Critical Analysis of Moral and Public Order Grounds Limiting Patent Protection

Neha Jagatap[1], Dr. Valarmathi R[2]
[2] *Professor, School of Law, Christ (Deemed to be University), Bengaluru*

Abstract: This article explores the intricate and multifaceted relationship between morality, public order, and patent protection, highlighting how ethical considerations significantly influence patent laws worldwide. It provides a comprehensive examination of the historical evolution of patent law alongside the philosophical foundations that underlie these legal frameworks. The focus is primarily on Indian law and its interaction with international agreements such as the Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS) and the European Patent Convention. The discussion reveals the inconsistencies and challenges that arise when moral standards are applied within patent law. A comparative analysis of landmark cases, notably Diamond v. Chakrabarty and the Oncomouse case, illustrates how ethical considerations can vary widely and impact legal outcomes. These cases exemplify the complexities surrounding the patenting process, particularly in fields like biotechnology and genetics, where the ethical implications of patenting living organisms are hotly debated. The article advocates for a series of reforms to create a balanced approach to the intersection of innovation and ethics. By striving to foster a legal environment that prioritizes both technological advancement and adherence to moral principles, the proposed reforms aim to address existing disparities within patent law. The ultimate goal is to ensure a fairer and more equitable patent system that considers the interests of inventors, consumers, and society. In conclusion, this article contributes to the ongoing discourse on harmonizing ethical considerations with the need for innovation in an ever-evolving global landscape. Analyzing the historical context and current legal frameworks underscores the importance of developing patent laws that are not only forward-thinking but also ethically sound, ensuring that the benefits of innovation are realized without compromising moral standards.

Keywords: Morality, Patents, Biotechnology, Public order, Technology.

INTRODUCTION

Patent law is essential in encouraging innovation by granting inventors exclusive rights to their creations and motivating investment in research and development. These rights are designed to reward creativity and stimulate progress but are not absolute. Ethical considerations and public interest often challenge the boundaries of patentability, particularly when the commercialization of inventions conflicts with societal values or poses risks to public welfare. The intersection of morality, public order, and patent law are especially contentious in fields like biotechnology, where advancements often raise significant ethical, environmental, and societal concerns.

Balancing the need for innovation to uphold ethical standards is a complex and evolving task. While patents incentivize scientific progress, they must also account for broader considerations, such as equitable benefits distribution and cultural and environmental integrity protection. This article critically examines the limitations on patent protection based on morality and public order, explicitly focusing on the Indian legal framework. By comparing Indian legislation with international systems, including TRIPS and the European Patent Convention, it explores inconsistencies and proposes a more balanced approach to patent law that harmonizes innovation with ethical principles and societal interests.

2. HISTORICAL EVOLUTION OF PATENT LAW

2.1 Origins of Patents

The origins of the patent system date back to the monopoly systems of 15th-century Venice, where inventors were granted exclusive rights to their creations as a reward for innovation. This early form of protection laid the foundation for the modern concept of patents. A significant milestone in the formalization of patent law came with the Statute of

Monopolies (1623) in England[1]. This legislation sought to distinguish legitimate inventions from monopolistic privileges that negatively impacted public welfare. It introduced the principle that patents should be granted exclusively for "manners of manufacture" that was beneficial and not contrary to the law or societal interests. By codifying these principles, the statute became the cornerstone of modern patent systems, emphasizing the balance between incentivizing innovation and protecting the public welfare.

2.2 Philosophical Underpinnings

The patent system is grounded in the principle of fairness, recognizing inventors' rights to benefit from their labor while advancing societal progress. This idea first gained prominence during the French Constitution Assembly of 1791, where it was declared that inventions beneficial to society belonged to their creators. This principle aligned intellectual property with material property, emphasizing inventors' contributions and protecting their interests. Over time, philosophers like John Locke, Immanuel Kant, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel, Michel de Servan, and Michel Foucault provided nuanced perspectives on this foundation.

John Locke's labor theory posits that ownership arises when labor adds value to natural resources. He argued that while natural resources are shared, individuals gain ownership by mixing their labor with these resources. This concept is foundational to intellectual property rights, as it justifies creators' claims over their innovations. However, Locke's theory struggles with applying objective standards to intellectual property, as creativity often lacks a tangible measure akin to physical labor. This leaves room for varied interpretations, complicating the establishment of consistent legal principles.

