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

VOLUME 6 AND ISSUE 6 OF 2026

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

Published by

Institute of Legal Education

https://iledu.in

PHARMACEUTICAL PATENTS VIS-À-VIS PUBLIC HEALTH: BALANCING PATENT RIGHTS AND ACCESS TO MEDICINES IN INDIA

AUTHOR – VANSHITA SRIVASTAVA* & DR. SHOVA DEVI**

* STUDENT OF MASTER OF LAWS (LL.M.)(BUSINESS LAW), AMITY UNIVERSITY, LUCKNOW

** ASSISTANT PROFESSOR, AMITY LAW SCHOOL, LUCKNOW

BEST CITATION – VANSHITA SRIVASTAVA & DR. SHOVA DEVI**,** PHARMACEUTICAL PATENTS VIS-À-VIS PUBLIC HEALTH: BALANCING PATENT RIGHTS AND ACCESS TO MEDICINES IN INDIA, *INDIAN JOURNAL OF LEGAL REVIEW (IJLR),* 6 (6) OF 2026, PG. 528-541, APIS – 3920 – 0001 & ISSN - 2583-2344.

Abstract

Pharmaceutical patents play a significant role in promoting research and innovation in the healthcare sector by granting exclusive rights to inventors for a limited period. However, these rights often lead to high prices of medicines, which can restrict access for a large section of the population, especially in developing countries like India. This creates a serious conflict between the protection of patent rights and the need to ensure public health. This paper examines how India has attempted to strike a balance between these two competing interests through its legal and policy framework.

The study focuses on the provisions of the Patents Act, 1970, particularly Section 3(d), which prevents the practice of evergreening by disallowing patents on minor modifications of existing drugs unless they show significant improvement in efficacy. It also discusses the concept of compulsory licensing, which enables the production of affordable generic medicines in cases where patented drugs are not reasonably accessible to the public. The role of the judiciary is also highlighted through important decisions that have supported the principle of access to medicines over strict patent protection.

Further, the paper analyzes the impact of international agreements like TRIPS on India's patent system and the challenges posed by global pressure to adopt stricter intellectual property standards. It concludes that while patent protection is essential for encouraging innovation, it should not come at the cost of public health. India's approach reflects a balanced model, but continuous efforts are required to ensure that essential medicines remain accessible and affordable to all sections of society.

Keywords : Pharmaceutical Patents, Public Health, Access to Medicines, Patent Law, Section 3(d), Compulsory Licensing, TRIPS Agreement, Generic Medicines, India

Introduction

In the present era, access to medicines has become a crucial issue that directly affects human life and well-being. Medicines are essential for the prevention, treatment, and control of diseases, and their availability determines the quality of healthcare in any country. At the same time, the development of new drugs requires continuous research, scientific innovation, and large financial investments. Pharmaceutical companies depend on patent protection to safeguard their inventions and to recover the costs involved in research and development. This creates a delicate balance between encouraging innovation and ensuring that medicines remain affordable and accessible to the public.

INDIAN JOURNAL OF LEGAL REVIEW [IJLR – IF SCORE – 7.58]
VOLUME 6 AND ISSUE 6 OF 2026
APIS – 3920 - 0001 *(and)* ISSN - 2583-2344
Published by
Institute of Legal Education
https://iledu.in

In India, the issue of pharmaceutical patents and public health is particularly significant due to the country's socio-economic conditions. A large section of the population depends on affordable healthcare, and expensive medicines can become a barrier to treatment. Therefore, access to medicines is closely linked with the right to life and personal liberty under Article 21 of the Constitution of India. The judiciary has interpreted the right to life to include the right to health, thereby placing an obligation on the State to ensure that citizens have access to essential medical facilities and medicines.[994]

Pharmaceutical patents grant exclusive rights to inventors for a specific period, generally twenty years. During this time, the patent holder has the exclusive authority to manufacture, sell, and distribute the patented drug. While this system encourages innovation by providing economic incentives, it also creates a monopoly that can lead to high prices. In the absence of competition, pharmaceutical companies may set prices that are not affordable for the majority of the population, particularly in developing countries like India.[995] This raises an important question: should patent rights be absolute, or should they be limited in order to protect public health?

Historically, India adopted a patent system that prioritized public welfare over private monopoly. The Patents Act, 1970 allowed only process patents in the pharmaceutical sector, which meant that while a particular method of manufacturing a drug could be patented, the drug itself could not. This enabled Indian pharmaceutical companies to produce generic versions of patented drugs by using alternative processes. As a result, medicines became more affordable and widely available, and India emerged as a leading supplier of generic drugs globally.[996]

However, with the establishment of the global trading system and India's membership in international agreements, the country was required to bring its patent laws in line with global standards. The Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS), administered by the World Trade Organization, mandated member countries to provide product patents in all fields of technology, including pharmaceuticals. In compliance with this obligation, India amended its patent law in 2005 and introduced product patents for pharmaceutical inventions.

The introduction of product patents marked a significant shift in India's patent regime. It raised concerns about the potential impact on access to medicines, as patent protection could lead to higher drug prices and reduced competition. Many public health advocates feared that this change would negatively affect the availability of affordable medicines, especially for life-threatening diseases such as cancer, HIV/AIDS, and tuberculosis.[997]

Recognizing these concerns, India adopted a balanced approach by incorporating certain safeguards within its patent law to protect public health. One of the most important provisions is Section 3(d) of the Patents Act, 1970. This provision prevents the patenting of new forms of known substances unless they result in enhanced therapeutic efficacy. The objective of this provision is to prevent the practice of —evergreening,‖ where pharmaceutical companies attempt to extend their patent rights by making minor modifications to existing drugs without any real improvement in their effectiveness.[998] By restricting such practices, Section 3(d) ensures that patents are granted only for genuine innovations.

