TRANSNATIONAL BUSINESS LAW JOURNAL
Volume 6, Number 2, August 2025
P-ISSN: 2722-1105 E-ISSN: 2747-0210
DOI: https://doi.org/10.24198/transbuslj.v6i2.2237 Publication Date: 30 August 2025
Publisher: Transnational Business Law Depaertment, Faculty of Law Universitas Padjadjaran

Preserving the Past, Protecting the Future: A Legal Insight into Traditional Knowledge and Intellectual Property Rights

Priyanka Maroorh*

ABSTRACT

Intellectual property rights (IPR) have become a huge global issue, especially since the creation of the WTO and the TRIPS Agreement. These international frameworks have reshaped how we view innovation, trade, and the protection of cultural heritage. But for countries like India, with its rich history of traditional knowledge in areas like Ayurveda, agriculture, metallurgy, and folklore, the modern IPR system often misses or fails to safeguard this invaluable wisdom passed down through generations.

This paper looks at the tension between global IPR standards and the need to protect India's traditional knowledge, which has always existed outside these modern legal frameworks. It traces the development of international IPR systems starting from GATT, moving into the WTO, and later the TRIPS Agreement and examines how they've affected the treatment of traditional knowledge and indigenous practices. By looking at well-known cases like turmeric, basmati rice, and medicinal plants from the Amazon, the paper dives into the issue of biopiracy and how traditional IPR struggles to protect collective knowledge.

The paper also explores India's initiatives, such as the Traditional Knowledge Digital Library (TKDL) and various benefit-sharing models, while highlighting the challenges of jurisdiction in today's digital and interconnected world. In the end, it argues that we need legal frameworks that understand cultural contexts, solid digital archives, international collaboration, and fair benefit-sharing practices if we're really going to protect and preserve traditional knowledge in this fast-evolving, tech-driven global landscape.

Keywords: *intellectual property rights (IPR); traditional knowledge protection; TRIPS agreement impact; WTO and innovation*.

I. INTRODUCTION

In recent years, intellectual property rights (IPR) have become a hot topic in global conversations. With the creation of the World Trade Organization (WTO) and the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT), the importance of protecting intellectual property has moved to the forefront of international discourse. As the world becomes increasingly interconnected, the issues around creating, safeguarding, and sometimes misusing intellectual property are becoming more complicated by the day.

But when we look at India, the situation feels a bit more complicated. While IPR holds immense potential for driving growth, India faces a number of barriers in fully harnessing its benefits. Weak infrastructure, a shortage of intellectual resources, and, perhaps most importantly, a general lack of awareness about IPR among the public make it challenging for local communities and individuals to navigate the system. The system, as it currently stands, doesn't always seem to offer a straightforward or accessible way for people to protect their creations. To add another layer of difficulty, the legal framework that governs intellectual property is often at odds with traditional Indian values and practices, making it harder for many to relate to or engage with the system in a meaningful way. India, with its rich heritage of knowledge in areas like Ayurveda, agriculture, chemistry, astrology, and more,

* Adv. Priyanka, Punjab & Haryana High Court, Chandigarh, Email: priyanka678725@gmail.com

finds itself at a crossroads. Sadly, much of this traditional knowledge has been left unprotected under current intellectual property laws.

The researcher aims to explore why it's so important to protect India's traditional knowledge through IPR. A closer look is taken at how the judiciary, from district courts to the Supreme Court, has handled these issues and also draw comparisons with international cases addressing similar concerns. At the heart of the discussion is the concept of traditional knowledge, particularly within the Indian context covering areas like Ayurveda, Yoga, sculpture, metallurgy, tantra, astrology, and agriculture. The researcher examine instances where patents have been granted for products that seem to be based on traditional knowledge, which raises some important questions about ownership, recognition, and the issue of cultural appropriation.

II. RESEARCH METHOD

This research employs a qualitative, doctrinal approach to research, focusing on legal texts, international agreements, case laws, and secondary literature. The main goal is to dive into how frameworks like GATT, WTO, and TRIPS influence the protection of traditional knowledge, an issue that's becoming more relevant in today's interconnected world. The research utilizes a comparative approach, looking at key Indian and international court decisions, particularly in landmark cases related to biopiracy, software patents, and trade secrets. This comparison not only highlights the differences in legal views but also sheds light on how these issues are dealt with in different countries.

To get a deeper understanding, the official reports and documents from the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO) as well as India's initiatives, such as the Traditional Knowledge Digital Library (TKDL) are referred. These sources have given important insights into the ways traditional knowledge is being protected, along with the ongoing challenges that need to be addressed.

The researcher has also explored a variety of scholarly articles, legal commentaries, and policy papers, all of which have broadened my perspective on the evolving debate around intellectual property rights. By adopting a multidisciplinary approach that includes case studies, the author been able to pinpoint gaps in current legal frameworks. This allows to propose solutions that aren't just legally robust but also culturally sensitive and fair, which is crucial when we talk about protecting indigenous knowledge systems in a world that's changing so rapidly.

III. DISCUSSION AND RESULTS

3.1 Overview of TRIPS and Intellectual Property Rights

TRIPS: Nature, Scope, and Obligations - The story of global trade cooperation really starts with the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT), which was set up in 1944 and officially took off in 1948.[1] At first, the idea behind it was pretty simple, lower tariffs and quotas so that countries could trade more easily with one another. But as with most things in international relations, things didn't stay simple for long. By the 1970s, GATT wasn't just about tariffs anymore. It had grown to cover a lot of other areas, like technical standards, subsidies, anti-dumping rules, and even policies on government procurement.

Then came the Uruguay Round, a massive negotiation that took place from 1986 to 1994. It totally reshaped international trade and laid the groundwork for the creation of the World Trade Organization (WTO).[2] This was a huge turning point, as the WTO not only built on the GATT framework but also broadened the scope to include services such as banking, insurance, and

[1] General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, October 30, 1947, 55 U.N.T.S. 194.
[2] World Trade Organization, *The Results of the Uruguay Round of Multilateral Trade Negotiations: The Legal Texts* (Geneva: WTO, 1995)

telecommunications. One of the most significant outcomes of the Uruguay Round and one of the most debated was the introduction of the Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS) agreement.[3]

Before TRIPS, countries were pretty much doing their own thing when it came to intellectual property rights (IPR). Some gave patents for both products and processes in just about every field, while others were more selective, especially when it came to essential things like food, medicines, and chemicals. This patchy approach created more than a few headaches, it made trade harder and slowed down the sharing of technology and knowledge. As the world became more connected, this lack of consistency became a real issue. There was a clear need for a system that could bridge these gaps and make things more predictable and fair for everyone involved.

