INDIAN JOURNAL OF LEGAL REVIEW

VOLUME 5 AND ISSUE 13 OF 2025

INSTITUTE OF LEGAL EDUCATION

INDIAN JOURNAL OF LEGAL REVIEW

APIS – 3920 – 0001 | ISSN - 2583-2344

(Open Access Journal)

Journal's Home Page – https://ijlr.iledu.in/

Journal's Editorial Page - https://ijlr.iledu.in/editorial-board/

Volume 5 and Issue 13 of 2025 (Access Full Issue on - https://ijlr.iledu.in/volume-5-and-issue-13-of-2025/)

Publisher

Prasanna S,

Chairman of Institute of Legal Education

No. 08, Arul Nagar, Seera Thoppu,

Maudhanda Kurichi, Srirangam,

Tiruchirappalli – 620102

Phone : +91 73059 14348 - info@iledu.in / Chairman@iledu.in

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

THE SCOPE OF MEDIATION AND ARBITRATION IN RESOLVING COPYRIGHT AND PATENT DISPUTES

AUTHOR - DIBYAM, STUDENT AT AMITY LAW SCHOOL/AMITY UNIVERSITY PATNA, BIHAR

BEST CITATION - DIBYAM, POWER, INEQUALITY, AND THE LAW: A SOCIOLOGICAL PERSPECTIVE ON LEGAL SYSTEMS, *INDIAN JOURNAL OF LEGAL REVIEW (IJLR)*, 5 (13) OF 2025, PG. 575-582, APIS – 3920 – 0001 & ISSN - 2583-2344.

Abstract

This essay explores the function, boundaries, and usefulness of mediation and arbitration—collectively, "alternative dispute resolution," or ADR—in settling copyright and patent rights issues. It identifies the primary doctrinal and practical barriers (arbitrability, interim remedies, validity challenges, public policy), maps the domestic and international legal framework, reviews common-law and Indian jurisprudence, and makes recommendations for parties, practitioners, and policymakers to optimise the advantages of alternative dispute resolution (ADR) in intellectual property disputes. Leading Indian rulings, institutional practice (WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Centre), primary tools (UNCITRAL Model Law; national arbitration statutes), and comparative commentary serve as the foundation for the examination. Parties are looking into alternatives to traditional litigation as copyright and patent rights conflicts have become more intense due to the growing globalisation of creative and technological markets. Due to their flexibility, anonymity, affordability, and capacity to include knowledgeable decision-makers, mediation and arbitration—collectively referred to as alternative dispute resolution (ADR)—have become appealing methods for settling such disputes. This essay explores the use of mediation and arbitration in copyright and patent disputes today, with an emphasis on its conceptual constraints, practicality, and legal viability.

Keywords

Intellectual property; arbitration; mediation; arbitrability; copyrights; patents; WIPO; UNCITRAL; India; interim relief; enforceability.

Introduction

Intellectual property (IP) issues are becoming more cross-border, technical, and commercially sensitive, particularly those involving copyright and patents. Conventional litigation can be costly, time-consuming, public, and unsuitable for upholding continuing commercial partnerships or protecting technical secrets. In the IP environment, ADR is appealing because it offers speed, confidentiality, party autonomy, and access to knowledgeable decision-makers. However, there are still unanswered problems, such as which intellectual property claims are arbitrable, whether tribunals can determine their validity and provide effective redress (royalties or injunctions), the function of mediation, and how national courts oversee and enforce the results of alternative dispute resolution. Using comparative and institutional practice, this study addresses those questions with a focus on India.

Methodology and Sources

Statutory texts, institutional practice manuals, and case law are all included in this doctrinal and comparative examination. The UNCITRAL Model Law, the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 (India), WIPO's arbitration and mediation practice, significant Indian rulings like A.

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

Ayyasamy v. A. Paramasivam and lower-court rulings on the arbitrability of copyright claims, and scholarly and professional commentary are some important primary sources. To demonstrate current trends and practices, representative institutional and analytical sources were reviewed.