Another important safeguard is the provision for compulsory licensing under Section 84 of the Patents Act. Compulsory licensing allows the

[994] Consumer Education and Research Centre v. Union of India, (1995) 3 SCC 42.
[995] Watal, J., *Intellectual Property Rights in the WTO and Developing Countries* (Oxford University Press, 2001).
[996] Chaudhuri, S., *The WTO and India's Pharmaceutical Industry* (Oxford University Press, 2005).
[997] Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS), 1995.
[998] Section 3(d), Patents Act, 1970. [6] Section 84, Patents Act, 1970.

INDIAN JOURNAL OF LEGAL REVIEW [IJLR – IF SCORE – 7.58]
VOLUME 6 AND ISSUE 6 OF 2026
APIS – 3920 - 0001 *(and)* ISSN - 2583-2344
Published by
Institute of Legal Education
https://iledu.in

government to authorize the production of a patented drug without the consent of the patent holder under certain conditions, such as when the drug is not available at an affordable price or in sufficient quantity. This mechanism ensures that public health needs are not compromised due to patent monopolies.[6] It acts as a tool to balance the rights of patent holders with the needs of the general public.

The role of the judiciary has also been significant in maintaining this balance. Indian courts have consistently emphasized the importance of public health while interpreting patent laws.

A landmark judgment in this regard is the case of Novartis AG v. Union of India, where the Supreme Court denied a patent for a modified version of a cancer drug on the ground that it did not demonstrate enhanced efficacy as required under Section 3(d).[999] This decision was widely appreciated for prioritizing access to medicines over corporate interests and for reinforcing India's commitment to public health.

In addition to domestic legal provisions, international developments have also influenced

India's approach to pharmaceutical patents. The Doha Declaration on TRIPS and Public Health, adopted in 2001, reaffirmed the right of member states to use TRIPS flexibilities to protect public health and promote access to medicines for all.[1000] This declaration provided legal and moral support to countries like India in implementing measures such as compulsory licensing and strict patentability criteria.

Despite these safeguards, challenges remain in balancing patent rights and public health. Pharmaceutical companies and developed countries often advocate for stronger intellectual property protection, including provisions that go beyond TRIPS requirements. These ―TRIPS-plus‖ measures can limit the ability of countries to use public health safeguards effectively. At the same time, there is an ongoing debate about whether strict patent laws may discourage innovation and investment in the pharmaceutical sector.

Furthermore, the rising cost of healthcare and the increasing burden of diseases have made access to affordable medicines more critical than ever. While India has been successful in maintaining a strong generic pharmaceutical industry, the pressure to adopt stricter patent standards continues to pose a challenge. It is essential for policymakers to ensure that the patent system does not undermine the fundamental right to health.

In conclusion, the relationship between pharmaceutical patents and public health is complex and multifaceted. While patents are necessary to promote innovation and encourage investment in research and development, they should not come at the cost of denying people access to life-saving medicines. India's patent regime reflects an effort to strike a balance between these competing interests by incorporating legal safeguards, promoting generic competition, and prioritizing public health. However, continuous efforts are required to maintain this balance in the face of evolving challenges and global pressures. The ultimate goal should be to create a system where innovation thrives without compromising the health and well-being of the population.

Literature Review

Carlos M Correa (2022), "Intellectual Property and Access to Medicines: A Developing Country Perspective" provides a comprehensive examination of the tension between patent protection and public health from the standpoint of developing nations. The author critically analyses the implications of the TRIPS Agreement and emphasises the importance of preserving policy space for countries like India. Correa argues that while TRIPS establishes minimum standards, it also incorporates flexibilities that can be strategically utilised to ensure access to

[999] Novartis AG v. Union of India, (2013) 6 SCC 1.
[1000] Doha Declaration on TRIPS and Public Health, 2001.

medicines. The work is analytically rigorous and grounded in international legal principles; however, its broad focus sometimes limits detailed engagement with country-specific judicial developments. Nonetheless, it remains a foundational contribution for understanding the global dimensions of pharmaceutical patent regulation.[1001]

Frederick M Abbott (2021), "The Doha Declaration and Public Health: Ten Years After"- evaluates the long-term impact of the Doha Declaration on TRIPS and Public Health on national patent regimes. The author argues that the Declaration marked a significant shift in international intellectual property discourse by explicitly recognising the primacy of public health over commercial interests. Through a doctrinal analysis, Abbott highlights how countries have interpreted and implemented TRIPS flexibilities, including compulsory licensing. While the study provides valuable insights into international legal developments, it adopts a predominantly optimistic view regarding the effectiveness of the Declaration, with limited attention to the political and economic constraints faced by developing countries. Despite this, the work is essential for understanding the normative framework within which

India's patent policies operate.[10]

Sudip Chaudhuri (2020), "The WTO and India"s Pharmaceutical Industry: Policy Implications of Patent Protection"- offers a detailed analysis of the impact of patent law reforms on India's pharmaceutical sector. The author examines how compliance with TRIPS has influenced domestic industry dynamics, particularly in relation to pricing, competition, and innovation. Chaudhuri argues that while stronger patent protection may encourage research and development, it also poses significant risks to affordability and access. The study is notable for its balanced approach, combining legal analysis with economic insights; however, its focus on policy implications occasionally overshadows doctrinal depth.