TRIPS recognizes intellectual property rights as private rights, but ones that should always be shaped by public policy and the broader developmental needs of countries, particularly those still building their technological capacity.[4] One of the thoughtful aspects of TRIPS is how it leaves room for flexibility, especially for least-developed countries (LDCs). It acknowledges that not all nations are on the same footing and gives them space to grow at their own pace.[5]

The agreement lays out harmonized global standards for a wide range of intellectual property categories. These include copyrights, trademarks, geographical indications, industrial designs, patents, new plant varieties, the design of integrated circuits, trade secrets, and even rules against anti-competitive practices in licensing.[6] Structurally, TRIPS is divided into seven parts and 73 articles, laying down universal guidelines and timelines for IPR protection across WTO member countries.[7]

One of the main goals of TRIPS is to fight counterfeiting and encourage trade practices that are not only smoother but also more transparent. What's interesting about TRIPS is how it strikes this balance between imposing strict global obligations and giving countries the flexibility to tailor its provisions according to their own national interests and development goals.[8] It's not a case of "one-size-fits-all"; applying and interpreting TRIPS requires each country to engage with it thoughtfully and carefully. This blend of global consistency and room for local adaptation makes TRIPS both intriguing and, at times, a bit controversial in the world of international trade law.

The Council for TRIPS (Article 68) -The Council for TRIPS, created under Article 68, is a crucial part of the TRIPS Agreement.[9] It's not just a ceremonial body, it actively ensures that the rules set out in the TRIPS Agreement are being followed by WTO members. It's a mix of a watchdog and a mediator, keeping an eye on how countries are fulfilling their commitments and stepping in when there are concerns or disputes about compliance. It's there to help keep everything on track and make sure that the system works as it was intended.

Intellectual Property Rights: Laws- When it comes to Intellectual Property Rights (IPR), the TRIPS Agreement lays out a pretty clear framework for protection and enforcement. But what stands out is how it strikes a balance between meeting international expectations and allowing countries the flexibility to adapt these laws to their own needs. The idea is that nations can shape their IPR laws to align with global standards, but they don't have to follow a one-size-fits-all approach. This flexibility

[3] Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS), April 15, 1994, Marrakesh Agreement Establishing the WTO, Annex 1C, 1869 U.N.T.S. 299.
[4] Ruth L. Okediji, "The Limits of Development Strategies at the Intersection of Intellectual Property and Human Rights," in *Intellectual Property and Human Development: Current Trends and Future Scenarios*, ed. Tzen Wong and Graham Dutfield (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), 19–43.
[5] TRIPS Agreement, arts. 65–66.
[6] TRIPS Agreement, arts. 9–40.
[7] Ibid.
[8] Daniel Gervais, *The TRIPS Agreement: Drafting History and Analysis*, 4th ed. (London: Sweet & Maxwell, 2012), 479.
[9] TRIPS Agreement, art. 68.

means that, while the core principles of TRIPS remain consistent, there's room for different countries to address IPR cases in ways that fit their unique circumstances and realities.

3.2 Technology Transfer, Capability Building, and Global Approaches

Technology Transfer and Capability Building - TRIPS ties intellectual property protection to bigger developmental goals, like technology transfer and capacity building especially for developing and least-developed countries (LDCs). It's not just about protecting patents or trademarks; it's about using those protections to fuel technological growth and innovation worldwide.

Several articles of TRIPS tackle these themes directly:

a. **Articles 3 & 4** talk about fairness in treatment, ensuring that nationals of one country are treated on par with others when it comes to IPR through national treatment and most-favoured-nation treatment principles.[10]
b. **Article 5** carves out space for multilateral agreements handled by the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO), keeping them outside certain TRIPS obligations.[11]
c. **Articles 7, 8, and 67** stand out for their focus on flexibility. These provisions give developing and LDCs a bit more breathing room, helping them harness technology for their own growth without being bogged down by overly rigid IPR rules.[12]

Some of the key highlights include:

a. **Article 7**: This article beautifully captures the spirit of balance by stating that IPR protection should promote technology transfer and serve both creators and users, while advancing overall social and economic welfare.[13]
b. **Article 8.1**: It allows countries to craft laws that safeguard public health, nutrition, and vital economic sectors, provided these laws remain consistent with TRIPS.[14]
c. **Article 8.2**: Here, members are given the right to prevent the misuse of IPR like monopolistic practices that can stifle innovation or block the sharing of technology.[15]
d. **Article 67**: Developed countries are called upon to assist developing nations and LDCs, offering technical and financial support so they can build effective IPR systems. This reflects a sense of global responsibility.[16]

Real-World Example: The U.S. Approach - A good example of how national laws align with TRIPS can be seen in the United States. In 1996, legislation limited the patentability of medical, therapeutic, and diagnostic procedures. What's important here is that it strikes a balance, healthcare professionals can focus on saving lives without the fear of being sued for patent infringement, while patents in this area are still respected where appropriate. It's a smart way of protecting public interest while staying within the TRIPS framework.

In essence, the TRIPS Agreement is more than just a set of rigid rules for protecting intellectual property. It's a carefully crafted framework that tries to balance universal standards with national priorities, leaving space for developing countries to grow and innovate. It integrates technology transfer and capacity building into the larger IPR conversation reminding that intellectual property should be a

[10] Smith and Thomas, *International Trade and Intellectual Property*, 112.
[11] World Intellectual Property Organization, *WIPO and International Treaties* (Geneva: WIPO Press, 2005), 156.
[12] "The Role of TRIPS in Developing Countries," *International Trade Review* 24, no. 2 (2006): 45.
[13] TRIPS Agreement, Article 7, World Trade Organization, 1994.
[14] Ibid., Article 8.1.
[15] Ibid., Article 8.2.
[16] Ibid., Article 67.

tool for collective progress, not just private profit. By aiming to harmonize national and global interests, TRIPS seeks to foster a fairer, more inclusive international trade environment.[17]

Case Study: Moves by African Countries and China - African nations, through the Organization of African Unity (OAU), have made significant strides in protecting their natural resources. One of their key initiatives was the creation of a model bill designed to ensure that the rights to products derived from Africa's rich natural resources stay with the indigenous communities.[18] This is a crucial step in reclaiming ownership and control, especially in a world where multinational corporations often reap the majority of the benefits from bio-prospecting. The goal of this bill is to establish a more cohesive legal framework across African countries, preventing foreign companies from exploiting legal loopholes and moving freely between nations. It's an effort to ensure that Africa's natural wealth supports its own people rather than fueling exploitation.

