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

BIOPIRACY AND PATENT ETHICS: A GLOBAL GOVERNANCE DILEMMA

AUTHOR - APURVA SINGH, STUDENT AT AMITY UNIVERSITY, PATNA

BEST CITATION - APURVA SINGH, BIOPIRACY AND PATENT ETHICS: A GLOBAL GOVERNANCE DILEMMA, *INDIAN JOURNAL OF LEGAL REVIEW (IJLR)*, 5 (13) OF 2025, PG. 528-532, APIS – 3920 – 0001 & ISSN - 2583-2344.

Abstract

Biopiracy has emerged as one of the most contentious ethical and legal challenges in the domain of Intellectual Property Rights (IPR). It involves the unauthorized and uncompensated appropriation of biological resources and traditional knowledge (TK), often from indigenous communities, by corporations or research entities seeking patent protection. The conflict between global patent regimes and the protection of biodiversity-rich developing countries—such as India—reflects a fundamental governance dilemma: how to reconcile intellectual property protection with ethical, equitable access to genetic resources. This paper explores the concept and evolution of biopiracy, examines international legal frameworks such as the TRIPS Agreement, the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), and the Nagoya Protocol, and evaluates India's national legal response through instruments like the Biological Diversity Act, 2002, and the Protection of Plant Varieties and Farmers' Rights Act, 2001. It critically analyses the ethical implications of patenting life forms, the inadequacy of benefit-sharing mechanisms, and the path forward toward an equitable global IP order that respects indigenous rights and biodiversity sovereignty.

Keywords - Biopiracy, Patent Ethics, Traditional Knowledge, Intellectual Property Rights, TRIPS Agreement, Convention on Biological Diversity, India, Global Governance, Patent Law, Indigenous Rights

1. Introduction

The globalization of trade and the proliferation of biotechnological innovations have intensified debates surrounding ownership and control over biological resources. Biopiracy, a term popularized in the 1990s, denotes the commercial exploitation of biological materials—such as plants, genes, and traditional medicinal knowledge—without proper authorization or compensation to the countries or communities that have nurtured them for centuries. The issue is particularly acute in biodiversity-rich developing nations like India, Brazil, and Indonesia, which face the dual challenge of conserving biodiversity and safeguarding indigenous intellectual contributions against exploitation by foreign patent holders.

The emergence of the World Trade Organization's Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS) in 1995 altered the global IPR landscape by mandating all member states to provide patent protection for inventions across all fields of technology. However, TRIPS largely neglected the traditional systems of knowledge and biological resource stewardship that existed outside formal scientific frameworks. Consequently, it created a structural imbalance between corporate rights and community-based intellectual systems.

The Indian experience, shaped by notable cases such as the patenting of turmeric, neem, and basmati rice, reflects the tensions inherent in global IPR governance. These cases exposed the ethical vacuum in patent regimes and

prompted the evolution of a domestic legal framework aimed at curbing biopiracy while promoting equitable benefit-sharing.

2. Understanding Biopiracy

2.1 Conceptual Framework

Biopiracy refers to the unauthorized commercial exploitation of biological materials or traditional knowledge by external entities, often resulting in patents that exclude the original knowledge holders from any benefit. It represents a form of intellectual theft that undermines biodiversity sovereignty and cultural rights. Vandana Shiva, an eminent Indian environmental activist, described biopiracy as the "colonialism of the twenty-first century," wherein corporations extract biological wealth from the Global South under the guise of innovation.

2.2 The Ethical Dimensions

At its core, biopiracy raises profound ethical questions concerning justice, fairness, and respect for indigenous contributions. Ethical scrutiny demands an acknowledgment that traditional knowledge, though collective and orally transmitted, constitutes an intellectual contribution deserving recognition. The monopolization of such knowledge through patents violates not only economic rights but also moral and cultural autonomy.

2.3 Examples of Biopiracy

Some of the most prominent examples include:

- **The Turmeric Patent Case (1995)**: The U.S. Patent and Trademark Office granted a patent to the University of Mississippi Medical Center for turmeric's wound-healing properties, knowledge that had been part of Indian Ayurvedic tradition for millennia. The patent was later revoked after India's Council of Scientific and Industrial Research (CSIR) challenged it.
- **Neem Case (1994)**: The European Patent Office granted a patent to W.R. Grace and the U.S. Department of Agriculture for neem-based fungicides, despite the plant's well-known use in Indian agriculture. The patent was eventually revoked after a protracted legal battle.
- **Basmati Rice Controversy (1997)**: The U.S. company RiceTec patented certain aromatic rice strains similar to Indian basmati, leading to diplomatic and legal protests from India.

