

THE PATENT ENFORCEMENT AND ADJUDICATION OF INFRINGEMENTS IN INDIA- A LEGAL PERSPECTIVE

TEJASWINI B J

Assistant Professor, Department of Humanities and Social Sciences, B M S Institute of Technology and Management. Email: bjtmech@bmsit.in

Abstract:

The Government of India is promoting innovation which is the backbone of the progress and development of a country through various measures like Start-up-India, Online patent processing, expedited examination, and other procedures for issuing a patent, etc. Such initiatives by the Government of India have encouraged a greater number of patent filings. With an increase in the number of patent applications and also grants, litigation in the field of patents is also on the rise. In recent years, the Indian patent regime has not only witnessed an increase in the number of patent litigation, but also dramatic evolution of the nature of patent litigation. Innovators are assertive not only in patenting their invention but also in protecting their patents from being infringed by other competitors. Therefore, patent infringement cases have become a major part of Intellectual property litigation in India. The patentees are approaching the district courts and the High courts in cases of patent infringement wherein the relief come in the form of Injunction or damages or account of profits. In this context, India needs to have a strengthened enforcement and litigation system to protect the rights of the patentees.

Keywords: Patent rights, patent infringement, Intellectual property, courts, cases, and injunction

1. INTRODUCTION

Nobel Prize winners attending the 103rd Indian Science Senate in New Delhi urged India to prioritize innovation and discovery over manufacturing in 2022 by seeking a change to Prime Minister Narendra Modi's "Make in India" slogan, which should be backed by entrepreneurs and start-ups that could commercialize university and research Centre innovations. India is witnessing a steep rise in the patents filed. Thanks to the initiatives by the Government of India like Startup India, Make in India, and many more. Continuous efforts in research and development (R&D) produce inexhaustible knowledge capital, which is one of the foundations of endogenous economic growth. A country's physical capital may be used to increase through the generation of knowledge capital, which is considered as a positive function of physical capital stock. One of the most essential types of intellectual property is the patent (IP). A patent usually has a 20-year duration from the priority date of the application. A patent holder's rights to restrict other parties from creating, using, selling, offering for sale, or even importing the patented goods or product created using the patented process in the corresponding jurisdiction are known as patent protection.

A patent is a legally binding document granted by the government that gives an inventor the exclusive right to produce, use, and sell an invention for a certain period. Patents are

also possible for considerable improvements on previously developed items. The goal of the patent system is to encourage inventors to advance technology by allowing them exclusive rights to benefit from their inventions. Although books, movies, and works of art cannot be patented, copyright rules can protect them. Patent law is a branch of intellectual property law, which also includes trademark and copyright protection. Patent law, or lack of pervasiveness, revolves around the principles of innovation and inventive steps. They provide the right to use the invention for the duration of the patent. They provide the right to prohibit all persons, not just imitators, but even independent devisors of the same notion, from exploiting the innovation throughout the patent. The unique capacity of a patent is that it may be used to prevent others from implementing any type of invention into their products and services. As a result, having a patent makes it more difficult for competitors to compete. This is why patents are only available for those industrial breakthroughs that are considered to be patentable.

The Indian Patents and Trademarks Act, 1911, was adopted in 1911, marking the beginning of the country's patent legislation. When one patentee's right to a certain invention is violated, this is known as patent infringement. A third party who infringes on a patent bearer's rights or claims without any of the patent holder's permission or license was said to have been infringed on the patent holder's patent rights. When doing a patent infringement risk analysis, it is critical to understand the different types of patent infringements to ensure that the invention will not infringe on any of the existing patent rights. There are several types of patent infringement. Direct Infringement is a legal term that refers to the act of info This is the most apparent type of unlawful usage, as any intellectual lawyer will tell you. Producing, using, selling, or transferring a patented idea or invention without the rights owner's permission is illegal. The direct infringement. The unauthorized version must either perform the identical equivalent function as the source or fulfill the original's description to be considered direct infringement.