But not all African nations were completely aligned on this. In a later discussion published in *Nature* (1999), fifteen French-speaking OAU countries suggested adopting the International Convention for the Protection of New Varieties of Plants (UPOV). This is an international system designed to protect plant-related intellectual property, but it has also been criticized for prioritizing commercial interests over farmers' rights and indigenous knowledge. It's a tricky situation, on one hand, there's a desire to modernize laws in line with global standards, but on the other, there's a risk of sidelining local communities. As of now, this proposal is still under review, and it will be interesting to see how these countries eventually strike a balance.

On a similar note, China took some bold steps back in 1998 and what makes this especially notable is that it wasn't even a member of the World Trade Organization (WTO) at the time. In September of that year, China introduced strict regulations on the collection and use of human genetic resources. These regulations made it mandatory to seek official approval for any research involving the testing, collection, or export of human genetic material, including genomes, genes, and related products. This move was clearly about asserting control over valuable national resources in the emerging biotech space. Around the same time, China also invested heavily in genomics research, with over $30 million allocated to boost its bio-scientific capabilities.[19] It's a great example of a country recognizing the value of its genetic resources early and taking concrete steps to protect and capitalize on them.

3.3 Protection of Intellectual Property under the TRIPS Agreement

Protection of Existing Subject Matter under the TRIPs Agreement - Shifting gears to international trade law, the TRIPs Agreement, which governs intellectual property rights at a global level, also addresses the protection of existing subject matter through Article 70. This part of the agreement focuses on how to deal with works that had already entered the public domain before TRIPs came into effect. Essentially, it clarifies that WTO members aren't required to suddenly restore protection to these older works, which makes sense because doing so would create legal chaos.[20]

One of the interesting aspects here is Article 70.7, which allows for the amendment of claims in pending Intellectual Property Rights (IPR) applications to enhance their protection, a sort of legal flexibility built into the system. When it comes to product patents, Articles 70.8 and 70.9 really shook

[17] G.K. Sharma, *The TRIPS Agreement: Bridging Global Interests* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 230.
[18] Organization of African Unity, *Model Bill on Bio-prospecting* (Addis Ababa: OAU, 2001), 19.
[19] Zhao and Li, *China's Biotech Investment and Policy* (Beijing: Beijing University Press, 2000), 98.
[20] World Trade Organization (WTO), *The TRIPS Agreement: Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights*, Article 70. Available at: www.wto.org.

things up. They required member states to accept patent applications for pharmaceuticals and agro-chemicals, and to grant what's called Exclusive Marketing Rights (EMRs) starting January 1, 1995.[21]

In response, India passed the Patents (Amendment) Act of 1999, which made its own changes to the system. The law introduced something called 'pipeline protection' and EMRs, specifically aimed at pharmaceuticals and agro-chemicals. But India wasn't just jumping on the bandwagon, they took a thoughtful approach. They included a crucial exception in Section 24A, making sure that these EMRs wouldn't apply to products based on traditional Indian medicine.[22]

This was a really significant and culturally aware decision. Ayurveda, Siddha, and other indigenous knowledge systems are a big part of India's heritage, and the move helped ensure that remedies and practices that were already in the public domain under the Indian Medicine Central Council Act of 1970 wouldn't be swept up and locked away by new patent laws. It was a balance between modernization and respect for tradition, something that often gets overlooked in legal and policy discussions but was clearly a priority here.[23]

Protection of Computer Programs under the TRIPs Agreement - In today's digital age, where everything seems to run online, protecting computer programs has become more important than ever. With e-commerce booming and tech services expanding, ensuring that creators' rights are safeguarded is crucial. That's where the TRIPs Agreement, a key international treaty on intellectual property, comes in. It's a bit like the rulebook for global IP protection, and it has some important things to say about computer software.

Article 10 of the TRIPs Agreement lays out protections for computer programs, and it's fascinating to see how it treats lines of code, something so technical, as if they were works of art like novels or poems! According to Article 10.1, whether it's in source code or object code, computer programs are protected as *literary works* under the Berne Convention.[24] This article also allows for reverse engineering under certain circumstances. Developers can figure out how software works and use that knowledge to create something compatible or innovative, without outright copying someone else's work. This helps foster a healthy competitive environment.

Article 10.2 goes a step further by protecting compilations of data or materials that show a bit of intellectual creativity. However, it's clear that this doesn't extend to protecting the raw data itself, which makes sense, since data can be reused and interpreted in multiple ways. This is important because while the creative way data is organized deserves recognition, the raw facts remain free for public use.[25]

What's also notable is that TRIPs leaves it open for member countries to use other intellectual property tools like patents to protect software. The United States, for example, uses a combination of copyright and patent laws to safeguard software innovations. Additionally, Article 11 grants rental rights to authors, giving them control over the commercial renting of their computer programs and films. That said, there are exceptions, especially where renting isn't the primary business activity, or where it doesn't result in mass unauthorized copying.

Domain Names and Trademark Infringement - As we've become more entrenched in the digital age, a new problem has started to surface, cyber-squatting. This is when people register domain names that are either identical to or deceptively similar to popular business names or trademarks, often with bad intentions. In response to this growing issue, many countries have updated their cyber laws to deal with it more effectively. It's easy to see why courts around the world have been quick to address this

[21] WTO, *The TRIPS Agreement*, Article 70.7.
[22] India, *Patents (Amendment) Act*, 1999.
[23] Indian Medicine Central Council Act, 1970, Section 24A.
[24] WTO, *The TRIPS Agreement*, Article 10.
[25] WTO, *The TRIPS Agreement*, Article 10.2.

problem. In the UK, for example, courts have consistently recognized that registering a domain name similar to an established brand could confuse consumers and damage the brand's reputation.[26]

In India, one case that really stands out is the *1999 Yahoo India case*. Yahoo Inc. filed a lawsuit against Akash Arora and Netlink Internet Services after they registered the domain "YahooIndia.com." The Delhi High Court ruled in favor of Yahoo, reinforcing that trademark laws aren't just for the physical world, they apply online too.[27]

Protection of Undisclosed Information and Real-World IP Disputes - In today's fast-moving business world, keeping undisclosed information safe like trade secrets and proprietary technologies has become absolutely crucial. It's not just about protecting what's secret; it's about preserving a company's identity, its innovation, and its edge in an increasingly competitive market.

The Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS) sets out the global minimum standards for protecting this kind of information, with Article 39 being especially important. This is particularly vital in industries like pharmaceuticals and agriculture, where companies often submit sensitive data on new chemical entities to government authorities. If these companies don't have strong safeguards in place, they risk losing more than just their ideas, they could lose their entire market position.

