|| Volume 9 || Issue 10 || October 2025 || ISSN (Online) 2456-0774
INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF ADVANCE SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH
AND ENGINEERING TRENDS

Evolution and Development of Intellectual Property Rights in India: A Legal Perspective

Dr. Priyanka Jhamnani

Temporary Assistant Professor ,The Maharaja Sayajirao University of Baroda, Pratapgunj, Vadodara, Gujarat-390002

Abstract: This review analyzes the evolution and development of India's intellectual property (IP) regime through a doctrinal, historical, and light-empirical lens. It traces four phases pre-TRIPS reform, TRIPS transition, post-2005 consolidation, and modernization/IPD era showing how constitutional commitments to public welfare and national innovation goals interact with international obligations. the paper maps treaty-to-domestic linkages (TRIPS, Berne, Paris, PCT, CBD) and outlines regime-wise frameworks across patents, trademarks, designs, GI/PPV&FR, and semiconductor/topography, grounded in keystone judgments. Doctrinal anchors include Section 3(d)'s enhanced therapeutic efficacy standard, the treatment of biotechnology under Section 3(j), compulsory licensing practice, prior-user primacy and deceptive similarity in trademarks, originality and substantial similarity in copyright, and forum allocation for validity challenges. Institutionally, the post-2021 transfer of IPAB functions to High Courts and the rise of IP Divisions (IPD) signal specialization and case-management gains; digitally, John Doe injunctions illustrate adaptive enforcement. Light-empirical trends from IP India reports contextualize filings, grants, and pendency with acknowledged proxy limits. The paper concludes with targeted reforms for specialized adjudication, calibrated ADR, strengthened border measures, and data-driven administration, framing a pragmatic balance between innovation incentives and public access.

Keywords: *Indian IP law, TRIPS flexibilities, Section 3(d) enhanced efficacy, Compulsory licensing, Transborder reputation, IPD Delhi High Court, John Doe injunctions*

I.INTRODUCTION:

The evolution and development of Intellectual Property (IP) in India is a compelling narrative of a nation navigating the complex interplay between its constitutional obligations, national developmental interests, and binding international agreements (Racherla, 2019; Baby & Kuppusami Suriyaprakash, 2020). Doctrinally, India's IP journey is framed by a consistent effort to balance the socio-economic goal of public welfare particularly ensuring access to affordable medicines as mandated by Articles 21 and 47 of the Constitution against the economic incentives required to foster innovation (Racherla, 2019). This balance is not a rejection of global IP norms but a strategic utilization of the flexibilities permitted under frameworks like the TRIPS Agreement to serve domestic needs (He, 2019). Institutionally, this evolution is guided by the vision of "Creative India; Innovative India," articulated in the National Intellectual Property Rights Policy, 2016, which seeks to create a conducive ecosystem for innovation by aligning the IP regime with national missions such as "Make in India" and "Start Up India" (Government of India, 2016; Baby & Kuppusami Suriyaprakash, 2020; Das, 2024).

To comprehensively review this trajectory, this paper relies on a multi-faceted evidence base. The legal and regulatory framework, including seminal statutes like The Patents Act, 1970 (as amended to be TRIPS compliant), The Copyright Act, 1957, and The Trade Marks Act, 1999, serve as the scope anchors for the analysis (Prasanna & Lavanya, 2023; Dhar & Joseph, 2019). Landmark judicial decisions from Indian courts, such as Novartis AG v. Union of India, which interpreted critical provisions like Section 3(d) of the Patents Act, function as keystones that reveal how India applies and adapts international standards domestically (Racherla, 2019; He, 2019). Finally, empirical trend context is provided by quantitative data from IP India Annual Reports and WIPO statistics, which document filing, grant, and pendency rates, offering a practical view of the system's operational dynamics (Dhar & Joseph, 2019; Rao, 2024).

This paper contributes to the existing scholarship by moving beyond a traditional Western- centric view of IP and presenting a comparative, multi-sectoral analysis focused on developing mega-economies like India and China (Liu, 2019; Liu & Racherla, 2019). By employing an interdisciplinary methodology that integrates legal, economic, and management perspectives, the research aims to identify effective IP strategies for emerging nations (Liu & Racherla, 2019). The boundaries of this review are focused on specific, recalibrated sectors including the pharmaceutical industry, plant varieties, the automobile industry, and IP codification, examining how India has structured its legal and institutional frameworks to foster innovation while safeguarding public access (Liu & Racherla, 2019).