Immanuel Kant emphasized intellectual property as an extension of personal freedom. He argued that creators should have control over their work, including how it is shared and used. For Kant, intellectual property is grounded in the creator's will, reflecting their individuality and autonomy. He viewed safeguarding creative works as essential to respecting and preserving their authenticity, thereby ensuring moral and legal acknowledgment of originality.

Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel offered a dialectical framework connecting personal liberty with legal systems. He viewed freedom as central to his philosophy, achieved through reciprocal rights within a structured legal framework. Hegel acknowledged labor's role in transforming natural resources but emphasized the creator's intellectual contribution over physical labor. For Hegel, intellectual property ownership stems from the creator's will and the unique value they impart to their work.

Michel de Servan proposed that intellectual property rights weaken as more individuals contribute to the creation process, limiting the exclusivity of such rights to society rather than the contributors themselves. While innovative, his theory lacks the comprehensive philosophical foundation of Locke or Kant, particularly concerning practical applications like patents.

Michel Foucault offered a critical perspective, focusing on society's role in shaping intellectual property and moral rights. He highlighted how creators' connections with consumers and society influence the recognition and enforcement of moral rights. Foucault advocated for balancing creators' interests with societal needs, emphasizing the interdependence between creators and consumers.

Collectively, these philosophical perspectives illuminate the complexity underlying patent rights. They reveal the tension between individual creativity rewards and innovation's broader societal benefits. Locke's focus on labor, Kant's emphasis on freedom, Hegel's legal reciprocity, and Foucault's societal influence underscore the multifaceted nature of the intellectual property. These insights highlight the importance of balancing fairness, moral respect, and societal progress, forming the backbone of modern patent systems that foster creativity and innovation.[2]

2.3 Global Developments

The internationalization of patent law began with the Paris Convention for the Protection of Industrial Property (1883)[3], which introduced key principles like national treatment and priority rights. This treaty marked the first significant step towards harmonizing

[1] Sarah R. Wasserman Rajec, Advances in Patent Rights Acquisition in International Patent Law, 41 ARDOZO ARTS & ENT. L.J. 447 (2023).

[2] Y. Passeraud, "Historical Insights into Industrial Property Rights" 7 (WIPO, CEIPIIIP/SB/93 /1.1993)

[3] Paris Convention 1883

patent laws across jurisdictions. Subsequent agreements, including the Patent Cooperation Treaty (1970)[4] and the European Patent Convention (1973)[5], further streamlined procedural standards, enabling inventors to seek protections in multiple countries more efficiently. This legislation also underscored the necessity of addressing ethical dilemmas and public order concerns, particularly with the advent of biotechnological advancements that challenge traditional norms of patentability.

3. LEGAL FRAMEWORK IN INDIA

3.1 Evolution of Indian Patent Law

India's patent law has evolved substantially, transforming from colonial-era legislation aligned with national priorities and public welfare. Initially shaped by colonial influence, the earliest form of patent law in India was Act VI of 1856[6], modeled on British law, which granted inventors exclusive rights for a limited period. The limited industrial application of these laws and their focus on serving colonial interests left much to be desired. Post-independence, the government sought to reform this system to address national priorities, including promoting domestic innovation and reducing reliance on foreign technologies.

The Patents Act 1970 marked a significant turning point in India's intellectual property. Based on the recommendations of the Ayyangar Committee Report[7], the Act reflected a balanced approach to protecting inventions while safeguarding the public interest. One of the report's key highlights was its emphasis on the dominance of foreign entities in Indian patents, with nearly 80-90% held by multinational corporations. The report argued that these patents were often not utilized in India, hindering industrial growth and innovation. The 1970 Act introduced significant reforms to address this, such as restricting product patents in critical areas like food, pharmaceuticals, and chemicals. Instead, it allowed only process patents, ensuring accessibility to essential commodities while fostering innovation through reverse engineering and adaptation.