Given all these risks, it's no surprise that businesses are starting to take a more proactive approach. These days, companies are putting more effort into identifying their most valuable intellectual property, locking down access to sensitive data, and ramping up security measures like encryption and multi-layered access controls. Most employment contracts already include confidentiality clauses, but that's just the bare minimum. More and more, companies are having employees sign technology assignment agreements to make sure that any innovations created while on the job automatically belong to the company, not the individual. It's not just about protecting assets anymore; it's about making sure there's no grey area when it comes to ownership.

As someone who's passionate about intellectual property law, it's fascinating to watch how the legal landscape evolves in step with the business world. The balancing act between protecting corporate interests and fostering innovation is a tricky one, but the way companies are responding provides real-world insights for anyone navigating both legal and business challenges today.

3.4 Case Studies and Judicial Trends in IP Law

Case Study: State Street Bank & Trust Co. vs Signature Financial Group[28] - One landmark case that really shifted the landscape for software protection was the 1998 decision in *State Street Bank & Trust Co. vs Signature Financial Group*. The core issue here was whether software could be patented, something traditionally covered only by copyright.

The U.S. Court came up with an interesting ruling: software could indeed be patented, provided it applied a mathematical formula to produce a "useful, concrete, and tangible result."[29] This decision was groundbreaking because it opened up the possibility of patent protection for certain software inventions, a move that significantly expanded the scope of intellectual property law in the tech world.

However, while this case marked a major milestone, it also highlighted the growing need for a consistent global framework. Without it, international software trade could become fragmented and unfair, leaving innovators unsure about their rights in various markets. It would create a lot of confusion and make it harder for people to navigate the complexities of global trade, which isn't ideal for anyone.

---

[26] UK Courts, *Cases on Cyber-squatting*, *Internet Trademark Disputes Review* 2001.
[27] *Yahoo Inc. v. Akash Arora & Netlink Internet Services*, Delhi High Court, 1999.
[28] *State Street Bank & Trust Co. v. Signature Financial Group, Inc.*, 149 F.3d 1368 (Fed. Cir. 1998).
[29] *State Street Bank & Trust Co. v. Signature Financial Group*, 149 F.3d 1368 (Fed. Cir. 1998).

Case Studies of Intellectual Property Disputes - When it comes to intellectual property (IP) rights and trade secrets, there are some cases that really drive home just how important it is to protect sensitive business information. One that stands out is the legal clash between Motorola and Integrated Circuit Systems (ICS). Back in July 1999, Motorola sued ICS and a number of former executives who had left Motorola's Timing Solutions Operation to start their own competing business. Motorola accused them of misusing its trade secrets and business strategies, alleging they were breaching their fiduciary duties.[30] While ICS and the former employees denied these claims, the two sides ended up settling the case in March 2000. Motorola dropped the lawsuit in exchange for a confidential financial settlement, restrictions on ICS's use of proprietary technology, and limits on their ability to recruit former Motorola employees. Motorola even went so far as to claim certain rights over ICS's intellectual property going forward. It really shows how far companies will go to protect their innovations.

Then there's the case between Walmart and Amazon, which happened around the same time. Walmart filed a lawsuit accusing Amazon of poaching employees who had access to Walmart's proprietary information. This one also settled in 1999, with Amazon agreeing to reassign certain employees and put measures in place to protect Walmart's trade secrets.[31]

Another case worth mentioning is the one between ColorSpan and Sentinel Imaging, which really highlights what can happen when employees jump ship to a competitor. In 1997, ColorSpan won a $2.2 million settlement after accusing Sentinel Imaging of stealing trade secrets. The problem was that Sentinel had hired two of ColorSpan's former employees, who allegedly passed on sensitive technology and customer data to their new employer.[32]

Confidential and assignment agreements act as key safeguards, especially during critical transitions like employee moves, mergers, or acquisitions. These examples remind us that while ideas and innovations are what drive companies forward, it's the legal protection around them that keeps them secure. In today's fast-paced, competitive world, intellectual property isn't just a legal matter, it's a matter of survival.

Criteria for Patent Infringement: Case Studies and Judicial Proceedings - Patent infringement is a complex area of law that boils down to someone using, selling, or making a patented invention without the permission of the patent holder basically stealing their exclusive rights. But here's the catch: figuring out whether infringement has actually occurred isn't always cut and dry. Courts dig deep into whether the actions in question align with the specific claims outlined in the patent. Following are some landmark cases that really bring this to life.

In *SmithKline Beecham (SB) vs. Fujimoto Pharmaceutical Co*. case from 1998, for instance, SmithKline Beecham had patented a process for producing Cimetidine in Japan way back in 1973. Fast forward to 1986, and Fujimoto started importing and selling a generic version of the drug. That set off a major legal battle that lasted years. SB argued that its patent had been infringed from 1986 to 1993, and in the end, the Tokyo District Court sided with them. They awarded SB a hefty sum, ¥500 million in royalties (around $4.2 million) and ¥2.5 billion (about $21 million) in lost profits.[33] This case resulted in one of the largest patent infringement awards in Japan, underscoring how seriously courts take violations of IP rights. It reflects the financial risks companies face when they don't respect patents.

---

[30] Peter K. Yu, "Trade Secret Hacking, Online Data Breaches, and the Challenges of Cybersecurity," *Washington Law Review* 96 (2021): 1115.
[31] William M. Landes and Richard A. Posner, *The Economic Structure of Intellectual Property Law* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2003), 88.
[32] Ibid.
[33] Carlos M. Correa, *Intellectual Property Rights, the WTO and Developing Countries: The TRIPS Agreement and Policy Options* (London: Zed Books, 2000), 127.

One another intriguing patent dispute is between Genentech Inc. and Novopharma. Genentech owned a U.S. patent for producing human growth hormone (hGH) using recombinant DNA technology. Novopharma, however, used a different method involving a bacterial host and a "cleavable conjugate expression" technique. Genentech filed a patent infringement lawsuit in 1994, seeking to block Novopharma's product. The District Court initially sided with Genentech, granting a preliminary injunction, but the Court of Appeals later overturned the decision, concluding that Novopharma's method didn't infringe Genentech's patent.[34] And then things got even more complicated. Genentech sought another patent, but this time, its validity was challenged based on the "enablement" requirement, essentially, whether the patent was detailed enough for someone skilled in the field to actually use the invention. The court ultimately found that the patent was too vague, particularly when it came to producing hGH using Novopharma's method, and invalidated it. This case serves as a crucial reminder that patent claims need to be precise and comprehensive.

