JETIR.ORG ISSN: 2349-5162 | ESTD Year : 2014 | Monthly Issue
JOURNAL OF EMERGING TECHNOLOGIES AND INNOVATIVE RESEARCH (JETIR)
An International Scholarly Open Access, Peer-reviewed, Refereed Journal

Exploring the Interplay between Intellectual Property Rights and Competition Law: Balancing Innovation and Market Fairness

Author 1st Tarushi Acharya, Author 2nd Dr.K. B ASTHANA

(Department of Law MUIT Lucknow) INDIA

Abstract- This explores the intricate relationship between Intellectual Property Rights (IPR) and Competition Law, delving into the challenges and opportunities presented by their integration. competition law & intellectual property rights have evolved separately. Each piece of legislation seeks to accomplish different goals using a unique set of means. The paper examines the evolving landscape of IPR and Competition Law, scrutinizing how these legal frameworks interact in modern business dynamics. It navigates the complexities surrounding issues such as anti-competitive practices, licensing agreements, and the potential abuse of intellectual property rights. By analyzing landmark cases and global regulatory trends, the aims to provide insights into the evolving synergy between IPR and Competition Law, offering a nuanced perspective on the delicate equilibrium required to encourage innovation while preventing monopolistic tendencies.

Index Term - Intellectual Property, Competition Law, Legal Frameworks, Competition Policy

INTRODUCTION

The fields of intellectual property law & competition law are frequently seen as antagonistic to one another. This tension arises because holders of IPRs are sometimes given statutory rights that give them monopoly control over the market & ability to charge monopoly rents to anybody who wants to utilize their IPRs[1]. That is to say, while competition law fights against monopolistic practices, intellectual property law actively promotes the formation of monopolistic rights.

The whole nature of intellectual property laws is monopolistic. They protect the owners & creators of works of art from infringement in perpetuity. Plus, they stop others from making money off of the discovery. The legal monopoly might result in market dominance or monopoly, which is illegal in the Competition Law. When this dominant position or unfair advantage is abused, IPR & Competition Law come into conflict[2].

When it comes to IPR, the main issues of competition law are the potential for abuse of monopoly power & harm that can be done by anti-competitive behavior. The most basic way in which market power is harmful to consumers is when it leads to prices that are higher than what is necessary to ensure efficient production. In addition, when corporations are afforded protection that slows or distorts innovation, the damage done by market power may go well beyond this. As a result, market dominance will impede long-term productivity gains and dampen prospects for improving people's standard of living.

[1] Eshan Ghosh, 'Competition Law and Intellectual Property Rights with Special Reference to the TRIPS Agreement' (2010)Research Paper for the Competition Commission of Indian< http://cci.gov.in/images/media/ResearchReports/EshanGhosh.pdf> accessed 2 March 2014

[2] Anthony F. Baldanza and Charles Todd, 'Intellectual Property Rights: Friends or Foes' (2006) Competition and Intellectual Property Rights Seminar of Ontario Bar Association, < http://www.fasken.com/en/intellectual-property-competition/> accessed 3 March 2014

The assumption that IPRs & Competition Law have a common goal—the maximization of social welfare—has led to a shift away from this strategy. Competition is supported by intellectual property protection because it encourages the invention & spread of new technologies, both of which are major sources of market competition. In a similar vein, competition encourages creativity, which advances the progress of IP. Anti-competitive behavior that would build, develop, or sustain market power or otherwise undermine intense rivalry among enterprises is shielded from the protections of competition law.

Competition Law employs two strategies to break up intellectual property rights monopolies. In this case, we're talking about mandatory licenses and gray market sales. The proprietor of intellectual property rights (IPR) may be required by law to grant up his monopoly over the work in question if the state grants him a forced license. Goods that enter a market legally but are imported into the country without permission from the rightful intellectual property owner are considered parallel imports[3].

A decade earlier, IP & competition laws were seen as mutually exclusive. The intellectual property rights system was seen as establishing monopolies to spur innovation, while competition law eradicates monopolies, producing an apparent tension between the two. It has become apparent, on the other hand, that the two play complimentary roles in propelling innovation in today's technologically dynamic marketplace. When an idea or concept is put into concrete form, it is said to be an "intellectual property," which represents a certain type of ownership & property right. When an idea is put into practice, copyright is given, and the same is true of patents, designs, and other types of intellectual property. The 'right of excision,' that implies the owner of the intellectual property rights can enforce his rights to the exclusion of the entire universe, is a crucial aspect of the grant of intellectual property rights. However, the goal of competition legislation is to maximize output and optimize resource usage. This is one perspective on the goals of competition law & IP protections. Therefore, competition law & IP law are two distinct branches of the law that each cover entirely separate terrain[4].

LITERATURE REVIEW

George Gryllos[5] et al. (2022) One of the most important institutions for promoting & protecting people's well-being is IP law, which also includes protections against unfair competition. Authors, inventors, & trademark holders all have special protections under the law similar to intellectual property. As a result of the exclusive character of these rights, the mechanism of supply & demand is set in action to fairly compensate the rights holders for their work. Legal decisions on the duration and nature of IP protection are grounded in economic philosophy. Due to the infinity of possible distinguishing signals, trademarks are entitled to indefinitely long protection from the use of any similarly worded or visually similar marks that can cause consumer confusion. Similar to how the limitless variety of shapes & sizes that works of human intellect & art can take warrants copyright protection for a lengthy but finite period, so too can the protection of such works be justified for an extended but finite period. After a sufficient length of time has passed, these works should be considered public domain for the sake of the greater good. Since technological breakthroughs lose value with time and their lessons are valuable to subsequent progress, a similar, but stronger, public interest needs the protection of these innovations for a shorter length of time. This means the other fundamental institution ensuring the smooth operation of economic activities is undermined by the exclusive character of the rights provided. Rule of fair competition. In contrast to rents collected through abusive conduct, 'proper' compensation for the right holder can be generated through the efficient operation of supply & demand. Applying the two areas of law in a way that preserves their essential legal characteristics is the main guiding principle[6].