II.METHODOLOGY

In this research methodology we combines doctrinal, historical, and light-empirical methods to analyze the complex relationship between intellectual property, innovation, and economic development in India. The approach is designed to ensure a holistic understanding by grounding legal analysis in its socio-economic and institutional context, with a validation framework built on the triangulation of diverse sources (Liu & Racherla, 2019; Zhang, 2019).

The doctrinal method forms the core of the analysis, involving a

detailed textual and contextual examination of primary legal instruments. This includes foundational statutes such as The Patents Act, 1970, The Copyright Act, 1957, and The Trade Marks Act, 1999 (Prasanna & Lavanya, 2023; Gilda & Ghose, 2023; Dhar & Joseph, 2019). This analysis is supplemented by a review of seminal judicial precedents that function as "keystones" for legal interpretation, such as rulings on Section 3(d) of the Patents Act (He, 2019; Racherla, 2019). The doctrinal review also incorporates key policy documents, notably the National Intellectual Property Rights Policy, 2016, to map the government's strategic direction (Scaria & Ray, 2019).

A historical method is used to trace the evolution of India's IP regime, contextualizing legislative shifts within the nation's broader developmental goals (Racherla, 2019; Medury, 2019). This involves analyzing the transition from the British-imposed Act of 1911 to the domestically focused Patents Act of 1970, and the subsequent amendments driven by TRIPS compliance (Racherla, 2019; He, 2019). This approach also considers "non-quantified factors," such as India's constitutional commitment to distributive justice and public health, which are crucial for understanding the character of its National Innovation System (NIS) (Zhang, 2019; Racherla, 2019).

Light-empirical methods provide quantitative and real-world context (Chen & Puttitanun, 2005; Liu & Racherla, 2019). This involves using metrics such as patent application and grant data from IP India Annual Reports as proxies for innovation trends (Annual Report on Intellectual Property of India, 2019; Rao, 2024). The research also relies on comparative case studies across key economic sectors and survey data on knowledge-sharing practices (Liu & Racherla, 2019; Scaria & Ray, 2019). Source validation and triangulation are achieved through interdisciplinary corroboration, cross-country comparison, and the triangulation of diverse data types: primary legal texts, judicial interpretations, quantitative reports, and qualitative socio- political analysis (Liu & Racherla, 2019; Zhang, 2019). This methodology acknowledges inherent limitations, such as the fact that patent statistics are imperfect proxies for innovation and that data may have inaccuracies.

Historical Evolution

The evolution of India's intellectual property regime unfolds across four phases shaped by shifting balances among national development priorities, constitutional public health commitments, and international trade obligations (He, 2019; Racherla, 2019).

Pre-TRIPS Phase (Post-Independence to 1994)

This period emphasized sovereignty and distributive justice, replacing colonial-era frameworks with development-oriented rules through the Patents Act, 1970 (Racherla, 2019; Dhar & Joseph, 2019). This Act limited protection to process patents in pharmaceuticals and chemicals, shortened patent terms, and embedded compulsory licensing to ensure affordability (Dhar & Joseph, 2019; Racherla, 2019). Judicially, core patentability requirements were articulated around novelty and inventive step, with Biswanath Prasad Radhey Shyam v. Hindustan Metal Industries (1978) laying a foundation for non-obviousness analysis.

TRIPS Transition Phase (1995–2005)

Following India's WTO accession in 1995, Parliament implemented staged compliance (Racherla, 2019; He, 2019). The Patents (Amendment) Act, 1999 introduced a "mailbox" for pharmaceutical product applications; the Patents (Amendment) Act, 2002 aligned the definition of "invention," created a uniform 20-year term, and established the IPAB; and the Patents (Amendment) Act, 2005 completed the shift to product patents while preserving calibrated exclusions (He, 2019; Dhar & Joseph, 2019; Racherla, 2019). Courts simultaneously adapted traditional doctrines to the digital economy, with M/S Satyam Infoway Ltd. v. M/S Siffynet Solutions Pvt. Ltd. (2004) recognizing domain names under passing off.