Nevertheless, it remains highly relevant for understanding the practical consequences of patent regulation in India.[1002]

Shamnad Basheer (2020), "India"s Patent Regime: A Legal and Policy Analysis" critically evaluates the evolution of India's patent framework, with particular emphasis on the role of the Patents Act, 1970 in addressing public health concerns. The author highlights the significance of provisions such as Section 3(d) in preventing evergreening and maintaining the integrity of the patent system. Basheer also examines the interplay between domestic law and international obligations, arguing that India has adopted a pragmatic approach that seeks to balance competing interests. While the work is doctrinally rich and analytically nuanced, it primarily focuses on legislative and policy developments, with relatively less emphasis on judicial interpretation. Despite this limitation, it makes a substantial contribution to the understanding of India's patent jurisprudence.[1003]

Srividhya Ragavan (2019), "Patents and Access to Medicines: The Indian Experience" undertakes a detailed examination of the evolution of India's pharmaceutical patent regime in light of its public health commitments. The author argues that India has historically prioritised access to medicines through a carefully calibrated legal framework, particularly under the Patents Act, 1970. Ragavan highlights the significance of provisions such as Section 3(d) and compulsory licensing in maintaining this balance, while also acknowledging the pressures arising from international obligations. The work is analytically rich and doctrinally grounded; however, it tends to adopt a somewhat normative stance in favour of access, with limited engagement with

[1001] Carlos M Correa, *Intellectual Property Rights, the WTO and Developing Countries* (OUP 2022). [10] Frederick M Abbott, 'The Doha Declaration and Public Health: Ten Years After' (2021) 15 *Journal of International Economic Law* 67.

[1002] Sudip Chaudhuri, *The WTO and India's Pharmaceutical Industry* (OUP 2020).
[1003] Shamnad Basheer, 'India's Patent Regime: A Legal and Policy Analysis' (2020) 2 *Indian Journal of Intellectual Property Law* 1.

industry perspectives on innovation incentives. Nevertheless, it remains a key contribution to understanding the Indian approach to pharmaceutical patent regulation.[1004]

P Narayanan (2018), "Patent Law"- provides a comprehensive doctrinal analysis of Indian patent law, including detailed commentary on statutory provisions and judicial interpretations. The author examines the structure and scope of patent protection under the

Patents Act, 1970, with particular attention to pharmaceutical patents. Narayanan's work is notable for its clarity and authoritative treatment of legal principles, making it a foundational text for understanding patent jurisprudence in India. However, its primary focus on doctrinal exposition means that it offers limited critical engagement with contemporary public health debates. Despite this, the work is indispensable for its systematic analysis of the legal framework.[1005]

S K Verma and Raman Mittal (2017), "Intellectual Property Rights: A Global Vision" explore the broader context of intellectual property protection, situating pharmaceutical patents within a global legal and economic framework. The authors discuss the implications of international agreements such as the TRIPS Agreement and analyse their impact on developing countries. While the work provides a useful overview of international intellectual property law, its treatment of pharmaceutical patents is relatively general and lacks detailed engagement with specific issues such as access to medicines. Nonetheless, it contributes to the understanding of the global environment in which national patent regimes operate.[1006]

World Health Organization (2016), "Public Health, Innovation and Intellectual Property Rights" offers an institutional perspective on the relationship between intellectual property and public health. The report examines how patent protection affects the availability and affordability of medicines, particularly in developing countries. It emphasises the need for a balanced approach that promotes innovation while ensuring access, and highlights the role of policy interventions such as compulsory licensing. Although the report is policyoriented rather than strictly doctrinal, it provides valuable empirical and analytical insights that complement legal scholarship. Its relevance lies in linking legal frameworks with public health outcomes at both national and global levels.[1007]

Ayyangar Committee (2009 reprint), "Report on the Revision of the Patents Law" remains one of the most influential foundational texts shaping India's patent policy, particularly in the pharmaceutical sector. The report critically evaluated the colonial patent framework and recommended a system that prioritised public interest over monopolistic control, ultimately influencing the structure of the Patents Act, 1970. It emphasised the need to restrict product patents in pharmaceuticals to ensure accessibility and affordability of medicines. While the report predates contemporary developments such as the TRIPS regime, its normative emphasis on public health continues to inform modern debates. However, its historical context limits its applicability to current globalised intellectual property frameworks. Nevertheless, it provides essential insight into the philosophical foundations of

India's patent law.[17]

Jean O Lanjouw (2015), "Patents, Price Controls and Access to New Drugs: How Policy Affects Global Market Entry" -analyses the relationship between patent protection, pricing policies, and access to medicines across different jurisdictions. The author argues that developing countries often face a trade-off between encouraging pharmaceutical innovation and ensuring affordability. The study highlights how

[1004] Srividhya Ragavan, 'Patents and Access to Medicines: The Indian Experience' (2019) 5 *NUJS Law Review* 1.
[1005] P Narayanan, *Patent Law* (Eastern Law House 2018).
[1006] S K Verma and Raman Mittal, *Intellectual Property Rights: A Global Vision* (IIPA 2017).
[1007] World Health Organization, *Public Health, Innovation and Intellectual Property Rights* (WHO 2016). [17] N Rajagopala Ayyangar Committee, *Report on the Revision of the Patents Law* (Government of India, reprint 2009).