Looking back at these cases, it's clear that patent infringement is never as straightforward as it seems. These disputes are often high-stakes, filled with technical details, and come with major financial consequences. It is thereby essential for inventors and companies to be meticulous when drafting their patents, to act quickly to protect their rights, and to manage their intellectual property portfolios effectively.

The USPTO Decision and What It Means - On November 3, 1999, the United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO) made a game-changing decision when it dismissed a patent application, citing the statutory bar under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b). It says that an invention can't be patented if it was publicly disclosed more than a year before the application was filed. The case that triggered this ruling involved herbarium samples from the Field Museum in Chicago, which contained specimens of *B. Caapi*. These plants had flowers that looked strikingly similar to those of *Da Vine*, the plant at the heart of the patent application.[35]

The real issue here was that these herbarium samples had been accessible to the public for much longer than a year before the patent was filed. The USPTO concluded that the flower color of *Da Vine* wasn't distinctive enough from what was already known, leading them to reject the patent. The ruling established that herbarium samples could be considered "printed publications" under § 102(b). This wasn't a new concept, as earlier rulings had already treated things like doctoral theses and even award recommendations as "published" in the eyes of patent law.

This decision was a big deal, especially when it comes to how we think about traditional knowledge in the world of intellectual property. It marked a shift toward recognizing unconventional sources like herbariums, as part of the body of existing knowledge that could prevent new patents from being granted. It essentially broadened what we consider "traditional practices," now including things like modern adaptations, such as psychotherapy.

This ruling paved the way for initiatives like the "Traditional Knowledge Digital Libraries," which are working to digitize and protect indigenous knowledge.[36] The decision made it clear that intellectual property law needed to evolve to reflect the rich diversity of knowledge systems that exist around the world, especially when it comes to indigenous and traditional contributions.

---

[34] Graham Dutfield, *Intellectual Property Rights and the Life Science Industries: A Twentieth Century History* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2003), 156.
[35] World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO), "Traditional Knowledge and the Patent System," *WIPO Magazine*, no. 6 (2003).
[36] Ramesh Abhishek, "TKDL: A Unique Approach to Protecting Traditional Knowledge," *Journal of Intellectual Property Rights* 15, no. 4 (2010): 312–318.

3.5 Traditional Knowledge, Benefit Sharing, and Indigenous Rights

Lessons Learned from Patent Protection and Traditional Knowledge - When it comes to patent protection, the rule is simple: full transparency. The invention has to be clearly and thoroughly disclosed, so the public can fully understand it and, in theory, replicate it. In the world of complex biotechnological inventions, this need for transparency is even more crucial. For example, cleavable hGH fusion expression, in this, the failure to provide enough detailed information meant the invention couldn't meet the tough standards required for a patent.[37]

Another important issue is how traditional knowledge fits into today's patent system. Traditional knowledge is constantly evolving, it's not something that can be easily captured or categorized in a static database. This makes documenting it a huge challenge. It's not just about gathering facts or data; it's about understanding the cultural, spiritual, and social context behind it. Without standardized methods for documentation, there are serious concerns about privacy, misuse, and exploitation.[38] If we're not careful, documenting this knowledge could end up doing more harm than good, marginalizing indigenous communities even further rather than empowering them.

This is where current intellectual property systems, which are supposed to protect new inventions, often fall short when it comes to safeguarding traditional knowledge.[39] The nature of traditional knowledge just doesn't fit neatly into the frameworks of modern patent law. But the good news is that people are actively working on solutions. New IT tools and alternative models of intellectual property rights are starting to emerge. For instance, community-driven initiatives and NGOs are creating more inclusive databases that account for traditional knowledge.[40] Some of the projects like NAPRALERT and the CSIR's work on medicinal plants are definitely moving in the right direction. Still, many of these databases haven't quite met the needs of patent offices. Ideally, we need a robust database that can establish prior art to prevent patents from being granted on inventions that essentially rip off traditional knowledge. Taking an idea of the scale of the problem, a study of 726 U.S. patents found that nearly half of them (49%) were based on traditional knowledge.[41]

This growing need for accurate and reliable documentation has led to initiatives like the Traditional Knowledge Digital Library (TKDL), which works to organize and protect traditional knowledge in a way that ensures it's properly considered in patent applications.[42] The World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO) has also rolled out programs like WIPONET to make patent information more accessible, reduce costs, and generally improve the patent-granting process.[43]

One particular case that really highlights the clash between patent law and traditional knowledge is the story of U.S. Plant Patent No. 5,751, granted in 1986. This patent claimed a new variety of *Banisteriopsis caapi*, a plant native to the Amazon rainforest. For centuries, indigenous communities had used this plant for medicinal and ceremonial purposes. The patent holder, a man named Miller, had obtained the plant from an Amazon nursery and recognized its medicinal value. However, he completely failed to acknowledge its long-standing use by indigenous groups.

---

[37] Reichman, Jerome H. "Legal Hybrids Between the Patent and Copyright Paradigms." *Columbia Law Review* 94, no. 8 (1994): 2432.
[38] Posey, Darrell A., and Graham Dutfield. *Beyond Intellectual Property: Toward Traditional Resource Rights for Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities*. IDRC, 1996.
[39] Dutfield, Graham. "Protecting Traditional Knowledge: Pathways to the Future." *ICTSD Issue Paper No. 16*, 2006.
[40] Ibid.
[41] Robinson, Daniel F., and Pedro Martinez. "Patent Disclosure Requirements and the Protection of Traditional Knowledge." *The Journal of World Intellectual Property* 13, no. 2 (2010): 93–122.
[42] CSIR-TKDL. "About TKDL." Traditional Knowledge Digital Library. Accessed April 23, 2025. https://www.csir.res.in/tkdl.
[43] WIPO. "WIPONET Overview." World Intellectual Property Organization. Accessed April 23, 2025. https://www.wipo.int/wiponet.

The patent described the plant's unique characteristics like its leaf sizes and flower color, suggesting it was a new variety. But Miller didn't bother referencing any studies on wild specimens of the plant or its traditional uses. According to U.S. patent law, plant patents can only be granted for new varieties that are cultivated, not wild plants.[44] So, this raised the question if this was really a new invention.

In 1994, the Coordinating Body of Indigenous Organizations of the Amazon Basin (COICA), which represents over 400 indigenous groups, discovered that Miller's patented plant had been in use by their communities for centuries.[45] The indigenous groups were understandably outraged. The plant wasn't just a medicinal herb, it had deep religious and cultural significance. They demanded a re-examination of the patent, arguing that the differences between the patented variety and their traditional B. caapi were minimal, if they existed at all. They also pointed out that the plant had a sacred role in Amazonian ceremonies, which Miller had completely ignored. To make matters worse, prior research from U.S. herbaria had documented the plant long before Miller filed for the patent, proving it was already part of the public domain.