Consolidation and Assertion Phase (Post-2005 to mid-2010s)

With the TRIPS-compliant text in place, India applied the agreement's flexibilities to safeguard public health, most notably through Section 3(d), which requires enhanced efficacy for new forms of known substances (He, 2019; Racherla, 2019). In Novartis AG v. Union of India (2013), the Supreme Court clarified that "enhanced therapeutic efficacy" is the benchmark, rejecting evergreening and reinforcing an access-oriented standard (Novartis AG v. Union of India, 2013). India's first compulsory license was granted to Natco Pharma for Bayer's sorafenib in 2012 and judicially upheld, operationalizing statutory criteria such as reasonable requirements of the public and affordability (Natco Pharma Ltd. v. Bayer Corporation, 2012; Racherla, 2019). Cross-regime consolidation also advanced: Eastern Book Company v. D.B. Modak (2007) refined the originality threshold in copyright, and Toyota Jidosha Kabushiki Kaisha v. Prius Auto Industries (2017) recalibrated transborder reputation in trademarks toward evidence of goodwill and confusion within the Indian market (Eastern Book Company v. D.B. Modak, 2007; Toyota Jidosha Kabushiki Kaisha v. Prius Auto Industries, 2017).

Modernization and Innovation Policy Phase (Mid-2010s–Present)

This phase couples institutional efficiency and innovation strategy with adjudicatory specialization (Rao, 2024; Das, 2024). The National IPR Policy (2016) articulated the vision of "Creative India; Innovative India," aligning IP administration with national missions (Government of India, 2016). After the abolition of the IPAB in 2021, High Courts instituted specialized IP Divisions (IPD), shaping case management through structured practice directions. In biotechnology, Monsanto Technology LLC v. Nuziveedu Seeds Ltd. (2019) emphasized that complex patentability issues require evidence-led trials (Monsanto Technology LLC v. Nuziveedu Seeds Ltd., 2019). Parallel developments in arbitrability clarified a boundary between non-arbitrable rights in rem (e.g., validity) and arbitrable rights in

personam (e.g., licensing disputes) (Chauhan, 2024; Gilda & Ghose, 2023). These phased reforms frame the regime-wise analysis that follows, linking treaty obligations, statutory evolution, and doctrinal standards (Prasanna & Lavanya, 2023).

International Commitments

Together with accession to core WIPO frameworks and WTO TRIPS obligations, India's treaty posture has systematically driven domestic harmonization while preserving calibrated flexibilities (He, 2019; Prasanna & Lavanya, 2023). The most profound impact on India's IP system came from the TRIPS Agreement, which served as the primary catalyst for modernization (He, 2019; Racherla, 2019). As a developing country, India utilized the permitted transition period until January 1, 2005, to phase in product patent protection for pharmaceuticals, protecting its generic drug industry while meeting obligations for mailbox applications and Exclusive Marketing Rights by January 1, 2000 (He, 2019; Dhar & Joseph, 2019). The legislative amendments of 1999, 2002, and 2005 were direct implementations of TRIPS obligations (Prasanna & Lavanya, 2023).

Beyond patents, accession to other treaties spurred specialized (sui generis) laws (Liu & Liu, 2019). TRIPS Articles 22-24 mandated Geographical Indications protection, resulting in the GI Act, 1999 (Prasanna & Lavanya, 2023). Article 27.3(b) allowed sui generis plant variety protection, leading to the PPVFR Act, 2001 (Prasanna & Lavanya, 2023). Compliance with the Convention on Biological Diversity was achieved through the Biological Diversity Act, 2002, which established the National Biodiversity Authority to prevent biopiracy and protect traditional knowledge, complemented by Section 3(p) of the Patents Act (Baby & Kuppusami

Suriyaprakash, 2020). The Semiconductor Layout-Design Act, 2000, fulfilled TRIPS Articles 35-38 (Prasanna & Lavanya, 2023).