3.2 Key Provisions

The Patents Act of 1970 is a legal framework that balances the rights of inventors with societal interests. Among its critical provisions, Section 3(b) stands out as a testament to India's commitment to aligning patent law with ethical and societal values.[8] This section excludes inventions whose use or commercialization would be contrary to public order or morality, or harmful to human, animal, plant life and health, or the environment. This mirrors similar provisions in international efforts, such as Article 53(a) of the European Patent Convention, which excludes inventions deemed unethical or harmful to public welfare.[9]

The application of Section 3(b) in India has been inconsistent, primarily due to limited jurisprudence and a lack of clear guidelines for assessing ethical dimensions. Notable cases, such as the rejection of a patent for a vibrator on moral grounds, illustrate the discretionary nature of its implementation. The Indian Patent Office has faced challenges in establishing universally acceptable standards for morality, reflecting the difficulty of defining ethical boundaries in a culturally and socially diverse nation like India.

3.3 Role of Indian Patent Offices

An effective strategy for balancing the public and private realms of biotechnology through the patent system involves navigating two critical challenges: reification and proprietarianism. Reification, as an epistemological shift, underpins biotechnology patenting, reflected in the disapproval by pro-patent advocates of terms such as "patenting life." Drahos aptly describes prioritarianism's influence: "Proprietarianism has infiltrated the development and direction of intellectual property law and policy." For proprietarianism to function effectively, patent laws have been adapted to accommodate the unique characteristics of biotechnological inventions.

---

[4] Patent Cooperation Treaty (PCT) in 1970
[5] European Patent Convention in 1973

[6] Suman Sahai, Indian Patents Act and TRIPS, Economic and Political Weekly , Jul. 17-24, 1993, Vol. 28, No. 29/30 (Jul. 17-24, 1993), pp. 1495+1497 available at: https://www.jstor.org/stable/4399958

[7] S.K. Verma, Biodiversity and Intellectual Property Rights, Journal of the Indian Law Institute, APRIL-DECEMBER 1997, Vol. 39, No. 2/4 (APRIL-DECEMBER 1997), pp. 203-215, Indian Law Institute. available at: https://www.jstor.org/stable/43953268
[8] Section 3(b) Patents Act 1970.
[9] Art. 53, European Patent Convention, 1973

In India, as globally, biotechnological inventions are primarily socially constructed through patent management. Following Cooper's observation (1991), the gradual establishment of rules for patentability effectively defines what constitutes an invention. Indian patent law, like its international counterparts, has adapted its criteria for patentability novelty, inventive step, and utility to suit biotechnology. This adaptation also encompasses the essential requirement of enabling disclosure to ensure that the public and the industry can utilize the invention. However, concerns persist in India regarding whether the information disclosed in biotechnology patents is clear and complete enough for replication by a person skilled in the field, a challenge highlighted in global debates.

The Indian Patent Office has faced challenges like those in Europe, where the patentability of biotechnological inventions, particularly those involving living matter, has necessitated the introduction of complex legal concepts and occasional deviations in the legal application. These adjustments are often driven by multinational corporations' demand for cross-border protection.

Moreover, the shift in judicial attitudes in the United States where patents are no longer seen as monopolies—has had a global ripple effect, influencing Indian patent law. For instance, the reinterpretation of inventiveness by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit (CAFC) has elevated secondary considerations like commercial success and addressing long-standing needs to pivotal criteria. This shift constrains India's ability to tailor its patent laws entirely according to its unique legislative principles, as international harmonization often imposes external pressures on domestic patent systems.

The Indian Patent Office thus finds itself at the intersection of these evolving global trends, balancing the socio-economic implications of biotechnology patents while adhering to domestic legal frameworks and international obligations.

3.4 International Conventions

India's patent law operates within the broader context of international agreements, such as the Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS) Agreement, which establishes minimum standards for patent protection. Article 27(2) of TRIPS permits member states to exclude particular inventions from patentability if their exploitation violates public order or morality if it is necessary to protect human, animal, or plant life and health or to avoid serious environmental harm.[10]

India has strengthened these provisions to align its patent regime with domestic priorities. For instance, the exclusion of higher life forms from patentability under Section 3(j) of the Patents Act reflects a deliberate choice to protect biodiversity and respect ethical norms.[11]. Similarly, the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) influences Indian law, emphasizing equitable benefit-sharing and conserving genetic resources.

Despite these efforts, challenges remain in balancing international obligations with domestic priorities. The flexibility offered by TRIPS allows for moral and ethical exclusions but also creates disparities in application across jurisdictions. This highlights the need for greater harmonization between international laws and national policies to ensure a balanced approach to innovation and ethical considerations.