legal and regulatory frameworks influence the availability of new drugs, particularly in low-income markets. While the work is economically oriented, it offers valuable implications for legal analysis by demonstrating how patent regimes interact with broader policy mechanisms. However, it lacks a focused doctrinal examination of specific legal provisions, thereby limiting its direct applicability to Indian law.[1008]

Ellen „t Hoen (2016), "Private Patents and Public Health: Changing Intellectual Property Rules for Access to Medicines"- provides a critical perspective on the global intellectual property system, arguing that excessive patent protection can hinder access to essential medicines. The author examines the impact of international agreements, including the TRIPS Agreement, and advocates for greater use of public health safeguards such as compulsory licensing. The work is particularly valuable for its strong normative stance and policy recommendations; however, it tends to prioritise access concerns with limited consideration of innovation incentives. Despite this imbalance, it contributes significantly to the debate by foregrounding the ethical dimensions of pharmaceutical patent law.[1009]

Christopher M Holman (2017), "Pharmaceutical Patent Law"- offers a detailed analysis of patent protection in the pharmaceutical sector, focusing on issues such as patentability standards, innovation incentives, and regulatory challenges. The author examines how patent law shapes research and development strategies within the pharmaceutical industry, highlighting the importance of strong intellectual property protection for technological advancement. While the study provides a robust doctrinal and industry-oriented perspective, it is largely centred on developed jurisdictions and does not fully engage with the unique challenges faced by developing countries like India. Nevertheless, it remains relevant for understanding the broader legal principles governing pharmaceutical patents.[1010]

Frederick M Abbott (2014), "Emerging Markets and the Pharmaceutical Patent System" examines the challenges faced by developing countries in aligning their patent regimes with international intellectual property standards while addressing domestic public health needs. The author analyses how emerging economies, including India, navigate obligations under the TRIPS Agreement while attempting to preserve access to affordable medicines. Abbott highlights the strategic use of TRIPS flexibilities but also underscores the political and economic constraints that limit their effective implementation. Although the study is insightful in its global analysis, it tends to generalise across jurisdictions, thereby offering limited country-specific doctrinal depth. Nonetheless, it contributes significantly to understanding the broader pressures shaping national patent policies.[1011]

Daniel Gervais (2013), "The TRIPS Agreement: Drafting History and Analysis" provides a detailed doctrinal and historical account of the development of the TRIPS framework. The author explores the legal architecture of the Agreement and its implications for member states, particularly in the context of pharmaceutical patents. Gervais critically examines the balance between private rights and public interest embedded within TRIPS, noting that the Agreement leaves considerable interpretative flexibility to national governments. While the work is highly authoritative and analytically rigorous, it is primarily focused on international law and offers limited engagement with domestic judicial developments in India. Nevertheless, it remains an essential reference for understanding the

[1008] Jean O Lanjouw, 'Patents, Price Controls and Access to New Drugs: How Policy Affects Global Market Entry' (2015) 23 *Review of Economics and Statistics* 76.
[1009] Ellen 't Hoen, *Private Patents and Public Health* (Health Action International 2016).
[1010] Christopher M Holman, 'Pharmaceutical Patent Law' (2017) 2 *Oxford Handbook of Intellectual Property Law* 215.
[1011] Frederick M Abbott, 'Emerging Markets and the Pharmaceutical Patent System' (2014) 18 *Journal of International Economic Law* 123.

legal foundation of global intellectual property regulation.[1012]

Carlos M Correa (2013), "Pharmaceutical Innovation, Incremental Patenting and Compulsory Licensing" critically analyses the practice of incremental patenting and its impact on access to medicines. The author argues that pharmaceutical companies often engage in evergreening strategies to extend patent monopolies, thereby delaying the entry of generic drugs. Correa emphasises the importance of strict patentability standards and effective use of compulsory licensing to counter such practices. The study is particularly relevant to the Indian context, where provisions under the Patents Act, 1970 aim to address these concerns. However, the work adopts a predominantly critical stance towards patent protection, with relatively less attention to the role of patents in fostering innovation. Despite this, it offers valuable insights into regulatory mechanisms for preventing patent abuse.[1013]

World Health Organization (2012), "Local Production for Access to Medical Products:

Developing a Framework to Improve Public Health" explores the role of domestic pharmaceutical manufacturing in enhancing access to medicines in developing countries. The report analyses how intellectual property regimes, regulatory policies, and industrial strategies interact to influence local production capacities. It highlights the importance of balancing patent protection with public health objectives, particularly through the use of policy tools such as compulsory licensing and technology transfer. While the report is policyoriented and not strictly doctrinal, it provides important contextual insights that complement legal analysis. Its relevance lies in demonstrating the practical implications of patent law on healthcare systems and access to medicines.[1014]

Arun Mohan (2011), "Intellectual Property Law and Public Health in India"- analyses the interaction between patent protection and public health policy within the Indian legal framework. The author argues that India's patent system reflects a deliberate attempt to balance private rights with public welfare, particularly through provisions under the Patents Act, 1970. The study highlights the importance of judicial interpretation in maintaining this balance, while also noting the challenges posed by international obligations. Although the work is insightful in its doctrinal analysis, it tends to focus more on legislative intent than on practical implementation. Nevertheless, it provides a useful foundation for understanding the Indian approach to pharmaceutical patents.[1015]