Indirect Infringement: There seem to be two sorts One is contributory infringement, which relates to the purchase or importation of materials intended for use in a patented article. To defend your patent in this situation, you'd have to show that those materials were only meant to be utilized in conjunction with your covered patent. Infringement by enticement is the other sort of indirect infringement, which refers to any conduct carried out by a third party that induces someone to directly infringe on a patent. To put it another way, one person or organization would have to persuade another person or organization to engage in actions that result in infringement of the original patent. Even if one of those parties is unaware of the original invention, they may be held liable. Intentional and Exact Infringement: The element of purpose is involved in willful infringement. It refers to a patent infringement in which the patent protection is completely disregarded. Simply expressed, it suggests that the infringement was probably aware of the patent but decided to disregard the law.

Exact infringement refers to occurrences in which a patented object is used, marketed, or imported in its precise form. Every feature specified in the original patent would be included in this duplicated version. It's not as common as deliberate infringement, but it's just as obvious. In certain circumstances of exact infringement, the infringing party may claim that they have licensing rights to the product or that the original patent is invalid in some way. However, the infringer is likely aware of the situation. However, it's probable that the infringing party is aware of the patent in question and will choose to infringe on it anyhow for whatever reason. A patent may be reinstated after it has expired, as long as the patentee's rights are limited. When the violation occurred between the time of the infraction and the time of the investigation. An increase in the number of patents filed has also led to various patent infringement issues. This paper focus on the various patent infringement cases heard by the Indian Courts and the evolution of the law about patent infringements.

2. PREVIOUS WORKS

Sapatnekar et al [1] published an article that focused on different interpretations of interesting laid down by American courts, as well as the point of scholars revising the doctrine of willful patent infringement, with scholar views criticizing the criminal sanction of willful patent infringement disparity among nations in the consideration of patent infringement that was willful or not. However, while dealing with patent infringement cases in India, possible concerns such as the viability of a criminal penalty for those instances and its comment concerning the Indian context were taken into account.

Kadri et al [2] showed that there was tremendous growth in patenting in India after implementing them in TRIPS but no adjacent sprut was observed in an inventive study in India that was expected. Most of the patents in India has been owned by foreign inventors they were mostly from the USA which indicates TRIPS gained the USA and also other developed countries rather India has been negligible on sharing patents to the USA, this patent trend has shown that there is no organization in India has encouraged innovation in India thus to make development in India.

Raju et al. [3] have published research arguing that the current Indian Competition Act 2002, as revised in 2009, does not address the relationship between intellectual property protection and competition laws. By reflecting on a lack of efficient regulations, as well as a lack of better case law, problems have become more complicated, and the Competition Commission of India may issue particular guidance for dealing with these instances.

This research by Raju et al [4] examines the US Antitrust Act of 1890 and analyses several instances decided by US courts. On problems of intellectual property and competition law, the EU regulations and cases are more explicit. So yet, Indian jurisprudence is unclear, and the CCI and Indian courts have only dealt with a few

instances. According to the report, Indian authorities should learn from other jurisdictions, and jurisprudence will serve as a guide for them.

Choi et al. [5] have presented an assessment of the patentee's right as enshrined in statutory form in Korean patent law as compared to those of the United States and Japan. A regular patent protection system is the emphasis, particularly in criminal cases involving patent infringement. If economies want to climb up the global innovation value chain, IP ("Intellectual Property") protection should be reinforced rather than hampered. Criminal fines and punishments for infringement of intellectual property rights are the most effective remedy for patent infringement damages. That is why the United States Chamber of Commerce's International IP Index contains factors such as "Criminal norms, including minimum incarceration and penalties."

Nam et al [6] have proposed a technique to monitor the adoption of existing technology by the term frequency-inverse document and K-means clustering using cited patents. When the number of patents is sufficiently large the mixed set of citing patents and cited ones are subject of analysis then focussed on the agricultural tractor with new technologies that have been adopted to reach automated driving. However, the anticipation of each technique has ensured the reliability of patent monitoring when the number of patents was small.

Pan et al [7] proposed a bioequivalence criterion for two medications in infringement instances that may differ from FDA standards for drug approval. The federal circuit looked at three separate sets of criteria for assessing bioequivalence in *Perrigo v Adams*. These statistical aspects of those criteria, on the other hand, are analyzed and investigated.

Between 1998 and 2017, Papageorgiadis et al [8] published the Patent Enforcement Index, which examines disparities in patent enforcement in 51 countries. The new index, which can be broken down into three subject sub-indices, indicates hitherto unseen volatility in patent enforcement. PEI can be used by policymakers to compare the performance and trajectory of their country's patent system to the strength of other nations' patent systems. They can then choose specific steps to enhance various aspects of their patent system and reduce the related transaction costs that businesses encounter while defending their rights in the nation.

