BALANCING INNOVATION AND FAIR COMPETITION: THE ROLE OF COMPETITION LAW IN INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY RIGHTS

Authored by
RajlathaKotni, Partner, Swagita Pandey, Associate and Gnanith K Hunsur, Intern, Lexport

The connection, between property (IP) rights and competition regulations involves an interplay of interests and objectives to consider carefully; On one side of the spectrum are IP rights like patents and trademarks that serve to encourage innovation by giving creators exclusive rights, for a limited period to profit from their work and recover their investments; conversely competition law strives to curb monopolistic behaviours that limit competition and negatively impact consumers.

In today's technology driven economy the ongoing conflict has gained significance. With intellectual property serving as a catalyst, for advancement there is a rising apprehension that the utilization of IP rights is hindering competition and fortifying dominant market standings. Global competition watchdogs are faced with the challenge of balancing IP rights to foster innovation while avoiding constraints that stifle competition.

Reaching the balance necessitates a customized approach for every circumstance. Antitrust laws may occasionally be necessary to prevent the abuse of intellectual property rights. On the other hand, in certain situations, protecting intellectual property rights might act as a motivator for ground-breaking innovations that eventually benefit customers. In order to create a framework that fosters innovation and maintains market competition, decision makers must carefully consider these elements.

Then, can we make the most of property's potential to advance society while preserving the welfare of consumers?

Synergies and Conflicts between IPR and Competition Law

There are substantial areas of possible conflict as well as major areas of synergy between competition law and intellectual property rights. Positively, intellectual property rights are meant to encourage innovation by giving inventors short-term monopolies, which may result in increased competition over time when new goods and technologies are developed. Although they take different approaches, competition law and intellectual property rights both seek to promote economic progress. By giving inventors temporary monopolies that let them profit solely from their inventions, intellectual property rights promote innovation by rewarding research and development. However, the objectives of competition law, which are to promote competition, prohibit monopolies, and safeguard consumer welfare, may occasionally clash with this exclusivity.-

According to Shapiro (2001), "patents and other forms of intellectual property protection are essential to providing incentives for investment in R&D and the development of new technologies". In sectors like pharmaceuticals, where the high expenses of drug research and clinical testing necessitate the promise of patent-protected earnings to justify the investment, this monopoly-driven model has played a vital role in fostering innovation.[1]

In certain scenarios, IPR and competition laws can complement each other. For instance, the exclusivity provided by IPR fosters innovation, increasing market diversity in the long run and potentially improving consumer welfare. However, conflicts arise when IPR grants monopolistic control over essential technologies or products, limiting access and stifling competition. Additionally, excessive IPR enforcement may lead to *"patent thickets"*, where overlapping patent claims create barriers for competitors, preventing new market entrants. In such cases, competition law may intervene through mechanisms like compulsory licensing, ensuring broader access to critical innovations while balancing the rights of inventors.

However, IPR's exclusionary nature also raises the possibility of anticompetitive behavior that undermines competition law's primary goal of protecting consumer welfare. According to Carrier, *"the grant of a patent confers upon the patent holder the right to exclude others from making, using, or selling the patented invention"*. This exclusivity can be exploited in a number of ways, including settlements between branded and generic medication manufacturers that

[1]Shapiro, C. (2001). *Navigating the patent thicket: Cross licenses, patent pools, and standard setting. In Innovation policy and the economy* (Vol. 1, pp. 119-150). MIT Press.

postpone the release of less expensive alternatives or patent thickets that make it difficult for rivals to enter a market.[2] According to Furukawa (2010), excessively wide patent protection might actually stifle innovation by allowing powerful companies to continue to hold a monopoly on the market.[3]

The challenge, therefore, is to find the right balance. Competition authorities must ensure that IPR are not used as a cover for anti-competitive practices, while still preserving incentives for innovation. Pate (2003) argues that a *"flexible and fact-specific analysis"* is required to evaluate the competitive effects of IPR on a case-by-case basis. For example, competition regulators may allow patent pools or cross-licensing agreements that promote the widespread adoption of new technologies, while blocking settlements that delay generic drug entry.[4]

