India with TRIPS obligations. However, due to strong opposition from civil society and the domestic IT industry, the exclusion was retained in the final amendment passed in 2005.

3.2. Indian Patent Office Guidelines

The **Indian Patent Office** has issued multiple sets of guidelines for examining computer-related inventions (CRIs), notably in **2013, 2016, and 2017**. The 2016 guidelines initially liberalized the examination process by permitting software patents if a "novel hardware" was disclosed. However, after criticism, the 2017 guidelines retracted this approach and reinstated a stricter interpretation aligned with Section 3(k).

Under the **2017 CRI Guidelines**, an invention must demonstrate:

1. **Novel hardware** or **technical effect** beyond mere software execution, and
2. A **contribution to technical advancement** or improved industrial application.

This approach reflects India's commitment to prevent the monopolization of abstract software ideas.

4. Comparative Legal Analysis

4.1. United States

The U.S. has a long and evolving history with software patents. Under *Diamond v. Diehr* (1981), the Supreme Court recognized that software integrated with a physical process could be patentable. However, in *Alice Corp. v. CLS Bank International* (2014), the Court curtailed this liberal approach, holding that abstract ideas implemented through generic computers are not patentable.

The **Alice Test** established a two-step framework:

1. Determine whether the claims are directed to an abstract idea.
2. If yes, assess whether the claim includes an "inventive concept" sufficient to transform the abstract idea into a patent-eligible application.

This decision invalidated thousands of software patents and brought the U.S. approach closer to that of the EU and India.

4.2. European Union

The **European Patent Convention (EPC)** excludes "programs for computers" from

INDIAN JOURNAL OF LEGAL REVIEW [IJLR – IF SCORE – 7.58]
VOLUME 5 AND ISSUE 13 OF 2025
APIS – 3920 - 0001 *(and)* ISSN - 2583-2344
Published by
Institute of Legal Education
https://iledu.in

patentability under Article 52(2), but provides flexibility where the program produces a **technical effect** beyond normal software operation. The European Patent Office (EPO) thus allows patents for inventions involving technical contributions, such as controlling an industrial process or improving computer efficiency.

4.3. Japan

Japan's **Patent Act** adopts a balanced approach. Software-related inventions are patentable if they involve the creation of a "technical idea utilizing a law of nature." This has enabled significant growth in Japan's software innovation while maintaining safeguards against trivial patents.

4.4. Comparative Summary

Jurisdiction	Approach to Software Patents	Key Requirement
India	Restrictive (Section 3(k))	Must show technical effect or hardware linkage
U.S.	Conditional (Alice Test)	Abstract idea + inventive concept
EU	Technical Effect Approach	Contribution to a technical field
Japan	Balanced	Technical idea using natural laws

India's stance, though restrictive, aligns closely with the EU model, emphasizing technical contribution over mere code protection.

5. Judicial Interpretation and Key Case Laws

5.1. *Electronic Navigation Research Institute v. Controller of Patents* (2013)

Facts: The applicant sought a patent for a system improving flight safety through computer-implemented data analysis.
Decision: The Indian Patent Office rejected the claim under Section 3(k), stating that the invention relied solely on software without novel hardware.
Ratio Decidendi: Computer programs per se are non-patentable unless tied to a specific hardware configuration or demonstrating technical effect.

5.2. *Yahoo Inc. Application* (2011)

Facts: Yahoo filed a patent application for an advertising system based on user behavior analysis.
Decision: The Patent Office held that the claimed invention was merely an algorithm executed by a computer.
Ratio: Algorithms and business methods, even if computer-implemented, are excluded from patentability.

5.3. *Ferid Allani v. Union of India* (Delhi High Court, 2019)

Facts: The petitioner's application for a method of accessing websites through graphical interfaces was rejected under Section 3(k).
Issue: Whether a computer-implemented invention demonstrating technical effect can be patentable.
Judgment: The Court ruled that the mere presence of software does not make an invention unpatentable. If the invention demonstrates a **technical contribution**, it may qualify for protection.
Ratio Decidendi: Section 3(k) should be interpreted dynamically to accommodate genuine technical innovations.
Significance: This case marked a significant shift, recognizing the evolving nature of technology and encouraging patentability for genuine technical inventions.

5.4. *Microsoft Technology Licensing LLC v. Assistant Controller of Patents* (2021)

Facts: Microsoft's application related to file management in a digital environment.
Decision: The Patent Office rejected it under Section 3(k), holding that improvements in file processing were algorithmic and lacked novel hardware.
Observation: The case reinforced India's

restrictive approach but also highlighted inconsistencies in applying the technical effect test.