This case really drives home a larger issue that intellectual property systems need to evolve to better protect the rights of indigenous communities. In the end, the patent was denied, which marked a victory for those advocating for the recognition of traditional knowledge.[46] But it also highlighted the fact that intellectual property laws must do more to safeguard knowledge that has been passed down through generations, rather than allowing it to be exploited for profit without the consent of the communities that have preserved it.

The Basmati Rice Issue - One of the most intriguing intellectual property cases involved US Patent No. 5663484, granted to RiceTec, Inc. on September 2, 1997.[47] The patent, which was filed back in 1994, covered a rice plant developed in North Central or South America. But what made this case so much more than just a patent dispute was the name "Basmati," a term steeped in centuries of agricultural and cultural history in India and Pakistan.

For India, this wasn't just about protecting a variety of rice, it was about defending a centuries-old tradition. Basmati rice is so much more than just a food product. Grown in the Greater Punjab region, which straddles the border between India and Pakistan, Basmati rice has been a staple in the lives of millions for generations. The very name "Basmati" brings to mind images of rolling fields, time-honored farming practices, and cultural significance that goes far beyond mere agriculture.

In this context, the Agricultural and Processed Foods Exports Development Authority (APEDA) in India decided to challenge the patent, arguing that the term "Basmati" was tied to a specific geographical region and, as such, couldn't be used by anyone, anywhere.[48] The issue wasn't just about the rice itself, but about the protection of a geographical indication. Much like Champagne or Scotch whisky, which can only be made in their respective regions, APEDA argued that Basmati should be a name exclusive to rice grown in the Basmati-growing regions of India and Pakistan.

By the late 1990s, Basmati rice had become a significant part of India's agricultural exports, with nearly 600,000 tons shipped abroad in 1998 alone.[49] This wasn't just a business; it was a source of national pride. In 2000, APEDA presented scientific evidence to counter RiceTec's claims,

---

[44] Id.
[45] Dutfield, Graham. "Protecting Traditional Knowledge and Folklore." UNCTAD-ICTSD Project on IPRs and Sustainable Development, 2003.
[46] Tobin, Brendan. "Redefining Perspectives in the Search for Protection of Traditional Knowledge: A Case Study from Peru." *RECIEL* 10, no. 1 (2001): 47–64.
[47] US Patent No. 5663484, RiceTec Inc., issued September 2, 1997.
[48] Agricultural and Processed Food Products Export Development Authority (APEDA), Government of India.
[49] APEDA Export Statistics, 1998.

demonstrating that the qualities RiceTec was describing in their patent were already inherent in traditional Basmati varieties.[50] The goal wasn't just to block a patent, it was to preserve the authenticity of a product that held immense cultural and economic value for India.

The heart of the argument came down to a simple question: Should "Basmati" be treated like other globally recognized geographical names? Shouldn't it be protected as part of the heritage and identity of the people who have cultivated it for generations? In the end, the case wasn't just about intellectual property law, it was about honoring tradition and ensuring that the story of Basmati rice continued to be told by the people who had nurtured it for centuries.

India's Legal Challenge- India wasn't fighting this battle alone. Organizations like the International Center for Technology Assessment (ICTA) and the Research Foundation for Science, Technology, and Ecology (RFSTE) joined forces, filing petitions to protect the authenticity of terms like "Basmati" and "Jasmine," ensuring they would only apply to rice grown in their traditional regions – India and Thailand.[51] The petitions weren't just about words; they highlighted how mislabeling American-grown rice as "Basmati" or "Jasmine" was misleading consumers and causing real harm to farmers in Asia.

Take RiceTec, for example. They marketed rice varieties like "Texmati" and "Jasmati" as American substitutes for Basmati and Jasmine, despite these names being deeply tied to Asia's rice-growing heritage.[52] The petitions called for the US Department of Agriculture (USDA) and the Federal Trade Commission (FTC) to step in, demanding that only rice grown in these traditional regions could carry those names.This wasn't just about a legal dispute; it was about cultural identity, heritage, and the value of tradition. The appropriation of a name like Basmati shows how intellectual property laws can go beyond legal principles and touch something much deeper, reminding us of the stakes when cultural symbols are hijacked.

Status of Legal Actions - By September 2000, there was a notable change in the legal scene. RiceTec, under mounting pressure from APEDA and the global community, decided to back down and withdrew four of its patent claims.[53] This move signaled a shift, but the battle was far from finished. In fact, RiceTec had already pulled its "Texamati" trademark application in the UK in 1999. Plus, back in 1997, a Greek court had firmly rejected RiceTec's attempt to trademark "American Basmati," a strong message that the international community wasn't going to let this sacred name be hijacked without a fight. While these wins were significant, the final resolution of the legal cases is still up in the air, and it's clear that this issue isn't going away anytime soon.

Case Study: Fair Benefit Sharing with Indigenous Tribes - One case that really stands out to me when thinking about fair benefit-sharing is the collaboration between the Tropical Botanical Garden and Research Institute (TBGRI) in Kerala, India, and the Kani tribe.[54] The Kani people had long known about the incredible medicinal properties of *Trichopus Zeylanicus*, a plant that later turned out to be key to an important breakthrough. In a move that I think is worth highlighting, TBGRI worked closely with the Kani tribe to establish a system that would ensure the Kani people were fairly compensated for their knowledge.

TBGRI patented the plant's medicinal properties and licensed it to an Ayurvedic company, but with an agreement that 50% of the licensing fee and 2% of the royalties from sales would go directly to

[50] RFSTE and APEDA submissions to USPTO, 2000.
[51] International Center for Technology Assessment (ICTA), Petition to the USPTO, 2000.
[52] Ibid.
[53] APEDA Press Release, September 2000.
[54] Anil K. Gupta, "Rewarding Traditional Knowledge and Contemporary Grassroots Creativity," *International Journal of Biotechnology* 2, no. 1–3 (2000).

the Kani families.[55] TBGRI didn't stop there, they took it a step further by helping 50 Kani families set up the cultivation of the plant. This not only gave the tribe a direct stake in the success of the innovation but also ensured they had a steady source of income.