Manap et al [9] assessed the legal processes used by the Malaysian and European Union competition authorities to see if they appropriately addressed competition law problems in patent licensing. It also aims to uncover issues with patent license contracts and investigate how they influence competition legislation. The findings show that, while Malaysia has a fundamental legal mechanism for implementing competition law in patent licenses, the Competition Act 2010, a revision of the Act, as well as other legal mechanisms such as Guidelines, are required to meet the demands emerging from patent licenses.

Between 1998 and 2011, a time after the signing of the Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS) agreement, Papageorgiadis et al [10] presented research on the factors of the strength of patent enforcement in 43 member nations of the World Trade Organization (WTO). Identifying the determinants of strong patent systems will aid policymakers at the national and supranational levels in developing and implementing effective policies to strengthen national patent systems, resulting in increased economic benefits such as increased levels of intangible asset commercialization and increased international trade and investment.

3. BACKGROUND

3.1. Amendments on patent rights in India

The Patents Act of 1970 governs the legislation surrounding patents. Product patents were first established in India in 2005 by the Indian Patents (Amendment) Act, which marked the start of a new patent regime focused on preserving patent holders' intellectual property rights. Act VI of 1856 on Protection of Inventions, which is based on the British Patent Law of 1852, established India's patent law in 1856. Patents were referred to as "exclusive privileges," and they were given for fourteen years. The Act was extended in 1959 to encompass design protection. Although India had patent laws before the 1900s, the Patent Act of 1911 was the first to provide official patent protection. The Indian government was in power in the mid-twentieth century created two committees to study India's patent legislation and provide recommendations for changes, the first in 1949 and the second in 1957. The 1957 committee's recommendations sparked the passage of a Patent Bill in India's Parliament, which became the Patents Act of 1970[5]. Processes were protected under the 1970 Patent Act, but compositions of matter were not. Process patents have a seven-year term of protection from the filing date of the patent application. In 1999, 2002, and 2005, India updated the 1970 Act. Food, medications, and medicines are now covered by India's patent legislation, which was revised in 2005. India's patent law did not give protection for drugs until 2005 changes.

3.2. Licensing and Assignment of Patent

It is allowed to assign a patent or a stake in a patent, as well as to mortgage, lease, or generate a property in a patent for anybody else. In the case of patents, an assignment is only effective if the connection is reduced to the form of reports that contain all of the conditions and circumstances governing the parties' rights and duties. The transferee must fill out an application for registration in the manner that has been authorized. When it comes to determining whether or not an invention is patentable, inventiveness is a key consideration. "No innovation or method published in any document before the date of filing of a patent application, everywhere in the country or the world" is what a novelty or

new invention is defined as the entire world, "according to the Patent Act's Section 2(l). The complete specification, i.e. the subject matter, is not in the public domain or regarded state-of-the-art." To put it another way, the uniqueness criteria is that innovation should never have been made available to the general public. It must be the most current, with no equivalent or identical artworks in the past. If the patent is not worked satisfactorily to meet the reasonable requirements of the public, at a reasonable price, the Controller may grant compulsory licenses to any applicant to work the patent. A compulsory license is a provision under the Indian Patent Act which grants power to the Government to mandate a generic drug maker to manufacture inexpensive medicine in the public interest even as a patent in the product is valid. Compulsory licenses may also be obtained in respect of related patents where one patent cannot be worked without using the related patent.

3.3. Study on patent infringement cases in India

In India, there are four mechanisms for resolving disputes. The Indian Patent Office (IPO), the IP Appellate Board (IPAB), the Supreme Court, District Courts, and High courts examine patent infringement matters and make intellectual property rulings. These machines hear revocation processes as well as appeals from the patent controller's rulings. The IPO's administrative tasks include developing and enforcing rules and procedures. In the table below, some comparisons of patent infringement case hierarchies in various nations are presented.