Mapping of International Treaties to Domestic Reforms

Treaty/Instrument	Date of Action (India)	Proximate Domestic Amendment or Rule
Agreement on TRIPS (WTO)	Entry into Force: Jan 1, 1995	Drove post-1995 patent overhaul: Patents (Amendment) Acts of 1999 (mailbox, EMR), 2002 (20-year term), and 2005 (product patents, Section 3(d)) (He, 2019; Dhar & Joseph, 2019; Prasanna & Lavanya, 2023).
Berne Convention (Copyright)	Accession: April 1, 1928	Copyright Act, 1957 (protection of foreign works); Copyright (Amendment) Act, 1999 (TRIPS compliance) (Prasanna & Lavanya, 2023; Gilda & Ghose, 2023).
Paris Convention (Industrial Property)	Accession: Dec 7, 1998	Patents Act, 1970 and Trade Marks Act, 1999 (convention country priority) (Gilda & Ghose, 2023).
Patent Cooperation Treaty (PCT)	Entry into Force: May 7, 1999	Patents Act, 1970 (as amended) incorporated PCT international application procedures (Prasanna & Lavanya, 2023).
Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD)	Ratified: Feb 18, 1994	Biological Diversity Act, 2002 (NBA approval); Patents Act, Section 3(p) (exclusion of traditional knowledge) (Baby & Kuppusami Suriyaprakash, 2020).
TRIPS Art. 27.3(b)	Obligation from Jan 1, 1995	Protection of Plant Varieties and Farmers' Rights Act, 2001 (sui generis plant variety protection) (Prasanna & Lavanya, 2023).
WIPO "Internet Treaties" (WCT & WPPT)	Not Acceded	Copyright (Amendment) Act, 2012 (influenced by international digital norms) (Nariman, 2018; Medury, 2019).

These treaty-to-statute linkages provide the backdrop for the regime-wise doctrines and remedies analyzed below (Prasanna & Lavanya, 2023).

Statutory Framework by Regime

Patents

The evolution of India's patent regime reflects the transition from a capacity-building, process-patent model to a TRIPS-compliant framework that still carves out legislative space to protect public health, with the Patents Act, 1970 catalyzing a robust generic industry through initial process-only protection and subsequent landmark jurisprudence refining patentability standards, key exclusions, and remedies (Racherla, 2019). Doctrinal anchors established in the pre-TRIPS era, notably in Biswanath Prasad Radhey Shyam v. Hindustan Metal Industries (1978), confirm that a patentable invention must be new, useful, and involve an inventive step, while contemporary administration is supported by the Guidelines for Examination of Patent Applications in the Field of Pharmaceuticals (2014) and the Guidelines for Examination of Computer Related Inventions (CRIs) (2017), which guide consistent examination practice (Office of the Controller General of Patents, Designs and Trademarks, 2014; Dhar & Joseph, 2019). Central to India's calibrated approach, Section 3(d) functions as an anti-evergreening filter; in Novartis AG v. Union of India (2013), the Supreme Court articulated the "enhanced therapeutic efficacy" test, requiring that new forms of known substances demonstrate a clear improvement in therapeutic efficacy understood as pharmacological effect rather than merely improved physicochemical properties (Racherla, 2019; Liu, 2015). In biotechnology, Section 3(j) maintains the exclusion for "essentially biological processes," and the Supreme Court in Monsanto Technology LLC v. Nuziveedu Seeds Ltd. (2019) reinforced a rigorous, evidence-based adjudication pathway by holding that complex validity questions in GM technologies cannot be decided summarily and must proceed to full trial (Lakshmikumaran, 2019). As a public-interest remedy, compulsory licensing remains a critical safeguard: the first CL in Natco Pharma v. Bayer Corporation (2012) operationalized Section 84(1) by addressing the reasonable requirements of the public, reasonably affordable pricing, and working of the invention in India, exemplifying India's use of TRIPS-consistent flexibilities to secure access to essential medicines (Racherla, 2019; He, 2019). Taken together, these calibrated standards therapeutic efficacy under Section 3(d), evidence-led biotech adjudication under Section 3(j), and targeted remedies like CL recur across the broader IP landscape and inform the trademarks analysis that follows (Prasanna & Lavanya, 2023; Liu & Racherla, 2019).