India is committed to fostering innovation while safeguarding the public interest through its legislative and policy choices. The dynamic interplay between domestic priorities and global obligations underscores the need for reforms aligning patent law with ethical and societal values.[12]

4. COMPARATIVE PERSPECTIVES

4.1 United States

[10] Viviane Yumy Mitsuuchi Kunisawa, THE FRAMEWORK OF TRIPS, The TRIPS Agreement Implementation, Patents in the Pharmaceutical Area, Nomos Verlagsgesellschaft mbH available at: https://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctv941vp4.7

[11] Convention for International Protection of Industrial Property, The American Journal of International Law, Vol. 4, No. 2, Supplement: Official Documents (Apr., 1910), pp. 143-152, Cambridge University Press. available at: https://www.jstor.org/stable/2212053

[12] S.K. Verma, Biodiversity and Intellectual Property Rights, Journal of the Indian Law Institute, APRIL-DECEMBER 1997, Vol. 39, No. 2/4 (APRIL-DECEMBER 1997), pp. 203-215, Indian Law Institute. available at: https://www.jstor.org/stable/43953268

U.S. patent law, rooted in the constitutional mandate of Article I, Section 8, Clause 8, seeks to balance innovation incentives with societal welfare. Influenced by the *Statute of Monopolies* (1623)[13]Early American legislation, such as the Patent Act 1790 protected inventions while minimizing government intervention. Over time, challenges such as speculative abuses led to significant reforms, including establishing an examination-based system in 1836 to ensure rigorous assessments of utility and novelty.

While U.S. patent law does not explicitly exclude inventions on moral grounds, courts have historically invoked the doctrine of moral utility derived from the *Patent Act 1790.* In *Lowell v. Lewis*[14]*,* the court denied patents for inventions that facilitated illicit activities, such as gambling devices, emphasizing their lack of societal benefit. Although inconsistently applied, the doctrine underscores efforts to balance patent rights with the public welfare.

Modern debates center ethical issues in patenting controversial technologies like biotechnology and artificial intelligence. Concerns include the commodification of life forms, privacy risks, and exacerbation of social inequalities. These debates highlight the need for adaptive legal mechanisms that address evolving societal and technological challenges.

Biotechnological patents, in particular, have tested the boundaries of U.S. patent law. Section 101 of the *Patent Act* permits patents for novel and non-obvious inventions. Still, it excludes natural laws, phenomena, and abstract ideas in *Parke-Davis & Co. v. H. K. Mulford Co.*[15]*,* the court upheld the patentability of purified adrenaline, reasoning that isolating and purifying natural substances transformed them into new, valuable products. This decision set a precedent for patents on purified compounds, significantly influencing the pharmaceutical industry.

In *Ex parte Allen,* the USPTO confirmed the patentability of non-naturally occurring organisms under Section 101 but denied a patent for a genetically engineered oyster due to obviousness. The case sparked ethical debates, further intensified by the *OncoMouse* patent, the first for a genetically modified animal. Although animal rights groups challenged the patent, courts dismissed the cases on procedural grounds, avoiding moral considerations. The USPTO drew a clear line in 1987, declaring human beings unpatentable while permitting patents on human-related materials like DNA, reflecting a cautious approach to balancing ethical concerns and innovation.

These cases illustrate the ongoing tension in U.S. patent law between fostering innovation and addressing moral and public order considerations. The challenge lies in maintaining this balance amidst rapid advancements in biotechnology and related fields.

4.2 Europe

The history of European patent law reflects a longstanding integration of moral and public policy concerns. Early influences stemmed from the UK's *Statute of Monopolies* (1623), which linked patents to the public interest by disallowing grants "contrary to the laws of the realm" or "mischievous to the state." This approach evolved with subsequent UK legislation, such as the *1852 Patent Law Amendment Act* and the *1883 Patents, Designs, and Trademarks Act*[16]*,* which solidified public interest tests and allowed patent revocation when deemed prejudicial to society. These principles influenced the European Patent Convention (EPC), which formalized moral considerations.

During the EPC's drafting, debates centered on whether morality should be universally defined or left to national interpretations. The resulting framework, including Article 53(a) EPC, prohibits patents for inventions whose commercial exploitation contravenes morality or public order.[17] Such exclusions cannot rely solely on national legal prohibitions, ensuring a balance between innovation and societal values. However, tribunals' interpretation and application of these principles have raised concerns about consistency in safeguarding public interests.