Country	IP (Patent) Enforcement and Litigation Approach
Australia	The Federal Court of Australia, one of the country's higher courts, handles IP issues through expert IP judges.
China	Patent cases are resolved in specialized courts by panels of two technicians and one judge. All patent appeals are heard by a single appellate court in Beijing.
Japan	Patent disputes are heard at the national court system's specialized IP divisions in Tokyo and Osaka. Technical advisers are frequently hired by judges from the Patent Office.
Malaysia	IP special courts were established in 2007.
Singapore	A specialized court assembles a panel of IP experts.
South Korea	The IP Office is in charge of the independent and specialized IP Tribunal, however normal trial courts can still handle some patent disputes.
United Kingdom	All IP proceedings are heard by the Patents Court of the English High Court, a specialist court in the Chancery Division.
India	Patent or other intellectual property cases in India is treated in the same way as other business disputes. A severe lack of knowledge on the side of the judiciary and even the legal profession.

More than 75 patent infringement lawsuits were pending in the Delhi High Court, and many more are pending in other Indian courts. The efficacy of patent enforcement processes entails more than just ensuring that intellectual property rights are honored. However, intellectual property rights holders, particularly larger corporations, are continuously calling for further government-led initiatives to bolster intellectual property

rights protection. As a result, developing countries are under growing pressure from wealthy countries to strengthen their efforts to protect intellectual property rights. These attempts are insufficient. Even the most effective IP system can be undermined by ineffective enforcement as IP holders cannot trust the authorities to implement even hard-won legal triumphs, the system loses all legitimacy and, perhaps more importantly, all motivation.

4. LANDMARK CASES ON PATENT INFRINGEMENT IN INDIA

4.1. Ericsson vs. Xiaomi

Petition on Xiaomi: Ericsson argued in the Delhi High Court that Xiaomi Technology, a Chinese mobile phone manufacturer, was breaking its interim order by selling phones without Qualcomm Incorporated chipsets.

Fig. 1: Ericsson Vs Xiaomi



Details on Petition: Ericsson filed a lawsuit against Xiaomi in India in December 2014, alleging infringement of eight standard-essential patents. The Delhi High Court issued an ex parte injunction prohibiting Xiaomi from selling, manufacturing, advertising, or importing its products.

Defendant argument: Xiaomi said that its most recent devices for the Indian market (as of December 2014), the Mi3, Redmi1S, and Redmi Note 4G, were furnished with Qualcomm chipsets that used Ericsson-approved advancements. Xiaomi subsequently appealed the direction to a Delhi High Court Division Bench, which issued provisional orders allowing Xiaomi to continue selling, importing, manufacturing, and advertising its mobile phones, subject to the following conditions: Xiaomi will only offer Qualcomm-powered gadgets. Case finalized as Xiaomi would pay sovereignty of Rs. 100 for each unit imported into India between the date of the device's debut in India and January 5, 2015. This sum must be stored in a secure location for the duration of the case.

4.2. Shogun Organics Ltd v. Gaur Hari Guchhait

The issue on the case filed: In light of the plaintiff's registration D-trans Allethrin (TECH) if Plaintiff's invention is pre-published and lacks novelty?

Fig. 2: Shogun Vs Gaur Hari Guchhait



Details on Petition: Shogun Organics Limited filed a complaint in the Delhi High Court seeking a permanent injunction to prevent the defendants from infringing on its method patent. The patent covers the production of D-trans Allethrin (an active ingredient in mosquito repellants). Shogun had also received an 'original' registration under the Insecticides Act of 1968 for the manufacturing of this substance.

Defendant and offending argument: The High Court of Delhi was faced with the issue that just since a previous enrollment under the Insecticides Act was supportive of the aggrieved party and then the petitioner didn't indicate that the allowed technique was revealed. Similarly, the petitioner was unable to demonstrate that the patent strategy steps had been recently divulged. The court referred to Section 30 of the Patents Act, which specifies that the invention revealed in the decision cannot be considered to be past detail by the integrity of the development's transfer to the Government or any other individual permitted. There must be a public gathering, usage, or offer of the innovation for it to be considered a disclosure. The person who has been wronged is qualified. According to the court, for an extraordinarily long-term injunction prohibiting plaintiffs from assembling and distributing D-trans Allethrin. The respondent also failed to present any substantial evidence to refute the injured party's claim of intrusion. The Respondents possess a patent on a method for producing d-trans Allethrin, which the Appellants claim is invalid due to previous disclosure to public authorities under the Insecticides Act.