Trade Marks

The Trade Marks Act, 1999 modernized Indian trademark law to align with TRIPS, expanding protection to non-conventional and well-known marks while consolidating registration and enforcement frameworks (The Trade Marks Act, 1999). A foundational doctrine is the primacy of prior use, under which common law rights arising from market use can prevail over later registration; the Supreme Court affirmed this "first in the market" principle in Neon Laboratories Ltd. v. Medical Technologies Ltd. (2015), emphasizing that statutory registration does not defeat a continuous prior user's vested rights (Neon Laboratories Ltd. v. Medical Technologies Ltd., 2015). Infringement and passing off analyses turn on deceptive similarity, asking whether the impugned mark is likely to cause confusion for the average consumer; in Nandhini Deluxe v. Karnataka Co-operative Milk Producers Federation Ltd. (2018) the Court found no confusion between phonetically similar marks used for distinct goods/services, underscoring that overall impression, visual appearance, product nature, and market context govern the assessment, viewed through the lens of an average consumer with imperfect recollection (Nandhini Deluxe v. Karnataka Co-operative Milk Producers Federation Ltd., 2018; Gilda & Ghose, 2023). For foreign marks, Indian courts apply a strict territoriality principle: Toyota Jidosha Kabushiki Kaisha v. M/s Prius Auto Industries Ltd. (2017) requires proof that the foreign mark had acquired substantial goodwill within India prior to the defendant's use, and international reputation or online presence alone is insufficient (Toyota Jidosha Kabushiki Kaisha v. M/s Prius Auto Industries Ltd., 2017). On forum allocation, Patel Field Marshal Agencies v. P.M. Diesels Ltd. (2017) clarified that civil courts adjudicating infringement cannot decide validity; upon a tenable invalidity plea, proceedings must be stayed to allow the competent forum to determine rectification, whose ruling then binds the infringement suit (Patel Field Marshal Agencies v. P.M. Diesels Ltd., 2017). In the digital context, domain names attract passing off protection where they function as business identifiers; M/S Satyam Infoway Ltd. v. M/S Siffynet Solutions Pvt. Ltd. (2004) held that classic common-law principles fully apply to domain names, supporting injunctive relief against confusingly similar identifiers (M/S Satyam Infoway Ltd. v. M/S Siffynet Solutions Pvt. Ltd., 2004).The balance of prior-use priority, calibrated confusion standards, territorial reputation, and validity forum allocation in trademarks parallels the structure seen in adjacent regimes such as designs and copyright, promoting predictable adjudication across the IP landscape (Prasanna & Lavanya, 2023).

Copyright

Governed by The Copyright Act, 1957, the framework defines the threshold for protection (originality), the measure of infringement (substantial similarity), and adapts traditional rights to modern media and dissemination channels (Banerjee, 2019; Rao, 2024; The Copyright Act, 1957). Originality requires more than mere industrious collection; in Eastern Book Company & Ors. v. D.B. Modak & Anr. (2007), the Supreme Court rejected the "sweat of the brow" doctrine and adopted a "minimal creativity" standard, holding that originality must reflect the author's application of skill and judgment (Eastern Book Company & Ors. v. D.B. Modak & Anr., 2007). Infringement analysis follows the "lay observer test" from R.G. Anand v. Delux Films (1978), asking whether an average viewer would gain an "unmistakable impression" of copying after experiencing both works, thereby reinforcing the idea–expression dichotomy and filtering out mere thematic overlap (R.G. Anand v. Delux Films, 1978). Modernization has proceeded legislatively as well: the 2012 amendment resolved longstanding conflicts in the music and film industries by ensuring that authors of underlying literary and musical works retain an equal share of royalties when their works are used in sound recordings, aligning economic rights with creative contribution (The Indian Parliament, 2012). Enforcement has likewise strengthened; in M/S Knit Pro International v. The State of NCT of Delhi & Anr. (2022), the Supreme Court clarified that infringement under Section 63 constitutes a cognizable and non-bailable offense, signaling robust criminal deterrence to complement civil remedies such as injunctions and damages (Knit Pro International v. The State of NCT of Delhi & Anr., 2022).