Notable cases illustrate the evolution of moral considerations. The *Onco-Mouse* case (T 19/90)

[13] Article I, Section 8, Clause 8
[14] Lowell v Lewis, 15 F Cas 1018 (CCCD Mass 1817).
[15] Lowell v Lewis, 15 F Cas 1018 (CCCD Mass 1817).
[16] UK Patents, Designs, and Trademarks Act 1883
[17] Art. 53, European Patent Convention, 1973

[18]Introduced a utilitarian approach, balancing societal benefits of cancer research against animal suffering. The European Patent Office (EPO) upheld the patent, reasoning that potential advancements in cancer treatment outweighed the ethical concerns. This case established the "unacceptability" standard, weighing acceptable and unacceptable suffering. In contrast, the *Upjohn* patent application for a transgenic mouse to study baldness was denied, as the ethical cost to animals outweighed the lack of substantial societal benefits.

The *Howard Relaxin* case (T 0272/95)[19] Addressed the patenting of a DNA sequence encoding a hormone essential for childbirth. Critics argued this commercialized human existence, but the EPO rejected these concerns. The decision introduced the "abhorrence standard," excluding patents only when they elicit widespread societal disgust. It emphasized that ethical considerations must be balanced with the need to foster innovation, reinforcing that patenting DNA and proteins is permissible with informed consent.

The *Plant Genetic Systems* case shifted the EPO's approach, applying the stricter "abhorrence standard" over the "unacceptability" standard. Despite concerns about environmental risks from glutamine synthetase inhibitors, the court required concrete evidence of societal harm for exclusion, prioritizing objective assessments over-generalized ethical concerns.

In the *WARF* and *Caltech* stem cell cases, the EPO denied patents involving processes requiring the destruction of human embryos under Rule 28(c) EPC.[20]. These decisions underscored the strict interpretation of moral exclusions, emphasizing that ethical constraints in the EPC precede scientific or medical benefits.

European patent law adopts a stricter regulatory approach than the U.S., where moral concerns are addressed through judicial doctrines, such as the "product of nature" exception. Provisions like Article 53(a) and Rule 28(c) embody a commitment to societal values, offering a more rigid framework for managing morally sensitive technologies. This reflects Europe’s cautious stance on balancing innovation with ethical accountability.[21]

4.3 Challenges in Harmonization

The varying approaches taken by different jurisdictions in addressing morality and public order within patent law create significant and multifaceted challenges for achieving a cohesive framework for international harmonization. In the United States, the legal system leans heavily on judicial flexibility, which allows judges to interpret ethical concerns on a case-by-case basis. This approach empowers the courts to adapt to new ethical dilemmas as they emerge in the rapidly evolving landscape of technology and innovation. The emphasis on judicial discretion means that resolving ethical issues can be dynamic. Still, it also leads to unpredictability, as different judges may reach different conclusions based on the specifics of individual cases.

Conversely, in regions such as Europe and India, there is a more structured and formalized approach to addressing ethical considerations in patent law. These jurisdictions have introduced explicit provisions outlining ethical standards and expectations. This framework aims to clarify and consistently apply patent laws, making it easier for inventors and companies to understand their rights and responsibilities. However, while this method offers predictability, it may stifle innovation if overly restrictive norms are applied.

This fundamental divergence in legal frameworks complicates the enforcement of patents globally and raises critical questions regarding the universality of ethical standards across various cultures and legal systems. As nations grapple with these complex patent landscapes, fostering ongoing dialogue and collaboration among policymakers, legal experts, and industry stakeholders becomes increasingly vital. The aim is to cultivate an inclusive and balanced international framework that respects the rich tapestry of cultural and ethical diversity while promoting and nurturing innovation across international borders. Such a collaborative effort would help align diverse patent laws and ensure that moral considerations are compatible with rapid technological advancements and the global marketplace.[22]

[18] Onco-Mouse case (T19/90)
[19] Howard Relaxin case (T 0272/95**)**
[20] WARF stem cell case
[21] Julien Crockett, Morality, California Law Review , February 2020, Vol. 108, No. 1 (February 2020), pp. 267-304
[22] Ibid.