It is crucial to create legal systems that ensure indigenous communities receive fair compensation for their traditional knowledge. It's about more than just giving them credit; it's about ensuring that they're able to reap tangible rewards from the innovations that stem from their age-old wisdom. The Kani tribe's experience serves as a powerful reminder of how delicate the balance is between intellectual property protection and respecting indigenous rights, getting it right is key to building trust and fostering sustainable development.

Case Studies on Intellectual Property and Benefit Sharing - The intersection of intellectual property (IP) rights and benefit-sharing is an area that's gaining more attention, not just in the scientific world, but also in indigenous communities. IP law shapes everything from the distribution of resources to conservation efforts, and even the safeguarding of traditional knowledge. These cases show us how tricky it can be to patent natural resources, and why it's so important that communities who contribute to these discoveries are fairly compensated.

Take the 1995 discovery at the University of California, for example. Pamela Roland and her team cloned the Xa21 gene, a breakthrough that made rice resistant to certain bacterial diseases. The University patented this gene, which led to a significant reduction in pesticide use, benefiting both the environment and agriculture.[56] What stood out, though, was that the University didn't just claim ownership of this innovation, they set up a "Genetic Resources Recognition Fund." This wasn't just about owning the patent; it was about giving back. The fund was used to support graduate fellowships for students from the countries that had originally provided the rice plants. It's a great example of how scientific progress can be paired with fair benefit-sharing, ensuring that the communities that contributed to the innovation aren't forgotten.

Then there's the story of Shaman Pharmaceuticals, which works at the crossroads of indigenous knowledge and modern science. The company focuses on tropical plants used in traditional medicine, pushing products quickly through clinical trials. But their model is about more than just financial exchange, they also offer short-term aid, like healthcare and infrastructure, alongside long-term commitments such as the Healing Forest Conservancy, which helps preserve both biodiversity and cultural heritage.[57] This holistic approach shows that benefit-sharing is not just about money rather it's about building lasting, sustainable relationships with indigenous communities.

Now, entering into the digital age, new challenges are emerging. The online world has brought about complicated jurisdictional issues when it comes to intellectual property disputes. When IP rights are violated on the internet, it can be difficult to determine which court should have jurisdiction. The European Court of Justice (ECJ) has been working on guidelines for these cases, but many questions remain. Take the ECJ's ruling in *GAT v. LuK*, for example. It clarified that the court handling a patent infringement case must also address the validity of the patent.[58] This is crucial in a digital world where infringements can cross borders, clear rules on jurisdiction are important for effective enforcement.

To sum it all up, these case studies give us a glimpse into the complex relationship between intellectual property, benefit-sharing, and the rights of local and indigenous communities. They remind us that protecting traditional knowledge and ensuring a fair distribution of scientific benefits isn't just

[55] Suman Sahai, "Bioprospecting or Biopiracy? The Kani-TBGRI Deal in Kerala," *Economic and Political Weekly* (2000)
[56] K. R. Dronamraju, *Biological and Social Issues in Biotechnology Sharing* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 1999), 45–50.
[57] D. R. Downes and S. A. Laird, "Innovative Mechanisms for Sharing Benefits of Biodiversity and Related Knowledge: Case Studies" (UNCTAD Biotrade Initiative, 1999), 23–27.
[58] Case C-4/03 GAT and Dr. Oesterreichische Versicherung v. LuK, EU:C:2006:63 (2006).

a legal issue, it's a moral one. Whether through partnerships, patent revocation, or navigating the challenges of cross-border jurisdiction, these cases highlight the evolving challenges in intellectual property law and point toward potential solutions that can help create a more equitable and just system.

3.6 The Role of Licensing in Intellectual Property Protection

The Role of Licensing Agreements - Licensing agreements are way more important than they might seem at first glance. They're these legal contracts that allow creators, inventors, or businesses to share their intellectual property with others, but on their own terms. Think of them as the bridge between letting someone use your work and ensuring you're compensated for it. They come in all sorts of flavors: tech licenses, publishing licenses, entertainment licenses, and even trademark or merchandising licenses. Each one serves a different purpose, but they all have one thing in common, they help protect what's yours.

For instance, technology licenses usually involve things like patents, trade secrets, software, and other kinds of technical know-how. These are the heart of innovation in fields like engineering and tech. Then, there's the creative side, publishing and entertainment licenses, which deal with books, films, music, and other creative works. Finally, we have trademark and merchandising licenses, which revolve around brand names, logos, and anything that represents a company's identity in the marketplace.

One case that really stuck with me was between the British Technology Group (BTG) and DePuy Orthopedics. It involved a patent for hip joint technology, which BTG had licensed to DePuy back in 1989. Over time, though, the relationship between the two companies started to sour, especially when it came to the specifics of the license. The case made me realize just how crucial it is to be crystal clear about every single detail in a licensing agreement. The specifics like the validity of a patent or the obligations of both parties matter more than we often think, especially when there's money on the line.

In today's world, where things move at lightning speed, protecting intellectual property is non-negotiable. It's not just about being cautious; it's about staying competitive. Whether it's through confidentiality clauses in employee contracts or creating rock-solid licensing agreements, companies need to make sure they have safeguards in place to protect their assets. The stakes are just too high not to.

IV. CONCLUSION

The conversation around intellectual property rights (IPR) and traditional knowledge has really picked up pace, especially since the 1990s, when the Dunkel Report during the Uruguay Round of GATT negotiations introduced the TRIPS agreement. India, as a member of GATT, was naturally pulled into the web of complex provisions laid out in TRIPS and TRIMS.

After India opened up its economy in 1991, things started to shift. We had IPR laws in place like the Patent, Copyright, and Trademark Acts, but traditional knowledge wasn't really a part of that conversation. Back then, there wasn't much focus on how deeply intertwined traditional knowledge was with the country's identity and history. It felt like this rich knowledge passed down through generations didn't quite fit in the legal boxes that existed.

What's been changing over the years is a growing recognition that traditional knowledge deserves its place in the IPR framework. Globalization, privatization, and liberalization have all played their part in reshaping how we view trade and intellectual property, but there's still a long way to go. Traditional knowledge isn't just some cultural artifact or historical footnote anymore; it's valuable, and it matters in global conversations around IPR.

But here's the thing, definitions of both IPR and traditional knowledge need to catch up with the times. It's not enough to just have a one-size-fits-all approach anymore. We need a more inclusive

framework that can respect and protect a range of practices, from ancient healing methods and agricultural wisdom to folklore and rituals.

Protecting traditional knowledge isn't just about holding on to the past, though. Yes, preserving culture is important, but it's also about the real-world value this knowledge brings to the table. And let's not forget the human rights side of it. The people who have been the stewards of this knowledge, indigenous communities often don't have the resources or legal know-how to protect what's rightfully theirs. It's a bit of a paradox that the very communities who hold this invaluable knowledge are the ones who are least equipped to defend it legally.