Guidelines on when IP licensing agreements are allowed under competition law are provided by the Technology Transfer Block Exemption Regulation in the European Union. To aid in navigating this complicated landscape, the Federal Trade Commission and the U.S. Department of Justice have jointly released guidance on the *"Antitrust-IP Intersection"*.[5]

In order to promote a robust innovation ecosystem and safeguard consumer interests, it is ultimately necessary to carefully manage the synergies and conflicts between these two policy domains. According to Hovenkamp (2015), *"antitrust law has an important role to play in policing the boundaries of permissible and impermissible uses of intellectual property"*. Policymakers can use IPR to propel advancement without compromising the advantages of a competitive market by finding the ideal balance.[6]

Abuse of Dominant Position through IP Rights

When organizations utilize their intellectual property monopolies to unjustly limit market access, so reducing consumer choice and innovation, this is known as abuse of a dominant position through IPR. By enforcing exclusionary licensing policies or declining to license essential technologies, dominant companies may utilize intellectual property rights to control the market and drive out rivals. For example, a company that has patents on a necessary technology may prevent rivals from using it, so preventing competition and preserving its market dominance.

In response, competition law offers tools like compulsory licensing, allowing regulators to ensure public access to essential technologies. Moreover, regulatory frameworks often include *"essential commodities"* doctrines, ensuring that critical resources controlled by a dominant player remain accessible to competitors.

Refusing to license important technology is a typical abuse, especially when the copyrighted technology is necessary for creating new goods or services. For example, a dominant software or telecommunications business may deny competitors a license to utilize its technology, so preventing them from accessing the market. This reduces innovation and choice in the market by raising the bar for new competitors and maintaining the company's monopoly power.

Exclusionary licensing practices are another strategy employed by powerful companies. These could include exclusivity provisions that restrict the licensee's ability to collaborate with other businesses or restrictive clauses in licensing agreements, including tying arrangements, which require the licensee to buy another, frequently superfluous good or service in order to obtain access. By limiting the range of options, such agreements can lessen competition and improve consumer welfare.[7]Under some circumstances, such as when a patented invention is not being sufficiently utilized, Indian law permits the forced licensing of patents. This lessens the monopolistic power of patent holders while promoting access to necessary medications and technologies. Although it encourages competition, there are worries that intellectual property rights may be devalued.

---

[2] Carrier, M. A. (2002). *Unraveling the patent-antitrust paradox. University of Pennsylvania Law Review*, 151(2), 761-854.
[3] Furukawa, Y. (2010). *Intellectual property protection and innovation: an inverted-U relationship. Economics Letters*, 109(2), 99-101.
[4] Pate, R. H. (2003). *Competition and intellectual property in the US: licensing freedom and the limits of antitrust. European Competition Law Review*, 24(11), 707-712.
[5] Department of Justice & Federal Trade Commission. (2017). Antitrust Guidelines for the Licensing of Intellectual Property.
[6]Hovenkamp, H. J. (2015). *Antitrust and information technologies. Florida Law Review*, 68, 419.
[7] Basheer, S., & Reddy, P. (2008). *The "Efficacy" of Indian Patent Law: Ironing out the Creases in Section 3(d)*. SCRIPTED, 5(2), 232-258.

Natco Pharma Limited filed a request for a compulsory license against Bayer's patent before the Controller of Patents in **Bayer Corporation vs. Union of India and Others***(India's first compulsory licensing case)*. The request was made in accordance with Section 84 (1) of the Indian Patent Act of 1970, as amended in 2005.[8]

Patent Trolls and the Impact on Competition

In India's intellectual property landscape, patent trolling—the act of obtaining patents not for the development of new products but just to demand licensing fees or settlements through the fear of infringement lawsuits—has become a significant concern. Research was out in the Indian setting clarifies the particular difficulties and reactions to this occurrence.Non-practicing entities (NPEs) are increasingly targeting Indian companies, especially small and medium-sized businesses, as patent trolling is on the rise in India. Even when they have a strong defense against the claims, these corporations are frequently forced to settle out of court due to the enormous expenses of patent litigation and the uncertainty surrounding the outcome.