5. ETHICAL DIMENSIONS IN BIOTECHNOLOGY

The patenting of biotechnological inventions, such as genetically modified organisms (GMOs), human genes, and synthetic biology innovations, raises profound ethical questions. Critics argue that granting patents on living organisms commodifies life and prioritizes commercial interests over public welfare. Such practices often conflict with societal values, especially when manipulating natural life forms for profit. The *Oncomouse* case, which dealt with patenting a genetically modified mouse for cancer research, exemplifies these ethical dilemmas. While the potential benefits of advancing cancer treatment were undeniable, the case also raised concerns about animal welfare and the moral implications of commercializing living beings. Similarly, the *Diamond v. Chakrabarty* case in the U.S., which permitted the patenting of a genetically engineered bacterium, underscored the tension between fostering scientific innovation and addressing the moral boundaries of patent law. These cases highlight the need for a balanced approach that promotes innovation while respecting ethical and environmental considerations.

Public policy concerns further complicate the ethical problems of biotechnology patents. Accessibility and affordability remain critical issues, particularly in developing countries like India, where public health and environmental sustainability often take precedence over the commercial interests of multinational corporations. Patents on life-saving drugs, genetically modified crops, or essential biotechnological innovations can result in monopolistic practices, making these products unaffordable or inaccessible to those in need. For instance, patents on genetically engineered seeds often place small-scale farmers at the mercy of large corporations, exacerbating economic inequality and undermining food security. Such scenarios call for reevaluating patent laws to ensure that they do not disproportionately favor commercial entities at the expense of public welfare. Incorporating public policy objectives, such as compulsory licensing and exemptions for critical areas, can help mitigate these challenges while balancing the interests of inventors and society.[23]

Protecting traditional knowledge and genetic resources also presents significant ethical and legal challenges. Indigenous communities have long contributed to biodiversity conservation and the development of valuable knowledge systems. Exploiting these resources through biopiracy and inadequate benefit-sharing arrangements undermines their rights and cultural heritage. International laws like the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) and the Nagoya Protocol emphasize equitable benefit-sharing and recognizing Indigenous contributions.[24] Despite these efforts, gaps in implementation leave many communities vulnerable to exploitation. Strengthening legal mechanisms to protect traditional knowledge and ensuring the active participation of Indigenous communities in decision-making processes are crucial steps toward fostering a more equitable patent system. These measures must address the ethical dimensions of biotechnological innovation while promoting sustainability and respect for cultural diversity.

6.1 Legislative Proposals

Reforming patent law to effectively tackle ethical challenges requires thoughtful legislative action. In India, Section 3(b) of the Patents Act plays a pivotal role by excluding inventions that contradict public order or morality. While this provision establishes a crucial foundation for addressing ethical considerations, it unfortunately lacks detailed guidelines for consistent application in practice. To enhance its effectiveness, it is essential to develop explicit criteria for evaluating morality and public order during the patent examination process.

---

[23] Maria Carmelina Londono-Lazaro & Juan F. Cordoba-Marentes, Embedding Human Dignity Standards into Biotechnology Patents: The Role of Morality Clauses, 12 EUR. J. RISK REG. 584 (September 2021) available at: https://heinonline-org-christuniversity.knimbus.com/HOL/Page?handle=hein.journals/ejrr12&collection=journals&id=604&startid=604&endid=621Miguel Sánchez Padrón and Mikel Gómez Uranga, Protection of Biotechnological Inventions: A Burden Too Heavy for the Patent System, Journal of Economic Issues , Jun., 2001, Vol. 35, No. 2 (Jun., 2001), pp. 315-322 Published by: Taylor & Francis, Ltd. Available at: https://www.jstor.org/stable/4227663

[24] Mohammed Abdur Rouf, Patent Rights and Public Interest, 1 DHAKA UNIV. STUD. PART F 137 (1989). Available at: https://heinonline-org-christuniversity.knimbus.com/HOL/License

These criteria can be informed by international best practices, such as the balancing approach utilized in the European Patent Convention (EPC). This method carefully weighs societal benefits against ethical concerns, enabling a more nuanced assessment of patent applications. By establishing clear protocols based on such best practices, we can improve the transparency of the patent-granting process, ensuring that decisions are both legally sound and aligned with moral principles and the broader interests of society.