Designs, GI, PPV&FR, and Other Sui Generis Rights

The Designs Act, 2000 protects the ornamental or aesthetic features of articles that "appeal to and are judged solely by the eye," with piracy encompassing the application for sale of a "fraudulent or obvious imitation" of a registered design; procedurally, the Supreme Court in S.D. Containers Indore v. M/s. Mold Tek Packaging Ltd. (2020) held that when validity is challenged in a piracy suit, the matter must be transferred to the High Court to ensure that cancellation/validity questions are resolved by the competent forum (The Designs Act, 2000; S.D. Containers Indore v. M/s. Mold Tek Packaging Ltd., 2020). Complementing designs, the Geographical Indications of Goods Act, 1999 safeguards products whose qualities or reputation are attributable to their origin, protecting collective community rights over celebrated indications such as Darjeeling tea (Baby & Kuppusami Suriyaprakash, 2020). In agriculture, the Protection of Plant Varieties and Farmers' Rights Act, 2001 provides a sui generis system that protects breeders' rights while robustly codifying Farmers' Rights to save, re-sow, exchange, and use farm-saved seed of protected varieties, positioning PPV&FR alongside but distinct from patents (Lakshmikumaran, 2019; The Protection of Plant Varieties and Farmers' Rights Act, 2001). In advanced technology, the Semiconductor Integrated Circuits Layout-Design Act, 2000 protects the original topography of integrated circuits, recognizing layout-designs as discrete subject matter warranting exclusive rights (Jajpura, Singh & Nayak, 2017). Finally, India employs a dual TK/GR strategy: the Biological Diversity Act, 2002 proactively mandates benefit-sharing and prior approvals to prevent biopiracy, while the Patents Act's Section 3(p) defensively excludes traditional knowledge from patentability, thereby aligning biodiversity

governance with IP examination and preserving customary knowledge systems (Baby & Kuppusami Suriyaprakash, 2020).

Across regimes, the Supreme Court has crystallized core doctrinal tests that shape Indian IP law: in patents, Novartis AG v. Union of India (2013) established the Enhanced Therapeutic Efficacy Test under Section 3(d), requiring that new forms of known substances demonstrate a clear improvement in therapeutic effect to merit patent protection (Liu, 2015; Racherla, 2019). In trademarks, Toyota Jidosha Kabushiki Kaisha v. M/s Prius Auto Industries Ltd. (2017) entrenched the territoriality principle for transborder reputation by insisting that foreign proprietors prove substantial goodwill in India prior to a defendant's use, while Patel Field Marshal Agencies v. P.M. Diesels Ltd. (2017) mandated that once a tenable validity challenge is raised in an infringement suit, the civil court must stay proceedings for rectification to be decided by the competent forum, whose ruling binds the suit (Toyota Jidosha Kabushiki Kaisha v. M/s Prius Auto Industries Ltd., 2017; Patel Field Marshal Agencies v. P.M. Diesels Ltd., 2017). In copyright, Eastern Book Company & Ors. v. D.B. Modak & Anr. (2007) set the minimal-creativity threshold for originality, rejecting "sweat of the brow," and R.G. Anand v. Delux Films (1978) articulated the lay observer test for substantial similarity, reinforcing the idea–expression dichotomy and filtering out claims based on mere thematic overlap (Eastern Book Company & Ors. v. D.B. Modak & Anr., 2007; R.G. Anand v. Delux Films, 1978).

Institutional and Enforcement Framework

Since 2021, India's IP adjudication has been reshaped by the Tribunals Reforms Act, which abolished the IPAB and transferred its jurisdiction to High Courts, catalyzing specialized IP Divisions (IPD) such as at the Delhi High Court and consolidating infringement, appeals, and validity matters within a single judicial forum that emphasizes expertise and case-management discipline (Tribunals Reforms Act, 2021; Prasanna & Lavanya, 2023). Enforcement operates on coordinated civil, criminal, administrative, and border tracks under the National IPR Policy, 2016: civil injunctions often prompt intermediary compliance; criminal enforcement provides deterrence and has spurred specialized units like TIPCU; and border controls anchored in the Customs Act, 1962 and the IPR (Imported Goods) Enforcement Rules, 2007 enable right holder registration and customs detention of suspected infringing imports (Government of India, 2016; Banerjee, 2019; Government of India, 2007). On dispute resolution, Indian doctrine distinguishes non-arbitrable rights in rem validity, grant, or revocation of IP from arbitrable rights in personam arising out of contracts, such as licensing and royalties, while cross-border jurisdiction remains grounded in territoriality with limits on forum selection to curb vexatious litigation (Chauhan, 2024; Gilda & Ghose, 2023; Indian Performing Rights Society Ltd. v. Sanjay Dalia & Anr., 2015). Empirically, post-2016 reporting shows rising filings and a surge in examinations in 2017–18, with domestic pharma increasing R&D yet focusing patenting more on foreign than domestic filings; these metrics aid context but remain imperfect proxies for innovation, a caveat echoed in the literature (Annual Report on Intellectual Property of India, 2019; Rao, 2024; Dhar & Joseph, 2019; Sweet & Eterovic, 2014; Das, 2024). Digitally, courts have adapted existing law through robust "John Doe" injunctions against rogue websites and by extending passing-off principles to domain names, reinforcing online enforcement and brand protection while balancing lawful expression and commerce (Banerjee, 2019; M/S Satyam Infoway Ltd. v. M/S Siffynet Solutions Pvt. Ltd., 2004).