The issue is made worse by India's inadequate patent opposition mechanism, which permits granting of weak patents and their accompanying abusive litigation. To screen out low-quality patents, they support post-grant opposition procedures and changes to the patent inspection process.[9]The Competition Commission of India (CCI) has responded to these worries by enforcing the Competition Act's provisions against patent trolling. The CCI concluded in **Micromax v. Ericsson** that the Swedish telecom behemoth had misused its power by charging smartphone makers exorbitant and discriminatory royalties. This historic ruling demonstrated the CCI's readiness to apply competition law to stop intellectual property rights abuse.[10]

Case Studies of IPR and Competition Law Conflicts

A trademark owner abuses their trademark by modifying or distorting it, as demonstrated in the 2005 case of **Valle Peruman and others v. Godfrey Phillips India Limited**[11]. It will be considered unfair trademark trade practices. The Supreme Court ruled that *"all kinds of intellectual property have the potential to infringe the competition"*,taking into account India's competition laws. The court further noted that, subject to the restrictions placed at the time of patent issuance, a trademark owner has the right to use his mark in a reasonable manner.

The Bombay High Court ruled in **Aamir Khan Production Private Limited v. The Director-General** (2010)[12] that the Competition Commission of India has the authority to investigate competition and intellectual property rights. In the **Kingfisher v. Competition Commission of India** (2012)[13] case, the Competition Appellate Tribunal furthered this court's position. In this instance, it was decided that Section 3(5) does not restrict an IP holder's ability to file a lawsuit for copyright, trademark, patent, or other infringement. The authority to handle any case presented to the Copyright Board has been granted by the Competition Commission of India. Therefore, the implementation of other legislation is prohibited under competition law.

Conclusion

In the past, it was believed that competition law and IPR law were incompatible. Nonetheless, it is clear that the relationship between IPR and competition law has changed as a result of recent advances. The Competition Law seeks to preserve market competition efficiency by prohibiting any abuse of dominant positions, unfair trade practices, and anti-competitiveness acts, whereas IPR seeks to protect the rights of creators. When creating the IPR rules, the legislature tried to safeguard the rights of inventors and provide compensation to them in the event that those rights were violated. The Competition Law's provisions are designed to provide society with improved market access.

Maintaining market fairness while promoting innovation requires striking a balance between competition legislation and intellectual property rights. IPR encourages investment in research and innovation by giving inventors exclusive rights. However, innovation and consumer choice may be hampered when powerful companies abuse these rights to

[8]*Bayer Corpn. v. Natco Pharma Ltd.*, 2017 SCC OnLine Del 12901.
[9] Rajagopalan, S., & Rasheed, A. (2018). *Patent Trolling in India: Evolving Jurisprudence and the Need for Reform. Journal of Intellectual Property Rights*, 23(1-2), 33-41.
[10]*Micromax Informatics Ltd. v. Telefonaktiebolaget LM Ericsson (PUBL)*, 2013 SCC OnLine Del 6536.
[11]*Godfrey Phillips India Ltd. v. State of U.P.*, (2005) 2 SCC 515.
[12]*Aamir Khan Productions (P) Ltd. v. Union of India*, 2010 SCC OnLine Bom 1226.
[13]*Kingfisher Airlines Ltd. v. Competition Commission of India*, 2010 SCC OnLine Bom 2186.

limit competition. Examples like the Microsoft case demonstrate how monopolistic behaviour may occur when businesses use their market position to restrict access for rivals, stifling a positive market dynamic.

In order to combat these abuses, competition law intervenes, utilizing instruments such as mandatory licensing and the necessary facilities concept to guarantee the continued availability of vital technology and inventions. Competition law promotes a fair market where new players can successfully compete by preventing anti-competitive behaviour.

*****