These cases highlight the asymmetry between industrial patent systems and indigenous epistemologies, exposing the inadequacy of current IP norms in protecting community-based innovations.

3. International Legal Framework Governing Biopiracy

3.1 The TRIPS Agreement

The TRIPS Agreement, under the World Trade Organization (WTO), seeks to harmonize intellectual property protection globally. Article 27.3(b) allows member states to exclude from patentability "plants and animals other than microorganisms," while mandating protection for plant varieties either through patents or an effective sui generis system. However, TRIPS does not recognize traditional knowledge systems or require patent applicants to disclose the origin of biological materials used in their inventions. This lacuna has enabled corporations to claim ownership over genetic resources and associated knowledge without consent or benefit-sharing.

3.2 The Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), 1992

The CBD represents a paradigm shift in global environmental and IP governance. It recognizes the sovereign rights of states over their biological resources and mandates "access and benefit-sharing" (ABS) mechanisms to ensure equitable distribution of gains arising from the use of genetic resources. Article 8(j) specifically calls for respect, preservation, and equitable benefit-sharing with holders of traditional knowledge.

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

3.3 The Nagoya Protocol, 2010

The Nagoya Protocol operationalizes the ABS principles of the CBD by establishing clear rules for prior informed consent (PIC) and mutually agreed terms (MAT) between users and providers of genetic resources. It obligates parties to ensure that traditional knowledge associated with genetic resources is accessed only with community consent and that benefits are shared fairly.

3.4 Interplay between TRIPS and CBD

A significant tension exists between TRIPS, which prioritizes the protection of private intellectual property, and CBD, which emphasizes sovereign control and equitable sharing. Developing countries have advocated for TRIPS amendments to include disclosure requirements of genetic resource origins, but consensus remains elusive. This conflict reflects the ethical dilemma of global governance—balancing innovation incentives with justice and biodiversity preservation.

4. India's Legal and Institutional Response

4.1 The Biological Diversity Act, 2002

India's Biological Diversity Act was enacted to implement the CBD's objectives. It establishes a three-tier structure:

1. **National Biodiversity Authority (NBA)**
2. **State Biodiversity Boards (SBBs)**
3. **Biodiversity Management Committees (BMCs)**

These institutions regulate access to biological resources and ensure benefit-sharing through Access and Benefit Sharing (ABS) agreements. Section 3 mandates that any foreign entity seeking access to Indian biological resources must obtain prior approval from the NBA. The Act also empowers local communities to document traditional knowledge through People's Biodiversity Registers (PBRs).

4.2 The Protection of Plant Varieties and Farmers' Rights Act, 2001 (PPVFR Act)

This legislation is India's sui generis system for plant variety protection, as permitted under TRIPS. It uniquely recognizes the rights of farmers as cultivators and conservers of biodiversity. Farmers are entitled to save, use, exchange, and sell seeds, unlike in the conventional patent framework. The Act also provides for benefit-sharing and protection of breeders' rights, representing a balanced model between innovation and traditional practice.

4.3 The Traditional Knowledge Digital Library (TKDL)

Launched in 2001 by CSIR and the Ministry of AYUSH, the TKDL is a groundbreaking initiative documenting over 2.9 lakh formulations from Ayurveda, Unani, and Siddha systems. It provides patent examiners worldwide with searchable evidence of prior art to prevent the granting of wrongful patents. TKDL has successfully challenged numerous patent applications globally, including in the U.S. and Europe, thereby curbing biopiracy through digital transparency.

5. Ethical and Legal Dimensions of Patent Protection

5.1 Patenting Life Forms

The ethical debate on whether life forms should be patentable hinges on the distinction between discovery and invention. The 1980 U.S. Supreme Court decision in *Diamond v. Chakrabarty* opened the door for the patenting of genetically modified microorganisms, triggering a global trend. However, this raises profound moral concerns about commodifying living organisms and eroding biodiversity commons. Many argue that life, as a product of nature, should remain outside the domain of private ownership.

5.2 Traditional Knowledge as Collective Intellectual Property

Unlike individual-centric Western IP systems, traditional knowledge is communal, dynamic, and context-specific. Conventional IP regimes, which demand novelty and inventiveness, fail to accommodate the cumulative and

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

intergenerational nature of such knowledge. Recognizing TK as "collective intellectual property" demands innovative legal frameworks that transcend the narrow confines of existing patent laws.

5.3 Benefit-Sharing and Equity

Ethical governance requires not merely preventing misappropriation but also ensuring that communities derive fair benefits from the commercial use of their resources. This includes monetary compensation, technology transfer, and community development. The principle of Free, Prior, and Informed Consent (FPIC) is crucial for ensuring justice in bioprospecting agreements.