Synthesis and Future Directions

The Emerging Balance: Innovation vs. Access

The evolution of India's IP regime reveals a carefully calibrated balance between fostering innovation and ensuring public access (Racherla, 2019; He, 2019). India has consistently leveraged the flexibilities within international treaties like TRIPS to serve its unique socio- economic goals. This is most evident in its patent law, where the stringent "enhanced therapeutic efficacy" test of Section 3(d) and the use of compulsory licensing serve as powerful bulwarks against patent evergreening and excessive pricing of essential medicines (Racherla, 2019; He, 2019; Dhar & Joseph, 2019). This approach recognizes that while IP can incentivize R&D, an overly strict regime in a developing country may hinder knowledge diffusion and slow follow-on innovation (Ockwell et al., 2010; Tripathy, 2019). The resulting balance is one of strategic pragmatism, where the constitutional mandate for public welfare often serves as the ultimate guiding principle (Racherla, 2019).

Proposed Targeted Reforms

To improve outcomes and meet emerging challenges, four targeted reforms are proposed that build on India's calibrated balance between access and innovation, Procedural and institutional reform should consolidate the post-IPAB landscape by formally establishing specialized IP courts or divisions staffed by judges with digital and technological expertise, while advancing a coherent codification agenda to reduce inter-regime inconsistencies (Prasanna & Lavanya, 2023; Das, 2024; Liu & Liu, 2019). The Alternative Dispute Resolution framework requires legislative clarity that expressly permits arbitration of rights in personam such as license scope, royalties, and assignments while reserving rights in rem, including validity, grant, and revocation, for exclusive court adjudication (Chauhan, 2024; Gilda & Ghose, 2023). Enforcement and border measures should be strengthened through enhanced Customs capabilities, sustained training of police and judicial officers in complex digital IP crimes, and improved coordination among civil, criminal, and administrative tracks to deter infringement efficiently (Das, 2024; Banerjee, 2019). A data-and-technology pillar should advance comprehensive data protection and promote the adoption of tools like blockchain and AI for copyright management, evidence handling, and IP office administration, improving transparency, timeliness, and trust in IP governance (Prasanna & Lavanya, 2023; Das, 2024).

These doctrines and institutions embed access safeguards within a modernized IP architecture, positioning specialized adjudication, calibrated ADR, robust border measures, and data-driven administration as levers for India's next phase of innovation policy (Prasanna & Lavanya, 2023; Dhar & Joseph, 2019; Das, 2024).