Moreover, it is crucial for legislative amendments to include provisions for periodic reviews. This would facilitate the ongoing evaluation of the patent system in light of emerging ethical challenges, particularly those posed by rapid advancements in fields such as biotechnology and artificial intelligence. As these technologies evolve, new ethical dilemmas will invariably arise, making a proactive framework essential for addressing them. By taking these steps, we can cultivate a more robust and ethically responsible patent system that promotes innovation while serving the public interest.Reforming patent law to effectively tackle ethical challenges requires thoughtful legislative action. In India, Section 3(b) of the Patents Act plays a pivotal role by excluding inventions that contradict public order or morality. While this provision establishes a crucial foundation for addressing ethical considerations, it unfortunately lacks detailed guidelines for consistent application in practice. To enhance its effectiveness, it is essential to develop explicit criteria for evaluating morality and public order during the patent examination process.

6.2 Role of Public Participation

Public participation is essential in shaping a patent system that reflects society's diverse values and priorities. Engaging a broad spectrum of stakeholders—including ethicists, environmentalists, industry experts, and representatives of Indigenous communities—can provide an understanding of the ethical dimensions of patentability. Public debates and consultations foster inclusivity and transparency, ensuring that reforms address the concerns of all affected groups. For instance, the involvement of Indigenous communities in discussions about patenting genetic resources can help safeguard their rights and prevent biopiracy. Similarly, environmentalists and ethicists can offer critical insights into the implications of patenting biotechnological and AI-based innovations. Institutionalizing mechanisms for stakeholder engagement, such as public hearings and advisory committees, can enrich the policymaking process and foster trust in the patent system.[25]

6.3 Future Directions

The rapid pace of technological advancements necessitates a forward-looking approach to patent law. Emerging fields such as artificial intelligence, synthetic biology, and nanotechnology are redefining the boundaries of innovation and raising unprecedented ethical and legal questions. For instance, AI-generated inventions challenge traditional notions of inventorship, while synthetic biology blurs the lines between natural and artificial creations. To address these challenges, patent laws must be reevaluated and updated to account for the unique ethical considerations of these technologies. Establishing specialized review boards for complex inventions, promoting interdisciplinary research, and incorporating ethical impact assessments into the patent examination process are crucial steps.[26]

In addition, international cooperation will play an important role in harmonizing patent laws to address global challenges. Aligning national policies with international laws like the Convention on Biological Diversity and the TRIPS Agreement can ensure equitable benefit-sharing and the protection of societal values.[27] By anticipating future developments and integrating ethical considerations into the regulatory framework, India can foster a sustainable and equitable innovation ecosystem that balances the needs of inventors, society, and the environment.

---

[25] Gerd Winter, Patent Law Policy in Biotechnology, 4 J.ENVTL. L. 167 (1992 available at: https://heinonline-org-christuniversity.knimbus.com/HOL/Page?handle=hein.journals/jenv4&collection=usjournals&id=173&startid=173&endid=194

[26] Maria Carmelina Londono-Lazaro & Juan F. Cordoba-Marentes, Embedding Human Dignity Standards into Biotechnology Patents: The Role of Morality Clauses, 12 EUR. J. RISK REG. 584 (September 2021) available at: https://heinonline-org-christuniversity.knimbus.com/HOL/Page?handle=hein.journals/ejrr12&collection=journals&id=604&startid=604&endid=621

7. CONCLUSION

Patent law stands at the crossroads of innovation, morality, and public welfare. While it is crucial in fostering creativity and technological progress, its ethical implications demand careful consideration. Patents are not merely legal instruments to reward inventors but also mechanisms to balance individual rights with societal interests. This delicate interplay becomes especially significant in emerging fields such as biotechnology, artificial intelligence, and synthetic biology, where the boundaries of innovation often intersect with profound moral and public policy concerns.

This article has explored the historical evolution of patent law, the philosophical foundations of intellectual property, and the comparative legal upholdings across jurisdictions to highlight the need for a more nuanced and balanced approach. In India, the challenge lies in aligning domestic patent laws with international standards, such as those established under TRIPS and the European Patent Convention, while addressing a diverse nation's unique ethical, cultural, and societal priorities. Strengthening provisions like Section 3(b) of the Patents Act and developing clear guidelines for assessing morality and public order are critical steps toward achieving this balance.

Fostering public participation and stakeholder engagement can enrich policymaking and ensure the patent system reflects diverse societal values. International cooperation, too, remains essential in harmonizing global patent standards and addressing shared ethical challenges. By pursuing legislative reforms, embracing inclusivity, and anticipating future technological developments, India can create a patent system that drives innovation and upholds the principles of equity, sustainability, and public welfare.