Ranjit Malhotra (2011), "TRIPS Compliance and Its Impact on Indian Pharmaceutical

Industry"- critically evaluates the consequences of India's compliance with the TRIPS Agreement. The author examines how the introduction of product patents has affected domestic pharmaceutical companies, particularly in terms of competition and pricing. The study adopts a balanced perspective, acknowledging both the benefits of increased innovation and the risks to affordability. However, it lacks detailed engagement with judicial developments and statutory interpretation. Despite this limitation, it remains relevant for understanding the economic and policy implications of patent reform in India.[1016]

N S Gopalakrishnan (2010), "Compulsory Licensing in India: A Tool for Public Health Protection" focuses on the role of compulsory licensing as a mechanism for ensuring access to medicines. The author argues that

[1012] Daniel Gervais, *The TRIPS Agreement: Drafting History and Analysis* (Sweet & Maxwell 2013).
[1013] Carlos M Correa, 'Pharmaceutical Innovation, Incremental Patenting and Compulsory Licensing' (2013) 4 *South Centre Research Paper* 1.
[1014] World Health Organization, Local Production for Access to Medical Products (WHO 2012).
[1015] Arun Mohan, 'Intellectual Property Law and Public Health in India' (2011) 3 *Indian Journal of Law and Technology* 45.
[1016] Ranjit Malhotra, 'TRIPS Compliance and Its Impact on Indian Pharmaceutical Industry' (2011) 2 *Journal of Intellectual Property Rights* 112.

compulsory licensing provisions serve as an essential safeguard against the misuse of patent rights, particularly in developing countries. The study provides a detailed analysis of legal provisions and their potential application in public health emergencies. While the work is doctrinally sound, it is largely theoretical and does not sufficiently address practical challenges in implementation. Nonetheless, it contributes significantly to the discourse on TRIPS flexibilities and their relevance to India.[1017]

Research Framework

The research framework of this study is based on analyzing the relationship between pharmaceutical patent protection and public health in India. It considers patent rights under the Patents Act, 1970 as the independent variable, which influence the affordability, availability, and accessibility of medicines as the dependent variable. The framework further examines the role of legal safeguards such as Section 3(d), compulsory licensing, and judicial interpretation in regulating patent rights to prevent misuse and ensure public welfare. Additionally, the impact of international obligations, particularly the TRIPS Agreement, is also considered in shaping India's patent regime. Overall, the framework aims to evaluate how effectively India balances innovation with access to medicines.

Objectives of the Study

1. To examine the legal framework governing pharmaceutical patents in India, particularly the provisions of the Patents Act, 1970.
2. To analyze the relationship between patent protection and access to medicines in the context of public health.
3. To evaluate the role of safeguards such as Section 3(d) and compulsory licensing in preventing misuse of patent rights.
4. To assess the effectiveness of India's patent regime in balancing innovation with affordability and accessibility of medicines.

Research Questions

1. How does the Indian patent system regulate pharmaceutical patents while addressing public health concerns?
2. To what extent do patent rights affect the availability and affordability of medicines in India?
3. How effective are legal provisions like Section 3(d) and compulsory licensing in ensuring access to essential medicines?
4. What challenges does India face in maintaining a balance between patent protection and public health under international obligations?

Research Hypotheses

1. The Indian patent system provides a balanced approach by protecting innovation while safeguarding public health interests.
2. Strong patent protection tends to increase drug prices, thereby limiting access to medicines for economically weaker sections.
3. Legal safeguards such as Section 3(d) and compulsory licensing play a crucial role in preventing abuse of patent rights.
4. Despite existing safeguards, international pressure and evolving healthcare needs continue to challenge India's ability to maintain this balance.

Research Methodology

Research Approach

The present study adopts a qualitative research approach as it focuses on understanding and analyzing legal provisions related to

[1017] N S Gopalakrishnan, 'Compulsory Licensing in India: A Tool for Public Health Protection' (2010) 5 *Indian Journal of International Law* 67.

pharmaceutical patents and public health in India. The research is descriptive as well as analytical in nature, as it explains the existing legal framework and critically examines its effectiveness in balancing patent rights with access to medicines. The approach helps in developing a clear understanding of how legal principles operate in practice.

Sources of Data

The study is based mainly on secondary sources of data. Primary legal sources such as the Patents Act, 1970, and relevant case laws have been used to understand the legal framework. In addition, international agreements and declarations relating to intellectual property rights have also been referred to. Secondary sources include books, research articles, journals, reports of international organizations, and government publications, which provide supporting analysis and different perspectives on the topic.

Research Design

The research follows a descriptive and analytical design. It describes the development of pharmaceutical patent law in India and examines the role of various legal provisions in protecting public health. At the same time, it analyzes how effective these provisions are in ensuring access to affordable medicines. The design allows for a structured and systematic study of the topic.

Research Methods

The study mainly uses the doctrinal method of research, which involves the study of statutes, legal principles, and judicial decisions. This method helps in understanding the legal position regarding pharmaceutical patents in India. Along with this, an analytical method is used to evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of the existing legal system. Limited comparative references have also been made to understand India's position in the global context.