6. Case Studies and Judicial Developments in India

6.1 The Turmeric and Neem Cases

India's success in revoking patents on turmeric and neem represents significant legal victories against biopiracy. The CSIR's evidence of prior art established that these inventions lacked novelty, setting a global precedent for defending traditional knowledge.

6.2 Basmati Rice Dispute

The *RiceTec Inc.* patent controversy revealed how inadequately defined geographical indications can be exploited. India responded by strengthening the Geographical Indications of Goods (Registration and Protection) Act, 1999, ensuring the protection of culturally and economically significant products.

6.3 Recent Initiatives

India has intensified its documentation and monitoring systems. The NBA has entered into ABS agreements with corporations like Colgate and PepsiCo, ensuring benefit-sharing for the use of local biological materials. This marks a pragmatic shift from reactive litigation to proactive governance.

7. Global Challenges in Regulating Biopiracy

Despite advancements, several challenges persist:

1. **Lack of Uniform International Standards:** Divergent national laws impede effective global enforcement.
2. **Weak Disclosure Mechanisms:** Patent offices worldwide still lack mandatory origin disclosure requirements.
3. **Corporate Dominance:** Multinational corporations possess legal and financial resources that outmatch community and national capacities.
4. **Digital Biopiracy:** Advances in genomics and synthetic biology enable genetic material replication without physical access, rendering traditional access laws ineffective.
5. **Inadequate Benefit-Sharing:** Most ABS arrangements fail to translate into tangible benefits for indigenous communities.

8. The Way Forward: Towards Ethical Global Governance

8.1 Strengthening International Norms

There is an urgent need to harmonize TRIPS and CBD through amendments mandating disclosure of genetic resource origins and evidence of prior informed consent in patent applications. WIPO's ongoing Intergovernmental Committee on Intellectual Property and Genetic Resources offers a promising forum for developing an international legal instrument to protect TK and prevent biopiracy.

8.2 Digital and Technological Safeguards

Databases like India's TKDL should be expanded globally. Artificial intelligence and blockchain can enhance transparency and traceability in genetic resource usage, ensuring automatic benefit-sharing through smart contracts.

8.3 Empowering Indigenous Communities

Legal empowerment through community protocols and participatory decision-making must form the core of biopiracy governance. Training and awareness programs can equip

communities to negotiate equitable bioprospecting agreements.

8.4 Ethical Reorientation of Patent Law

The patent system must evolve beyond economic incentives to integrate ethical considerations of justice and sustainability. Recognition of "biocultural rights" can serve as a moral foundation for this reform.

9. Conclusion

Biopiracy embodies the tensions of globalization, where the commodification of nature collides with indigenous rights and environmental ethics. The prevailing IP system, rooted in Western individualism, inadequately accommodates the collective, ecological, and cultural dimensions of traditional knowledge. India's legal framework—anchored in the Biological Diversity Act, PPVFR Act, and TKDL—offers a model of resistance and reform. However, the global governance architecture must evolve through greater coherence between TRIPS and CBD, stronger community participation, and ethical reorientation of patent law. Only through such an integrated approach can the world transition from biopiracy to biopartnership, ensuring that innovation coexists with justice, and progress aligns with equity.

References

1. World Trade Organization, *Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS)*, 1995.
2. United Nations, *Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD)*, 1992.
3. *Nagoya Protocol on Access to Genetic Resources and the Fair and Equitable Sharing of Benefits*, 2010.
4. Government of India, *The Biological Diversity Act*, 2002.
5. Government of India, *Protection of Plant Varieties and Farmers' Rights Act*, 2001.
6. Council of Scientific and Industrial Research (CSIR), *Traditional Knowledge Digital Library (TKDL) Documentation Report*, 2020.
7. Vandana Shiva, *Biopiracy: The Plunder of Nature and Knowledge*, South End Press, 1997.
8. World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO), *Intellectual Property and Genetic Resources*, 2021.
9. Dutfield, Graham, *Intellectual Property, Biogenetic Resources and Traditional Knowledge*, Earthscan, 2004.
10. Posey, D.A., *Cultural and Spiritual Values of Biodiversity*, UNEP, 1999.
11. Sreenivasan, M., "Biopiracy and the Legal Protection of Traditional Knowledge in India," *Indian Journal of Law and Technology*, Vol. 12 (2016).
12. CSIR vs. U.S. Patent Office, Turmeric Case (1997).
13. Neem Patent Revocation, European Patent Office, Case EP0436257 (2000).
14. RiceTec Inc. Patent Controversy, U.S. Patent No. 5663484 (1997).
15. Ghosh, A., "Ethics and Equity in Bioprospecting," *Journal of World Intellectual Property*, Vol. 24, No. 3 (2021).