Part I — The Legal Framework

International Instruments and Institutional ADR

1. **UNCITRAL Model Law**: Many national acts are based on the Model Law (1985), which offers a widely accepted procedural standard for international commercial arbitration. It maintains Member State discretion on arbitrability while not completely excluding intellectual property conflicts. The appeal of arbitration in intellectual property disputes is largely due to its emphasis on party autonomy, minimal court involvement, and the enforceability of rulings.
2. **WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center**: In addition to promoting institutional case management, confidentiality, and expert panels—all of which serve several practical demands of IP parties—WIPO has created specialised ADR protocols for IP and technology disputes, such as expedited arbitration, expert decision, and mediation. The use of IP ADR and customised procedural instruments (online case management, specialised panel rosters) has increased, according to WIPO's experience.
3. **Domestic Law (India)**

   • Sections 7 and 8 define arbitration agreements and mandate that, in cases where an arbitration agreement is in place, courts send disputes to arbitration (subject to prima facie legality). In IP contract disputes, this procedural gateway is frequently used. India Code

   • Section 34 et seq.: Provide specific grounds (public policy, incompetence, procedural irregularities) for setting aside awards; these grounds are pertinent where IP awards violate statutory rights or the interests of third parties. Kanoon from India

   • Sectoral statutes: IP laws like the Trade Marks Act of 1999 (Section 134) and the Copyright Act of 1957 (Section 62 on territorial jurisdiction for actions) provide statutory forum requirements, which courts have interpreted when determining whether arbitration supersedes statutory court remedies. Kanoon+1 Indian

Part II — The Core Doctrinal Question: Are Copyright and Patent Disputes Arbitrable?

General Principles

The question of whether a disagreement can be settled by private adjudication (arbitration) as opposed to public courts is known as arbitrability. In contemporary arbitral practice, there are differences between:

• Contractual claims and licensing disputes, or actions in personam, are typically arbitrable as they involve contractual responsibilities and awards bind the parties.

• Actions in rem (rights enforceable against the world, such as statutory invalidation or public registries) are typically regarded as non-arbitrable if their resolution necessitates legally binding changes to statutory registers or public body judgements.

While validity challenges are frequently handled carefully, many jurisdictions now treat infringement, breach, and contractual IP claims as arbitrable. Although they may be arbitrable, an arbitral award on validity usually binds only the parties and cannot directly amend public IP registers; some national law or practice reserves validity determinations to courts or IP offices. Comparative surveys reveal a growing trend towards treating a large number of intellectual property issues as arbitrable, subject to certain restrictions.

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

Indian Jurisprudence — Fragmented but Evolving

India's jurisprudence is nuanced and sometimes conflicting:

- Bombay High Court – Eros International v. Telemax (2016): The Bombay High Court ruled that copyright issues resulting from contracts with arbitration clauses might be brought to arbitration; it concentrated on whether the relief sought was in personam (contractual) and hence subject to arbitration. This ruling highlighted the importance of the arbitration agreement and the requested remedy while challenging a strict non-arbitrability position.
- A. Ayyasamy v. A. Paramasivam (2016), Supreme Court: The Supreme Court's discussion created some uncertainty; in an obiter, it stated that trademarks and patents had "generally been treated as non-arbitrable." However, the Court's primary ruling concerned the arbitrability of fraud claims rather than establishing a comprehensive rule on IP arbitrability. The correct interpretation of Ayyasamy has been disputed by commentators and lower courts.
- Practical implications: Indian courts will typically uphold arbitration agreements and send disputes to arbitration (Section 8), but they may decline to do so if (i) the dispute involves significant public law issues or (ii) the requested relief necessitates in rem orders that are outside the jurisdiction of the tribunal (e.g., rectification of public registers or statutory powers of the Patent Office). The line is fact-sensitive and keeps changing as a result of case law. Academic opinion observes a slow trend towards acknowledging the arbitrability of many intellectual property problems, particularly those involving contracts and licensing.

Part III — Practical Obstacles & Doctrinal Limits

1. Validity Challenges and Public Registers

Even if arbitrators determine the validity of a patent between parties, enforcement against third parties or alteration of the patent register necessitates administrative action. Patent validity frequently entails issues that are inextricably linked to statutory registries and public rights. As a result, many courts handle validity issues as either non-arbitrable or arbitrable only insofar as awards bind parties and do not try to change public rights.

2. Interim Relief (Injunctions, Anton Piller Orders)

Certain types of interim relief, particularly those that call for enforcement against third parties or the seizure of goods across jurisdictions, are restricted in their ability to be granted by arbitral tribunals. Although tribunals may issue interim remedies in some regimes (and some statutes permit courts to grant interim relief in support of arbitration), national courts are frequently the proper place for injunctive relief. Parties frequently employ hybrid tactics, requesting both substantive resolution from the tribunal and emergency interim relief from the courts.