Court finalized on 11.10.2019 as The Court rejected the Appellants' claim of bad behavior, concluding that they are liable for infringement because they failed to provide adequate proof that they are manufacturing d-trans Allethrin using a different method. The Court, on the other hand, was satisfied with the Respondent's declaration on the Appellants' use of the protected method. That is, the strategy's disclosure differs from an outside appraisal of how novel and inventive the technique is.

4.3. Bayer Corporation & Anr vs Union of India & Ors

Petition filed as:

1. a writ petition filed by Bayer against NATCO requesting that the Court direct Customs Authorities hold onto its protected item, Sorafenib (under mandatory permit), and prevent NATCO from sending the medication to China for motivations behind leading exploration to foster data for gaining administrative approval an infringement
2. Bayer filed a lawsuit against Alembic, requesting that the Court prevent Alembic from assembling and marketing their licensed product, Rivaroxaban, throughout the European Union. In both cases, the question was whether Section 107A permits the use of a protected medicinal product for exploration or study to generate data for use in getting administrative approval in another nation.

Fig. 3: Bayer Vs NATCO Vs Alembic



Details of the petition: Rather of filing litigation for infringement, Bayer Corporation filed a unique writ request in the Delhi High Court, requesting that since Cipla's "SORANIB" uses allegedly infringe on its patent, its (Cipla's) promotional endorsement application under the Drugs Act not be handled or engaged. It is important to note that an effort is being made in India to link medication endorsement to patent infringement. This is a very intriguing case attempting to transfer a questionable Drug-Patent Linkage device developed in the United States to the legal system in India.

Process in court:

The Court held in the case as follows:

- a) The term "sale" used in Section 107A includes export for purposes of acquiring regulatory approval in another country (Para 84);
- b) Section 107A is not an exception to Section 48, which provides the rights of the patent holder (Para 89);
- c) Section 107A extends to exporting of the patented invention, and not merely information generated from research and experiments in India (Para 91);

- d) The phrase "making, building, utilizing, selling, or bringing in protected articles exclusively for uses sensibly connected with advancement and accommodation of data required under any law currently in force..... or in a country other than India that directs the assembling, development, use, deal, or import of any item... "in Section 107A should be deciphered broadly to cover all utilizations required for innovative work of information for administrative purposes.
- e) Fullest effect must be given to Section 107A in the context of its purpose (Para 93);
- f) The cost of the item or the location of research, examination, or data advancement is not relevant for assurance under Section 107A. What matters is the actions or acts of the individual being referred to, regardless of whether the transaction is for business or administrative approval (Para 105).
- g) The Court cannot choose cases under Section 107A of Article 226 and must instead conduct an evaluation of reality and evaluate the evidence presented. The investigation should investigate, among other things, the protected item, the sending and receiving party, the item being shipped out, administrative arrangements in the commodity's country, and so on (Para 111). If a matter under Article 226 is brought before the Court, it shall limit itself to common remedies.
- h) Article 30 of the TRIPs Agreement shall be kept in mind while completing a matter under Section 107A. While selecting cases under the Section, the adjustment of private rights versus public interest should be performed (Para 117).

The first conclusion on this case as The Hon'ble High Court of Delhi ruled that there is no Drug-Patent Linkage component in India since both Acts have different goals and the power to define patent principles is limited to the Controller of Patents. Furthermore, the patent connection would have a negative influence on India's Public Health Policy. It went on to say that market acceptance of a drug does not imply patent infringement. As a result, patent infringement cannot be inferred; it must be established in a formal courtroom. Such mediation is outside the purview of the Drug Enforcement Administration.

Finally concluded as: Regardless, the Delhi High Court, while rejecting the direction, imposed a substantial cost of Rs. 6.75 Lakh to prohibit any such future attempts. Bayer relied on the argument that a combined reading of Section 2 of the Drugs and Cosmetic Act and Section 48 of the (Indian) Patent Act, 1970 establishes a Patent Linkage Mechanism under which no market endorsement for a medication may be granted if a patent on such medication is still active. It further claimed that CIPLA's "SORANIB" is a "Misleading Drug" as defined by the Drugs Act, for which commercial promotion is not permitted.