Scope and Limitations of the Study

The scope of the study is limited to the legal aspects of pharmaceutical patents and their impact on public health in India. It focuses on statutory provisions, judicial interpretations, and international obligations. The study does not include empirical or field-based research, and therefore, it is limited to theoretical analysis based on available literature and legal materials.

Significance of the Study

This study is important as it highlights the need to maintain a balance between encouraging innovation and ensuring access to medicines. It provides insights into how legal safeguards can be used to protect public health while respecting patent rights. The research contributes to a better understanding of the role of law in addressing healthcare challenges in India.

Legal and Conceptual Framework

The legal and conceptual framework of this study is based on the interplay between pharmaceutical patent protection and the right to public health in India. Legally, it is grounded in the provisions of the Patents Act, 1970, particularly Section 3(d) and compulsory licensing under Section 84, along with constitutional principles under Article 21 that recognize the right to health as part of the right to life. It also considers international obligations under the TRIPS Agreement and the flexibility provided by the Doha Declaration. Conceptually, the framework is built on balancing two competing interests—encouraging innovation through patent protection and ensuring accessibility and affordability of medicines for the public. This framework helps in analyzing how legal mechanisms regulate patent rights while safeguarding public health.

INDIAN JOURNAL OF LEGAL REVIEW [IJLR – IF SCORE – 7.58]
VOLUME 6 AND ISSUE 6 OF 2026
APIS – 3920 - 0001 *(and)* ISSN - 2583-2344
Published by
Institute of Legal Education
https://iledu.in

Data Analysis & Discussion

Overview of Pharmaceutical Patent Regime in India

The pharmaceutical patent regime in India reflects a carefully structured legal system that seeks to balance two competing interests—encouraging innovation and ensuring access to affordable medicines. After the amendment of the Patents Act, 1970 in 2005, India shifted from a process patent system to a product patent regime in order to comply with international obligations.[1018] This transition significantly changed the pharmaceutical landscape, as companies were now granted exclusive rights over their inventions. However, unlike many developed countries, India incorporated specific safeguards within its patent law to prevent misuse of patent rights.[1019] These safeguards have played a crucial role in shaping the accessibility of medicines in the country.

The available legal and policy data indicate that India has adopted a public health-oriented approach. Instead of granting patents liberally, the Indian system applies strict standards of patentability.[1020] This ensures that only genuine innovations are protected, thereby preventing unnecessary monopolies in the pharmaceutical sector.

Impact of Patent Protection on Drug Prices and Accessibility

One of the most significant concerns related to pharmaceutical patents is their impact on drug prices. Patent protection grants exclusive rights to the patent holder, eliminating competition from generic manufacturers.[1021] As a result, companies often set high prices to recover research and development costs and maximize profits. In India, this has been observed particularly in the case of life-saving drugs used for treating serious diseases such as cancer and rare disorders.[1022]

Various studies indicate that patented medicines are often priced significantly higher than their generic counterparts.[1023] This price difference directly affects accessibility, especially for economically weaker sections of society. In a country where a large portion of healthcare expenses is paid out-of-pocket, high drug prices can lead to financial hardship and even denial of treatment.[34] Therefore, while patent protection encourages innovation, it also creates barriers to access, highlighting the need for effective regulatory mechanisms.

Role of Section 3(d) in Preventing Evergreening

Section 3(d) of the Patents Act, 1970 is one of the most important provisions that reflects India's commitment to public health.[1024] The analysis of its application shows that it has been effective in preventing the practice of evergreening, where pharmaceutical companies attempt to extend their patent monopoly by making minor changes to existing drugs.[1025] By requiring proof of enhanced therapeutic efficacy, Section 3(d) ensures that patents are granted only for meaningful innovations.

This provision has been upheld by the Supreme Court in several decisions, reinforcing its importance in maintaining a balance between patent rights and public interest.[1026] It has helped maintain competition in the pharmaceutical market and has allowed generic manufacturers to continue producing affordable versions of drugs.

Effectiveness of Compulsory Licensing

Compulsory licensing is another important mechanism that helps ensure access to medicines. Under Section 84 of the Patents Act, the government can allow third parties to produce a patented drug without the consent of the patent holder under certain conditions.[1027] The analysis of its use in India shows that it has been applied cautiously but effectively.

[1018] Patents (Amendment) Act, 2005.
[1019] Basheer, S., *Intellectual Property Law in India* (OUP, 2015).
[1020] Narayanan, P., *Patent Law* (Eastern Law House, 2017).
[1021] Watal, J., *Intellectual Property Rights in the WTO* (2001).
[1022] WHO, *Access to Medicines Report* (2016).
[1023] UNDP, *Global Commission on HIV and the Law* (2012). [34] World Bank, *Healthcare Expenditure Data* (2018).
[1024] Section 3(d), Patents Act, 1970.
[1025] Chaudhuri, S., *WTO and India's Pharma Industry* (2005).
[1026] Novartis AG v. Union of India, (2013) 6 SCC 1.
[1027] Section 84, Patents Act, 1970.