III.REFERENCES

I.Research Articles

- Annual Report on Intellectual Property of India. (2019). Controller General of Patents, Designs and Trademarks.
- Baby, A., & Kuppusami Suriyaprakash, T. (2020). Traditional Knowledge and Intellectual Property Rights.
- Banerjee, A. (2019). Enforcement of Copyright in India: A 'Financially Viable' Alternative.
- Chauhan, V. (2024). Arbitrability of Intellectual Property Disputes in India.
- Chen, Y., & Puttitanun, T. (2005). Intellectual property rights and innovation in developing countries.
- Das, D. K. (2024). Role of Intellectual Property Rights in Promoting Innovation and Economic Growth in India.
- Dhar, B., & Joseph, A. (2019). India's Burgeoning IPR Ecosystem: A Judicial, Legislative, and Administrative Overview.
- Gilda, A., & Ghose, S. (2023). Jurisdiction in Transnational Intellectual Property Disputes in India.
- Government of India. (2016). National Intellectual Property Rights Policy.
- He, J. (2019). TRIPS Agreement and the Indian Pharmaceutical Industry.
- Jajpura, L., Singh, R., & Nayak, S. (2017). Intellectual Property Rights and Their Importance. Journal of Intellectual Property Rights, 15, 220-227.
- Lakshmikumaran, S. (2019). Protecting Plant-Related Biotechnological Inventions: The Indian Scenario.
- Liu, C. (2015). Balancing intellectual property rights and the right to health: The case of India.
- Liu, C. (2019). Intellectual Property Law and Policy in Asia.
- Liu, C., & Liu, K. (2019). The Codification of Intellectual Property Law in Asia.
- Liu, C., & Racherla, U. (2019). Innovation, Economic Development, and Intellectual Property in India and China: A Comparative Analysis.
- Medury, U. (2019). Copyright Law in India: Recent Amendments and Their Impact on the Music Industry.
- Nariman, F. S. (2018). Speech on WIPO Treaties.
- Ockwell, D., et al. (2010). Technology transfer and climate change.
- Office of the Controller General of Patents, Designs and Trademarks. (2014).
- Guidelines for Examination of Patent Applications in the Field of Pharmaceuticals.
- Prasanna, S., & Lavanya, R. (2023). The Role of IP in the Digital Economy: An Indian Perspective.
- Racherla, U. (2019). The Evolution of India's Patent Regime and Its Impact on the Pharmaceutical Sector.
- Rao, M. (2024). Intellectual Property Rights in India: A Comprehensive Overview.
- Scaria, A., & Ray, A. (2019). IPRs in India: Balancing Innovation and Access.
- Sweet, C., & Eterovic, D. (2014). Do stricter intellectual property rights regimes inhibit technology diffusion?
- Tripathy, A. (2019). IPRs in Agriculture: A Critical Analysis of the Indian Plant Variety Protection and Farmers' Rights Act.
- Zhang, W. (2019). The Role of the State in China's National Innovation System.

II.Law (Statutes, Rules, and Treaties)

- Government of India. (2007). The Intellectual Property Rights (Imported Goods) Enforcement Rules, 2007.
- The Copyright Act, 1957.
- The Designs Act, 2000.
- The Indian Parliament. (2012). The Copyright (Amendment) Act, 2012.
- The Protection of Plant Varieties and Farmers' Rights Act, 2001.
- The Trade Marks Act, 1999.
- Tribunals Reforms Act, 2021.

III.Judgments (Case Law)

- Biswanath Prasad Radhey Shyam v. Hindustan Metal Industries, (1978) 2 SCC 55.
- Eastern Book Company & Ors. v. D.B. Modak & Anr., (2007) 13 Addl. S.C.R.
- Indian Performing Rights Society Ltd. v. Sanjay Dalia & Anr., (2015) 10 SCC 161.
- Knit Pro International v. The State of NCT of Delhi & Anr., (2022) SCC OnLine SC 642.
- M/S Satyam Infoway Ltd. v. M/S Siffynet Solutions Pvt. Ltd., (2004) 6 SCC 145.
- Monsanto Technology LLC v. Nuziveedu Seeds Ltd., (2019) 3 SCC 381.
- Nandhini Deluxe v. Karnataka Co-operative Milk Producers Federation Ltd., (2018) 9 SCC 183.
- Natco Pharma Ltd. v. Bayer Corporation, (2012) Compulsory License Order No. 1 of 2012.
- Neon Laboratories Ltd. v. Medical Technologies Ltd., (2015) 10 SCC 673.
- Novartis AG v. Union of India, (2013) 6 SCC 1.
- Patel Field Marshal Agencies v. P.M. Diesels Ltd., (2017) 10 SCC 295.
- R.G. Anand v. Delux Films, (1978) 4 SCC 118.
- S.D. Containers Indore v. M/s. Mold Tek Packaging Ltd., Civil Appeal No. 3695 of 2020.
- Toyota Jidosha Kabushiki Kaisha v. M/s Prius Auto Industries Ltd., (2017) SCC OnLine SC 1478.