3. Expertise and Technical Complexity

One obvious advantage of arbitration in patent disputes is that it allows for the selection of technical and legal experts. For technology/IP disputes, WIPO and other organisations keep lists of technical arbitrators and provide expedited panels.

4. Confidentiality vs. Public Interest

Confidentiality in arbitration can be advantageous (protect trade secrets), but it can also obstruct public law objectives, such as the public interest in monitoring monopolies or the public notification of defective patents. Certain public interest cases are reserved for open court adjudication when courts strike a balance between these interests.

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

5. Enforcement and Setting Aside

Even in cases where an arbitral decision settles intellectual property disputes between parties, enforcement (both domestic recognition and international enforcement) may be contested on the basis of public policy; awards may be overturned due to Section 34 (India) and New York Convention defences. The parties must create procedures and awards that reduce the likelihood of a successful challenge.

Part IV — Mediation: Complementary Role

For intellectual property conflicts when parties desire relationship preservation, flexible remedies (licenses, cross-licensing, income sharing), confidentiality, and speed, mediation—including WIPO mediation—is a great option. When parties want commercial settlements instead of precedent or public adjudication, mediated outcomes are frequently preferred since they are contractually enforceable and may be quickly implemented. Institutional mediation (WIPO) provides specialised procedures and domain knowledge for the technology and creative industries.

Part V — Comparative Practice: How Courts and Institutions Reconcile ADR with IP Regimes

• United Kingdom: Patent arbitrability is more limited by statutory revocation procedures and the Patents Act, although trademark and copyright issues are frequently arbitrated. When it comes to contractual matters, national practice prioritises party sovereignty while acknowledging limitations on validity when public registers are involved.
• United States: Courts have ruled that arbitrability depends on statute wording and public policy; parties frequently arbitrate license and breach disputes. In cases where the statute does not specifically prohibit it, U.S. practice sometimes permits arbitration of validity; nonetheless, rulings on validity merely bind parties unless administrative redress is requested.
• International institutional trend: WIPO and other arbitral centres have reduced previous objections to arbitrability by developing IP-specific rules that address secrecy, technical knowledge, and quicker procedures.

Part VI — Recommendations

For **Practitioners and Parties**

1. Create exact ADR clauses: Differentiate between (a) disputes pertaining to contracts and licenses (which are specifically subject to arbitration or mediation) and (b) disputes pertaining to validity and registries (which either exclude or explicitly provide for tribunal power to decide validity but specify limitations for public registers and enforcement).
2. Hybrid remedies: These include model emergency arbitrator agreements or court-friendly interim relief clauses that preserve the right to ask courts for emergency interim relief while requiring arbitration for the merits.
3. Select specialised organisations or regulations: Choose arbitrators with technological skills and use WIPO or other IP-savvy organisations.
4. Confidentiality and award form: To lower the possibility of public policy challenges, draft awards and confidentiality terms that provide the required restricted public exposure (e.g., redacted awards for enforcement).

For **Policymakers**

1. Clarify statutory arbitrability: Laws or authoritative court rulings should outline which intellectual property remedies—particularly those pertaining to patents and register alteration—can or cannot be decided through arbitration.
2. Facilitate collaboration between tribunals and courts: Laws could establish simplified processes for tribunals to submit enquiries to intellectual property offices or for courts to accept technical decisions reached by parties while maintaining public interest review procedures.

Conclusion

Intellectual property (IP), especially copyright and patent rights, is increasingly at the forefront

of international innovation and business strategy due to the quick development of knowledge-driven economies. Conflicts over ownership, infringement, compensation, and exploitation of creative and inventive outputs have increased in tandem with this growth. In the past, the standard procedure for resolving these disputes was litigation. However, court proceedings have become increasingly inadequate due to their adversarial nature, exorbitant expenses, procedural complexity, and protracted deadlines, particularly in industries where creative material and technology are developing at a faster rate than the legal system. In this regard, arbitration and mediation have become essential Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) methods that offer practical means of reaching quick, expert-led, and economically sound results.

The understanding that many disputes primarily include issues of private rights—licensing terms, royalty payments, authorship claims, confidentiality breaches, and contractual obligations—is a fundamental basis for the applicability of alternative dispute resolution (ADR) in intellectual property situations. In this case, mediation has particularly noteworthy benefits. Its cooperative, non-adversarial framework promotes trust and aids participants in maintaining business partnerships that are frequently enduring and advantageous to both parties. Parties maintain total control over the process and outcome since mediation results are freely agreed upon rather than imposed.