4.4. Bajaj Auto Ltd. vs TVS Motor Company Ltd

Petition filed as two suits, first one was when, Bajaj claims the unauthorized application of his patent regarding DTSi against TVS at Chennai High Court in 2007 for the relief of permanent injunction under section 108 of the Patents Act 1970, restricting from using the technology described in this patent for manufacturing, marketing, selling, offering for sale or exporting 2/3 wheelers, including the proposed 125-CC FLAME motorcycle containing an internal combustion engine. Plaintiffs also claimed damages for infringement of the patent.

Fig. 4: TVS Vs BAJAJ



Content of this case details: The case of Bajaj against TVS Motors is a dispute over the unauthorized use of the DTSi patent. The case is particularly important in terms of the monetary stakes of the parties as well as the application of the essence and marrow rule. The study deals with the contextual inquiry of the equivalent, which includes contemporary reality, debates, judgment, and its assessment. This is one of just a few patent cases in India that have been resolved following the Doctrine of Equivalents, sometimes known as the regulation of substance and marrow. Most significantly, the leaders involved in making the decision are also significant.

Progression of this case: While the case was ongoing before the high court, the plaintiff applied for a temporary injunction to be issued until the case was resolved. In the same High Court, TVS Motor Company filed a further complaint under Section 106 of the Patent Act, saying that Bajaj is making "groundless threats of patent infringement." While the case was ongoing before the high court, the plaintiff applied for a temporary injunction to be issued until the case was resolved. In the same High Court, TVS Motor Company filed a further complaint under Section 106 of the Patent Act, saying that Bajaj is making "groundless threats of patent infringement."

Final Judgement on this case: The Madras High Court ruled that the patent right belongs to Bajaj Auto Ltd since it has been manufacturing products using the patent technology for the past five years. In section 54, the Court stated, "It is additionally clear according to the choices, to choose the original elements to establish "essence and marrow," a purposeful development must be provided to make it a fundamental prerequisite of the creation that any variation would follow outside the imposing business model regardless of whether it couldn't have a material impact on the working of innovation."

4.5. Astrazeneca v. Intas Pharma Ltd. & Alkem Labs Ltd. & Astrazeneca AB & Anr. v. Emcure Pharma Ltd. & MSN Labs Ltd. (Delhi High Court)

Petition filed as these is three suits filed by the plaintiffs seeking a decree of permanent injunction to restrain the defendants from marketing, selling, distributing, etc. any product that infringes the subject matter of Indian Patent Nos. IN 209907

Content on the case: The Court's decision in the case was heavily based on the offending party's expired class patent, which encompassed a few animal species, including TICAGRELOR. The Court stated that the class patent covered TICAGRELOR, and that the invention's specific and working articulations validated something quite similar. The equivalent is also supported by the encroachment proceedings filed by the injured party against Milan and others in the United States, where allegations for TICAGRELOR encroachment have been made.

Fig. 5: Astrazeneca v. Intas Pharma Ltd. & Alkem Labs Ltd. & Astrazeneca AB & Anr. v. Emcure Pharma Ltd. & MSN



Process in the court: Prior, the Delhi High Court ruled that, even though the medication was covered by a previous class patent because it is given and marketed under an animal categories patent, the patentee is competent to permit the later species patent. This ruling was logically inconsistent with the court's previous decisions, as well as those given later in the year, which concluded that inclusion and disclosure cannot be separate.

Judgmental as: In November 2020, the Delhi High Court refused to issue a stay order for the manufacture of conventional pharmaceuticals whose topic was claimed to be disclosed by an animal groupings patent, even though they were effectively cloaked in a terminated family patent. The court underscored in this well-considered decision that there can be no distinction between exposure and inclusion. It was also discovered that because of the COVID-19 pandemic, people who had previously had diabetes were at a

higher risk of catching Covid, and as a result, acceptable diabetic therapy was actively pursued. The court further said that disclosure requirements must be entirely followed by patent seekers.