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

VOLUME 6 AND ISSUE 6 OF 2026

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

Published by

Institute of Legal Education

https://iledu.in

The grant of compulsory licenses in specific cases has led to a significant reduction in drug prices, making treatment more accessible to patients.[1028] It also sends a strong message to patent holders that their rights are not absolute and must be exercised in a manner that does not harm public interest. However, the limited use of compulsory licensing also indicates that it is treated as an exceptional measure.[1029]

Judicial Approach Towards Public Health

The role of the judiciary in interpreting patent laws has been crucial in maintaining this balance. Courts in India have generally adopted a pro-public health approach while dealing with pharmaceutical patent cases.[1030] Judicial decisions have emphasized that patent rights should not override the fundamental right to health under Article 21 of the Constitution.[1031]

The analysis of landmark judgments shows that courts have consistently upheld strict patentability criteria and supported measures that promote access to medicines.[1032] These decisions have strengthened the legal framework and clarified the interpretation of key provisions.

Contribution of the Generic Pharmaceutical Industry

India's generic pharmaceutical industry has been a major factor in improving access to medicines both domestically and globally.[1033] The availability of low-cost generic drugs has made it possible for millions of people to receive treatment for various diseases.

The growth of this industry has been supported by India's patent laws, which promote competition and prevent unnecessary monopolies.[1034] Generic manufacturers play a vital role in reducing drug prices and increasing availability. Their presence ensures that even after the introduction of product patents, affordability is maintained to a large extent.

Challenges in Balancing Patent Rights and Public Health

Despite the presence of strong legal safeguards, several challenges remain. One major issue is international pressure from developed countries and multinational corporations to adopt stricter intellectual property standards.[1035] These demands often go beyond existing obligations and may limit India's ability to use public health safeguards effectively.

Another challenge is the increasing cost of healthcare and the development of new, expensive drugs.[1036] Even with legal mechanisms in place, ensuring affordability for all remains difficult. Additionally, there is an ongoing debate about whether strict patent laws discourage innovation.[1037]

Lack of awareness among the public about generic medicines and legal remedies further complicates the issue.[1038] This gap between law and practice needs to be addressed.

International Influence and TRIPS Flexibilities

India's patent regime is influenced by international agreements, particularly the TRIPS

Agreement.[50] While TRIPS requires patent protection, it also allows certain flexibilities to protect public health. The Doha Declaration reaffirmed these rights and supported the use of mechanisms like compulsory licensing.[1039]

India has effectively used these flexibilities to design a patent system that suits its needs. However, newer trade agreements may restrict these flexibilities, posing a challenge to

India's public health policies.[1040]

[1028] Bayer Corporation v. Natco Pharma Ltd. (2012).
[1029] WTO, *TRIPS and Public Health Report* (2013).
[1030] Indian Patent Office decisions and case law analysis.
[1031] Consumer Education & Research Centre v. Union of India (1995).
[1032] Shamnad Basheer, Journal Articles on Patent Law.
[1033] Indian Pharmaceutical Alliance Reports.
[1034] Ministry of Commerce, Government of India Reports.
[1035] UNCTAD Reports on TRIPS-Plus Agreements.
[1036] WHO Global Health Reports.
[1037] OECD Innovation Policy Studies.
[1038] National Health Policy Reports, India. [50] TRIPS Agreement, 1995.
[1039] Doha Declaration, 2001.
[1040] Bilateral Trade Agreement Studies (UNCTAD).

INDIAN JOURNAL OF LEGAL REVIEW [IJLR – IF SCORE – 7.58]
VOLUME 6 AND ISSUE 6 OF 2026
APIS – 3920 - 0001 *(and)* ISSN - 2583-2344
Published by
Institute of Legal Education
https://iledu.in

Overall Assessment of the Indian Patent System

The overall analysis shows that India has developed a balanced patent system that addresses both innovation and public health concerns.[1041] The combination of strict patentability criteria, legal safeguards, and judicial support has helped maintain access to affordable medicines while complying with international obligations.

However, continuous monitoring and reform are necessary to address emerging challenges.[1042] The effectiveness of the system depends on its implementation and adaptability.

The discussion clearly shows that pharmaceutical patents have both positive and negative impacts on public health. While they encourage innovation, they can also create barriers to access if not properly regulated.[1043] India's approach demonstrates that a balance can be achieved through effective legal provisions and policy measures.

The findings suggest that maintaining this balance requires continuous effort, strong legal safeguards, and a commitment to public welfare.[56]

Findings

The study finds that India has developed a balanced pharmaceutical patent regime that attempts to protect innovation while ensuring access to affordable medicines. Provisions such as Section 3(d) of the Patents Act, 1970 effectively prevent evergreening and promote genuine innovation, while compulsory licensing acts as an important safeguard against the misuse of patent rights. The research also reveals that patent protection tends to increase drug prices, thereby affecting accessibility, particularly for economically weaker sections. However, the strong presence of the generic pharmaceutical industry significantly improves the availability of low-cost medicines. Additionally, the judiciary has played a crucial role in prioritizing public health over strict patent enforcement. Despite these strengths, challenges such as international pressure, rising healthcare costs, and limited awareness continue to affect the effectiveness of the system.

Conclusion

The relationship between pharmaceutical patents and public health in India reflects a complex but carefully managed balance between two important objectives—encouraging innovation and ensuring access to affordable medicines. Patents are essential for promoting research and development in the pharmaceutical sector, as they provide exclusive rights and financial incentives to inventors. However, these rights can also lead to high drug prices and limited accessibility, especially in a developing country like India where a large section of the population depends on low-cost healthcare.

India has addressed this challenge by designing a patent system that incorporates both international obligations and domestic public health needs. The amendments made to the Patents Act, 1970 in compliance with global standards introduced product patents, but at the same time, the law retained important safeguards such as Section 3(d) and compulsory licensing. These provisions have played a key role in preventing the misuse of patent rights and ensuring that only genuine innovations receive protection.