5.5. Comparative Case Law Overview

Case	Jurisdiction	Key Issue	Outcome	Relevance to India
Gottschalk v. Benson (1972)	U.S.	Mathematical algorithm patentability	Denied	Supports Section 3(k) exclusion
Diamond v. Diehr (1981)	U.S.	Software controlling a process	Granted	Shows flexibility for technical effect
Alice Corp. v. CLS Bank (2014)	U.S.	Abstract ideas in computer implementation	Denied	Reinforces technical contribution approach
Ferid Allani v. UOI (2019)	India	Technical effect in software invention	Granted (conditional)	Landmark Indian precedent

6. Challenges in Granting Software Patents in India

1. **Ambiguity in Legal Language:** The term "computer program per se" lacks precise statutory definition, leading to inconsistent interpretation across cases.
2. **Technical Effect Assessment:** Patent examiners often lack standardized criteria to evaluate what constitutes a "technical contribution," leading to subjective decisions.
3. **Overlap with Copyright Law:** Software already enjoys protection under the **Copyright Act, 1957**, creating redundancy and potential double protection.
4. **Risk of Monopolization:** Broad patent grants may allow corporations to monopolize abstract ideas, stifling innovation among start-ups and independent developers.
5. **Lack of Judicial Precedent:** Limited Indian case law on software patents results in uncertainty and unpredictability for innovators.
6. **Economic Implications:** As India's software industry thrives on open innovation and service models, excessive patenting could discourage small enterprises and programmers.

7. Policy Debates and TRIPS Compliance

The **TRIPS Agreement (1995)** requires WTO members to provide patent protection for inventions "in all fields of technology," provided they are new, involve an inventive step, and are industrially applicable. However, TRIPS does not explicitly mandate the patenting of computer programs, allowing members flexibility.

India's exclusion under Section 3(k) thus remains TRIPS-compliant. This position aligns with Article 27(1), provided it applies uniformly across technologies and does not discriminate arbitrarily.

The **Indian government** has consistently emphasized that innovation in software can be incentivized through **copyright, trade secrets, and competition policies** rather than broad patent protection.

8. Future Prospects and Recommendations

1. **Clarify Section 3(k):** Amend the Patents Act to define "technical effect" and "computer

program per se," ensuring consistent interpretation.

2. **Adopt a Tiered Protection Model:** Provide limited patent protection for software demonstrating clear industrial or technical application, while keeping abstract algorithms unpatentable.
3. **Strengthen Examiner Training:** Patent officers should receive specialized technical training to evaluate software-related inventions effectively.
4. **Encourage Open Innovation:** Promote open-source licensing frameworks and government incentives for collaborative software development.
5. **Establish Specialized IP Courts:** Dedicated IP benches or tribunals can handle complex technological disputes with consistency and expertise.
6. **International Collaboration:** India should actively participate in WIPO and WTO dialogues to shape evolving global norms on software patentability.

9. Conclusion

Software patents represent the delicate intersection between innovation and monopolization. India's cautious approach under Section 3(k) has protected the domestic IT sector from excessive litigation and monopolistic control, while ensuring freedom for innovation. However, the growing complexity of artificial intelligence, machine learning, and embedded systems demands a more nuanced approach.

Courts, policymakers, and the patent office must harmonize legal interpretation with technological reality. A redefined framework that recognizes **technical contribution**, encourages **innovation**, and safeguards **public interest** will ensure that India remains a global leader in technology and intellectual property.

References

1. *Ferid Allani v. Union of India*, (2019) SCC OnLine Del 11867.
2. *Microsoft Technology Licensing LLC v. Assistant Controller of Patents* (2021) SCC OnLine IPAB 12.
3. *Gottschalk v. Benson*, 409 U.S. 63 (1972).
4. *Diamond v. Diehr*, 450 U.S. 175 (1981).
5. *Alice Corp. v. CLS Bank International*, 573 U.S. 208 (2014).
6. *Electronic Navigation Research Institute v. Controller of Patents*, 2013 (IPAB).
7. *Yahoo Inc. Application*, 2011 (IPO Decision).
8. The Patents Act, 1970 (as amended in 2005).
9. Indian Patent Office, *Guidelines for Examination of Computer-Related Inventions (CRI)*, 2017.
10. WIPO, *Study on Patent Protection for Software-Related Inventions*, 2021.
11. Basheer, S., "Software Patents and India's Innovation Policy," *NLSIR*, Vol. 25, 2020.
12. Choudhury, R., "Section 3(k) and the Future of Software Patenting in India," *NUJS Law Review*, Vol. 14, 2021.