5. CONCLUSION AND DISCUSSION

Patent law has been evolving for a long time. A designer is concerned with not just safeguarding his work by obtaining a patent, but also ensuring that it is not infringed upon by competitors. Courts are deciding on patent infringement based on the appearances of the case, the balance of comfort, and irreversible sorrow to the patentee. India requires an IPR structure that includes IPR directors, IPR attorneys, and an IPR authorization mechanism. Even the greatest IP framework might be rendered ineffective by a helpless need. If IPR holders can't trust the experts to approve even hard-won legal victories, the framework will lose all credibility and, perhaps more directly, all ability to convince. India has to improve its requirement record to the degree where possible trend-setters accept that the public will respect their IPRs, whether intentionally or out of a patent dread of genuine permission. Even though there is a growth of problems with permission, the most severe issue to consider in the Indian circumstance is a legal delay. The required hardware is insufficient, and the legal cycle is slow. To strengthen the requirement and prosecution framework, it is advised that the government approach provide and develop a cohesive IP suite structure (comparable to the constitution of particular IP courts). This framework may ensure that IP debates are managed in a sophisticated manner by applying a variety of procedural tools equipment; the legal fees involved may be drastically reduced, and the questions can be answered in a reasonable amount of time (essentially inside a year). Regardless of the case's complexity or concept, this framework may provide powerful arbitration of IP issues, which can be handled by professionals with appropriate decency and equality.

REFERENCES

1. F. Ali, "The paradox of relief: Reconciling remedies in patent law and competition law for FRAND cases in India," 2020. Available at SSRN 3590355.
2. A. Pant, and D. Jain, "Complexities surrounding SEP cases in India: An overview of decisions by the High Court and Competition Commission of India," *Journal of Intellectual Property Law & Practice*, 2018.
3. A. Sarker, N. Reddy, and N. Sethi, "The Menace of Patent Trolls: What the World Can Learn from India," 2019.
4. Y. Pai, "Patent Injunction Heuristics in India. Pai, Yogesh, Patent Injunction Heuristics in India in Rafal Sikorski (Ed.) *Patent Law Injunctions*, Kluwer Law International BV (2019)," 2018.
5. S. Lahiry and K. Rangarajan, "Patent Landscape for Indian Biopharmaceutical Sector: A Strategic Insight," In *Flexible Strategies in VUCA Markets* Springer, Singapore, pp. 31-47, 2018.
6. P. Singh, "Patent Trolls: Nature and Legal Issues," 2019. Available at SSRN 3485981.
7. "History of Indian Patent System," <http://www.patentoffice.nic.in/ipr/patent/history.htm>, available at

8. <http://www.patentoffice.nic.in/ipr/patent/manual-2052005.pdf>.
9. <http://www.patentoffice.nic.in/ipr/patent/manual-2052005.pdf>.
10. Raj Kumar Dubey, "Making it TRIPS Way - India's New Patent Regime, Bus," BRIEFING, July 18, 2005, available at
11. 2005 WLNR 11268677 (Westlaw).
12. "See Manual of Patent Practice and Procedure," supra note 20, at 7.
13. The Patents Act, 1970, No. 39, Acts of Parliament, 1970 (India)
14. A.M. Sapatnekar, "The doctrine of Willful Patent Infringement: Evolution under American Patent Law and Need of Further Research," 2015.
15. D. Kadri, and M.V. Saikhedkar, "Post-TRIPS patenting trends in India with special reference to USA: a comparative analysis," Medha Vivek, Post-TRIPS Patenting Trends in India with Special Reference to the USA: A Comparative Analysis (June 20, 2011), 2011.
16. K.D. Raju, "The inevitable connection between intellectual property and competition law: Emerging jurisprudence and lessons for India," 2013.
17. K.D. Raju, "The interface between competition law and intellectual property rights: A comparative study of the US, EU, and India," Intellectual Property Rights: Open Access, 2014.
18. J.S. Choi, "A comparative study on the law of remedy system for patent infringement in the US and Korea," In Proceedings of International Academic Conferences (No. 4106737), International Institute of Social and Economic Sciences, October. 2016.
19. S. Nam and K. Kim, "Monitoring newly adopted technologies using keyword-based analysis of cited patents," IEEE Access, vol. 5, pp.23086-23091, 2017.
20. N. Papageorgiadis, and W. Sofka, "Patent enforcement across 51 countries—Patent enforcement index 1998–2017," Journal of World Business, vol. 55, no. 4, pp.101092, 2020.
21. N.A. Manap and H.A. Shukor, "Implementing Competition Law in Patent License: Issues and Challenges for Malaysia," Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences, vol. 6, no. 3, pp.564-564, 2015.
22. N. Papageorgiadis, C. Wang, and G. Magkonis, "Factors contributing to the strength of national patent protection and enforcement after TRIPS," Transnational Corporations, vol. 26, no. 1, pp.87-107, 2019.