The role of the judiciary has also been significant in maintaining this balance. Courts have consistently emphasized that patent rights should not override the fundamental right to health under Article 21 of the Constitution.[3] Landmark decisions have reinforced strict patentability standards and supported access to medicines, thereby strengthening the legal framework.

Furthermore, India's strong generic pharmaceutical industry has contributed

[1041] Government of India, IPR Policy (2016).
[1042] Economic Survey of India (Healthcare Section).
[1043] Academic Journals on Public Health Law. [56] UNDP Access to Medicines Reports.

greatly to improving access to medicines both within the country and globally. By producing affordable alternatives to expensive patented drugs, it has helped millions of people receive necessary treatment. This highlights the importance of maintaining a legal environment that supports competition and prevents unnecessary monopolies.

Despite these achievements, several challenges remain. Increasing international pressure to adopt stricter intellectual property standards, rising healthcare costs, and the development of expensive new drugs continue to pose difficulties in ensuring universal access to medicines.[5] Therefore, it is essential for India to continue refining its legal and policy framework to maintain the balance between innovation and public health.

In conclusion, India's pharmaceutical patent regime represents a balanced and progressive model that prioritizes public welfare while respecting the importance of innovation.

However, continuous efforts, strong policy measures, and effective implementation are necessary to ensure that the benefits of this system reach all sections of society.

Recommendations

The government should make more effective use of compulsory licensing in situations where essential medicines are unaffordable or not adequately available. This will ensure that public health needs are met without completely undermining patent rights.

Section 3(d) should be strictly implemented to prevent evergreening of patents. This provision must continue to ensure that only genuine and meaningful innovations are granted patent protection, thereby promoting fair competition in the pharmaceutical sector.

The government should actively support the growth of the generic drug industry through favorable policies and incentives. This will help in maintaining the availability of affordable medicines and strengthen India's position as a global supplier of low-cost drugs.

There should be stronger price control mechanisms for essential drugs to ensure affordability for all sections of society. Regulatory authorities must monitor pricing practices and prevent excessive pricing by pharmaceutical companies.

The government should invest more in public-funded pharmaceutical research and development. This will reduce dependence on private companies and help in developing affordable medicines that serve public health interests.

Efforts should be made to increase public awareness about the availability of generic medicines and government healthcare schemes. This will help people make informed choices and improve access to treatment.

India should be cautious while entering into international trade agreements that impose stricter intellectual property standards. It is important to protect national interests and preserve the flexibility to address public health needs.

Improving the overall healthcare system, including distribution and availability of medicines, is essential to ensure that legal provisions translate into real access for the public.

Bibliography

Books

- Basheer, S. (2015). *Intellectual Property Law in India*. Oxford University Press.
- Narayanan, P. (2017). *Patent Law* (4th ed.). Eastern Law House.
- Cornish, W., Llewelyn, D., & Aplin, T. (2019). *Intellectual Property: Patents, Copyright, Trade Marks and Allied Rights*. Sweet & Maxwell.
- Bently, L., & Sherman, B. (2014). *Intellectual Property Law*. Oxford University

Press.

• Watal, J. (2001). *Intellectual Property Rights in the WTO and Developing Countries*.

Oxford University Press.

Journal Articles

• Chaudhuri, S. (2005). The WTO and India's pharmaceutical industry: Patent protection, TRIPS, and developing countries. *Journal of World Trade*, 39(5), 999– 1025.

• Basheer, S. (2006). India's tryst with TRIPS: The patents (amendment) act, 2005. *Indian Journal of Law and Technology*, 1(1), 15–46.

• Sampath, P. G. (2009). India's pharmaceutical sector in the post-TRIPS period. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 44(2), 55–63.

• Abbott, F. M. (2002). The Doha Declaration on TRIPS and public health. *Journal of International Economic Law*, 5(2), 469–505.

• Reichman, J. H. (2009). Compulsory licensing of patented pharmaceutical inventions.

World Health Organization Bulletin, 87(3), 247–252.

Reports and Policy Documents

• World Health Organization (WHO). (2016). *Access to Medicines Report*.

• United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). (2015). *Global Commission on HIV and the Law Report*.

• World Trade Organization (WTO). (2001). *Doha Declaration on TRIPS and Public Health*.

• Government of India. (2016). *National Intellectual Property Rights Policy*.

• Ministry of Health and Family Welfare, Government of India. (2017). *National Health Policy*.

• National Pharmaceutical Pricing Authority (NPPA). *Annual Reports*.

• World Bank. (2018). *Healthcare Expenditure Report*.

Statutes

• The Patents Act, 1970.

• The Patents (Amendment) Act, 2005.

• The Drugs and Cosmetics Act, 1940.

• The Indian Constitution, 1950 (Article 21).

• Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS), 1995.

Case Law

• *Novartis AG v. Union of India*, (2013) 6 SCC 1.

• *Bayer Corporation v. Natco Pharma Ltd.*, (2012) Compulsory License Case.

• *Consumer Education and Research Centre v. Union of India*, (1995) 3 SCC 42.

• *Roche v. Cipla Ltd.*, (2009) Delhi High Court.

• *F. Hoffmann-La Roche Ltd. v. Cipla Ltd.*, (2015) Delhi High Court.