This flexibility allows for creative solutions—like structured royalty sharing, cross-licensing agreements, joint ventures, ongoing cooperation, or even future project commitments—that are usually not possible through traditional litigation. Additionally, mediation protects confidentiality, which is important in fields were sensitive technical data, trade secrets, or unpublished creative works may be at issue. It is impossible to overstate the importance of this confidentiality; public litigation records frequently reveal important proprietary information that harms the business interests of both disputing parties.

For intellectual property disputes, arbitration also provides strong advantages, especially where technical or industry-specific knowledge is required. Parties may designate arbitrators with expertise in areas like software engineering, biology, pharmaceuticals, semiconductor design, or entertainment law during arbitration proceedings. A more knowledgeable and context-sensitive decision is ensured by the capacity to select specialists who comprehend intricate scientific or creative procedures. Expert testimony, on the other hand, is necessary, time-consuming, and expensive in court processes since judges may not have enough subject-matter expertise. Arbitration is particularly useful for cross-border disputes, which are becoming more frequent in globalised IP markets, because it usually offers quicker resolution, less procedural formality, and enforceability of verdicts under international instruments like the New York Convention.

However, there are obstacles to ADR's application in intellectual property cases, especially when it comes to patent validity and issues having repercussions for the public interest. Its arbitrability is still disputed because patent validity impacts not only the rights between parties but also the public domain and industry as a whole. Certain nations, such as the United States, allow arbitrators to decide whether a patent is valid, with limited implications for public law. Others, like India, continue to exercise caution and oppose complete acceptance of arbitrability in cases that could impact public registers or monopolies granted by the state. The Indian Supreme Court's precedent in instances such as A. Ayyasamy v. A. Paramasivam highlights the judiciary's unwillingness to allow arbitration in cases involving criminal, public-interest, or in rem components.

Furthermore, arbitral awards that determine validity usually do not directly change the

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

patent registry or bind third parties, in contrast to court rulings. As a result, the legal effect is fragmented, binding solely on arbitration parties and unable to fully resolve a validity question. Although this restriction lessens arbitration's usefulness in certain situations, it does not lessen its worth in disagreements over license conditions, royalties, or contract interpretation, which make up the majority of real-world patent-related disputes.

Similarly, because copyright disputes often concern private business interests and never require public registry revision or affect third-party entitlements, their arbitrability is usually recognised on a global scale. In Eros International v. Telemax, the Bombay High Court upheld arbitration of copyright-related contractual issues, demonstrating how the Indian legal system acknowledges this. Nonetheless, judicial involvement may still be necessary in authorship or ownership disputes involving law interpretation, fraud, or changes to public records.

ADR's flexibility in handling cross-border disputes is one of its main advantages. Copyright and patent conflicts often cross jurisdictions due to the prevalence of international firms, global distribution networks, and transnational licensing. Choice-of-law issues, enforcement difficulties, and procedural differences between national systems make traditional litigation in such matters extremely costly. Arbitration helps get around these obstacles because it is supported by international recognition under the New York Convention. Emerging frameworks like the Singapore Convention on Mediation, which reflect the rising worldwide acceptability of ADR outcomes, also support mediation.

Despite these benefits, there are still a number of structural obstacles. First, parties from different jurisdictions are particularly affected by the lack of consistent criteria governing arbitrability. Second, there can be practical issues because the enforcement of mediated settlements differs widely between nations. Third, although if anonymity is seen as a benefit, it can also obstruct the creation of uniform legal precedent or public guidelines on important intellectual property issues. Lastly, the idea that alternative dispute resolution (ADR) is always less expensive than litigation can occasionally be undermined by high arbitration costs, especially when several experts are engaged. These restrictions point to the need for stronger legal frameworks, unified international standards, and increased institutional backing.

India is an example of a jurisdiction at a turning point. There are still gaps, especially when it comes to statutory clarity on patent arbitrability and procedures for identifying mediated results, despite the courts and legislature's growing support for alternative dispute resolution (ADR) as a way to reduce court pressure and promote commercial certainty. Progress is indicated by the creation of organisations like the Mumbai Centre for International Arbitration and the 2019 revisions to the Arbitration and Conciliation Act. A more precise framework for institutional mediation is provided by the Mediation Act, 2023. When taken as a whole, these improvements show promise. However, more reforms are required to enable ADR to handle IP conflicts effectively, fairly, and in accordance with the public interest, given India's aspirations to become a global leader in innovation.