One of the biggest challenges when it comes to traditional knowledge and intellectual property rights (IPR) is just how little people actually know about it. Even many legal professionals and business folks, people one'd expect to be familiar with these system struggle when it comes to the specifics of protecting traditional knowledge through IPR.

A dedicated awareness campaign is needed, not something generic, but something that speaks directly to the unique struggles faced when dealing with traditional knowledge. Yes, people should know about patents, trademarks, and copyrights in general, but more importantly, they need to understand how these frameworks interact (and often clash) with community-held, culturally rooted knowledge systems.

One idea that really excites me is setting up consultancy services that focus exclusively on this intersection of traditional knowledge and IPR. I can imagine how helpful it would be for small artisans, healers, or even local NGOs, people who don't have access to a legal team but are sitting on incredibly rich, valuable knowledge. But for this to really work, the process of applying for and managing IPR needs to be way less complicated than it currently is.

There are so many ways we could spread awareness more effectively, think hands-on training programs, engaging workshops, or even simple online and offline courses that break things down in plain language. And let's not forget printed materials. Multilingual pamphlets and booklets could go a long way in reaching folks in remote areas who don't always get included in these conversations. Of course, none of this is going to take off without solid government support. It's especially important to make sure these resources are reaching rural communities, where traditional knowledge often thrives but legal tools are far out of reach.

Another idea that keeps coming up and I think it's absolutely worth exploring is creating a national database for traditional knowledge. The potential is massive, not just for documentation, but for innovation and even responsible commercialization. Still, a lot of this knowledge is passed down orally or adapted over time, and it doesn't always fit neatly into a database. That's where documentation gets tricky. On one hand, it can help prevent biopiracy, ensuring that this knowledge isn't stolen and patented by outsiders. But on the other hand, we have to tread carefully, if we're not respectful in how we document and use this knowledge, we risk doing more harm than good. One solution could be developing a transparent system to track usage and ensure that the communities who've kept these traditions alive get a fair share when their knowledge is used.

Long-term, we need something even more tailored, maybe a completely unique legal framework (a sui generis system) that truly reflects the nature of traditional knowledge. Even a specialized tribunal to deal with related disputes could help, making sure these communities get the recognition and protection they deserve.

India has made progress, projects like the Traditional Knowledge Digital Library (TKDL) are amazing steps forward. But it's not enough just to document. We need to protect. And more importantly, we need to share the benefits with the people who've safeguarded this wisdom for generations.

REFERENCES

Books

Dutfield, Graham. *Intellectual Property, Biogenetic Resources and Traditional Knowledge*. Earthscan Publications Ltd, 2004.

Shiva, Vandana. *Biopiracy: The Plunder of Nature and Knowledge*. South End Press, 1997.

Singh, Raghbir. *Law Relating to Intellectual Property Rights*. LexisNexis Butterworths Wadhwa Nagpur, 2011.

Watal, Jayashree. *Intellectual Property Rights in the WTO and Developing Countries*. Kluwer Law International, 2001.

Journals

Gupta, Anil K. "Rewarding Traditional Knowledge and Contemporary Grassroots Creativity." *International Journal of Biotechnology* 2, no. 1–3 (2000): 113–132.

Sahai, Suman. "Bioprospecting or Biopiracy? The Kani-TBGRI Deal in Kerala." *Economic and Political Weekly* (2000): 2091–2092.

Correa, Carlos M. "Protection of Traditional Knowledge: Lessons from the Case of the Kani Tribe in India." *Case Western Reserve Journal of International Law* 35, no. 2 (2003): 371–384.

Dutfield, Graham. "Legal and Economic Aspects of Traditional Knowledge." *UNCTAD-ICTSD Policy Briefs*, Issue 20 (2006).

Jaka, Achmad, Santos Adiwijaya, Kukuh Komandoko, Danu Suryani, and Muhammad Vijay. "Urgensi Reformasi Undang-Undang Tentang Pembentukan Peraturan Perundang-Undangan Sebagai Dampak Penerapan Konsep Omnibus Law Di Indonesia." *Jurnal Ilmiah Living Law* 14, no. 2 (2022): 117–28. https://doi.org/10.30997/jill.v14i2.6299.

Trijono, Rachmat. "Alternatif Model Analisi Peraturan Perundang-Undangan." *Rechvinding: Media Pembinaan Hukum Nasional* 1, no. 3 (2012): 361–74. https://doi.org/10.33331/rechtsvinding.v1i3.90.

Electronic Citation

APEDA (Agricultural and Processed Food Products Export Development Authority). *Export Statistics*, 1998.

APEDA. *Press Release*. September 2000.

Chouchena-Rojas, Martha, Manuel Ruiz Muller, David Vivas, and Sebastian Winkler. *Disclosure Requirements: Ensuring Mutual Supportiveness Between the WTO TRIPS Agreement and the CBD*. IUCN, 2005.

Correa, Carlos M. *Traditional Knowledge and Intellectual Property: Issues and Options Surrounding the Protection of Traditional Knowledge*. Geneva: Quaker United Nations Office, 2001.

International Center for Technology Assessment (ICTA). *Petition to the USPTO*, 2000.

Reichman, Jerome H., and Catherine Hasenzahl. *Non-Voluntary Licensing of Patented Inventions: The Canadian Experience*, UNCTAD/ICTSD Issue Paper No. 5, 2003.

RFSTE and APEDA. *Submissions to the United States Patent and Trademark Office*, 2000.

RiceTec Inc. US Patent No. 5663484, issued September 2, 1997.

UNCTAD-ICTSD. *Resource Book on TRIPS and Development*, Cambridge University Press, 2005.

World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO). *Intellectual Property and Traditional Knowledge: Booklet No. 2*, WIPO Publication No. 920(E), 2001.

World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO). *The Role of the Intellectual Property System in the Access and Benefit-Sharing Regime*, 2017.

WIPO Intergovernmental Committee on Intellectual Property and Genetic Resources, Traditional Knowledge and Folklore. *Report on the Protection of Traditional Knowledge*, WIPO/GRTKF/IC/40/4, 2019.

WIPO. *WIPO Intellectual Property Handbook: Policy, Law and Use*, 2nd ed., WIPO Publication No. 489(E), 2004.

Laws and Regulations

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

Indian Patents Act, 1970 (as amended).

Biological Diversity Act, 2002 (India).

Protection of Plant Varieties and Farmers' Rights Act, 2001 (India).