In the end, a balanced strategy that combines traditional adjudication with mediation and arbitration is necessary for the future of copyright and patent dispute resolution. For business disputes, alternative dispute resolution (ADR) processes provide unmatched benefits, including speed, confidentiality, competence, flexibility, worldwide enforceability, and relationship preservation. In contrast, courts continue to play a crucial role in matters involving precedent-setting, public-interest considerations, and registry-level decisions. Litigation and alternative dispute resolution (ADR) should be viewed as complimentary elements of a complex conflict-resolution ecosystem rather than as opposing entities.

The need for quick, expert-driven solutions will only grow as technology develops more quickly and companies embrace more cooperative business models. Arbitration and mediation are in a unique position to satisfy this need. Their increasing acceptance around the world is proof of a fundamental change in legal culture, which values collaboration over conflict and customised solutions over strict judgement. ADR has the potential to revolutionise the field of copyright and patent dispute settlement, promoting both business interests and the general welfare, if it is properly fostered through strong frameworks, international harmonisation, institutional backing, and judicial acceptance.

Sources & References

I. Statutes & International Instruments

1. Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 (India)
2. Copyright Act, 1957 (India)
3. Patents Act, 1970 (India)
4. UNCITRAL Model Law on International Commercial Arbitration (1985)
5. New York Convention on the Recognition and Enforcement of Foreign Arbitral Awards (1958)
6. United States Patent Act, 35 U.S.C.
7. United States Copyright Act, 17 U.S.C.
8. UK Arbitration Act, 1996
9. UK Patents Act, 1977

II. Case Law

India

1. A. Ayyasamy v. A. Paramasivam & Ors., (2016) 10 SCC 386
2. Eros International Media Ltd. v. Telemax Links India Pvt. Ltd., 2016 SCC OnLine Bom 2172
3. Hero Electric Vehicles Pvt. Ltd. v. Lectro E-Mobility Pvt. Ltd., 2021 SCC OnLine Del 1058
4. Booz Allen & Hamilton Inc. v. SBI Home Finance Ltd., (2011) 5 SCC 532 (In rem vs. in personam distinction)
5. Vidya Drolia v. Durga Trading Corporation, (2021) 2 SCC 1 (Expanded arbitrability principles)

United States

6. Mitsubishi Motors Corp. v. Soler Chrysler-Plymouth, Inc., 473 U.S. 614 (1985) (Support for arbitrability of statutory claims)
7. Publicists v. Writers Guild (US cases on copyright–ADR)

United Kingdom / EU

8. L'Oreal v. eBay (CJEU)
9. Arbitrability discussions under UK Patents system

III. Institutional Rules & Materials

1. WIPO Arbitration Rules – World Intellectual Property Organization (Mediation, Arbitration & Expert Determination)
2. WIPO Mediation Rules
3. WIPO Case Administration Reports
4. International Chamber of Commerce (ICC) Arbitration Rules
5. Singapore International Arbitration Centre (SIAC) Rules
6. LCIA Arbitration Rules
7. American Arbitration Association (AAA) – IP Arbitration Rules

IV. Academic Books & Texts

1. Gary Born, *International Commercial Arbitration*
2. Bernard Hanotiau, *Complex Arbitrations: Multiparty, Multicontract, Multi-issue*
3. Robert Merkin & Johanna Hjalmarsson, *Arbitration Law*

4. Paul Goldstein, *Copyright, Patent, Trademark & Related State Doctrines*
5. Bainbridge, *Intellectual Property*

V. Articles / Treatises / Commentaries

1. WIPO — "Arbitration and Mediation of IP Disputes"
2. R. Dreyfuss & G. Ginsburg — scholarship on patent arbitrability
3. Thomas Wälde — ADR in IP and technology sector
4. Global Arbitration Review (GAR) — IP arbitration developments
5. Journal of Intellectual Property Law & Practice
6. Journal of World Intellectual Property
7. Harvard Journal of Law & Technology
8. Stanford Technology Law Review
9. "Arbitral resolution of patent validity disputes" – academic commentary
10. "Mediation in IP disputes — WIPO case notes"

VI. Online / Policy Sources

1. WIPO website — ADR Section https://www.wipo.int/amc
2. UNCITRAL website — Model Law resources
3. New York Convention Guide
4. USPTO — Procedures for reporting arbitration decisions on patent validity
5. UK IPO — Guidelines on ADR in Patent Disputes