Protecting the freedom to file a patent is crucial to the functioning of today's free markets. They should function without impeding the enforcement of laws that aim to safeguard competition, which is a key driver

[3] Atul Patel, Aurobindo Panda, Akshay Deo, Siddhartha Khettry and Sujith Philip Mathew, 'Intellectual Property Law & Competition Law' (2011) Vol. 6, Issue 2 (2011) Journal of International Commercial Law and Technology. < www.jiclt.com/index.php/jiclt/article/download/132/130> accessed 5 March 2014

[4] Roy Abir and Kumar, Jayant, "Competition law in India" (Kolkata: Eastern Law House) 2008, p. 169-170.

[5] Gryllos, G. (2022). Intellectual property and competition: State of the law on the relationship between two institutions in the service of welfare. *Available at SSRN 4095409*.

[6] Competition Act 2002, s 27.

of innovation. There are three essential features that the legal framework controlling the award of patent rights & enforcement procedures associated with them must have if patent rights are not to become an impediment to the running of the economy. To begin, they need to ensure that patents are only issued or renewed for innovations that truly advance the state of the art, both innovative & non-obvious. As a second requirement, full disclosure of the invention under protection is required. As a third point, remedies can't affect how rules of competition are enforced. Protecting intellectual property should include exempting from antitrust review any practices that try to assure a payment resulting from undistorted market forces. The choices taken by lawmakers in outlining the parameters of property protection are not expected to be "adjusted" by the competition law. The purpose of antitrust laws is to ensure that legitimate property rights are not abused.

Chizaram Joy OBANU[7] et al. (2021) The purpose of competition law is to prevent any one person or business from gaining an unfair advantage in the market by establishing a monopoly. Monopolies prevent new entrants into a market & drive-up prices for consumers because they allow a few companies to control all of the production & distribution of a product or service. Protecting the free market from tactics that would otherwise distort it, competition law is a crucial weapon. In order to protect customers from unfair pricing, curb monopolistic tactics, & guarantee efficient use of available resources, this is essential. Whereas physical property is a collection of physical items, intellectual property is a collection of creative & innovative works and ideas created by the human mind. Laws are enacted by numerous law-making agencies to guarantee the safety of these rights, and the laws typically grant exclusive ownership of the invention in question to the person or group that first came up with the idea. The qualities of IPR that prevent competitors from copying the protected product are similar to those of a monopoly, whereas competition law forbids the abuse of monopoly power by corporations. Innovation and technical progress are fostered by competition legislation and IPR, which in turn helps to develop a free-market economy and provides enormous benefits to consumers. The efficient allocation of market resources is guaranteed by both competition law & IPR. There is a natural synergy between competition law and IPR that encourages the development of new goods & services and advances in technology. Improved consumer well-being is typically the result of new, easily available, and reasonably priced products and services, rather than the introduction of substitutes. The FCCPA outlaws' monopolization, abuse of dominating position, and other activities that distract from intellectual property rights in Nigeria. Although the FCCPA is a significant step forward in regulating the free market, there still needs to be norms in place that control the scope to which competition law & IPR can be applied.

Michael G Jacobides[8] et al. (2021) The proliferation of business ecosystems over the past decade has been one of the most significant shifts in the industrial landscape. These ecosystems consist of networks of interdependent businesses that share resources and draw on (digital) platforms to maximize the value of their complements & secure the loyalty of their customers by capitalizing on the "bottlenecks" that naturally occur in the designs of emerging market niches. This has resulted in new power imbalances, in which the ecosystem of multiple complementary products & associated complementary businesses serves as the "field" of competition rather than the relevant product market, as is typically the case in competition law. There are new questions about competition that these dynamics bring up. We start by defining what we mean by an ecosystem, then look at how ecosystems are currently being dealt with under the purview of competition law, and then pinpoint the gap in the present framework of conventional competition law. Next, we examine the current (2020) proposals of the Digital Market Act on ex-ante regulation, with its focus on "gatekeepers," and provide a critical review of the current efforts & proposals in the European Union for providing regulatory remedies for ex-ante or ex-post resolution of problems. Before delving into proposed Greek legislation that specifically focuses on ecosystem regulation, we examine previous regulatory measures in European countries that focused on ex-post regulation and the importance of business models & ecosystem architectures in regulation. We end with some thoughts on the difficulties of creating & enforcing an ecosystem regulatory framework based on our experience in the regulatory process & literature we've reviewed.

[7] OBANU, C. J. (2022). RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN COMPETITION LAW AND INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW. *LAW AND SOCIAL JUSTICE REVIEW*, *2*(2).

[8] Jacobines, M. G., & Lianos, I. (2021). Ecosystems and competition law in theory and practice. *Industrial and Corporate Change*, *30*(5), 1199-1229.

Ishita Chatterjee[9] et al. (2019) It is the monopolizing nature of IP that causes tension with antitrust law. In contrast, monopolies obtained under IPR are temporary. Even though monopoly isn't the aim of intellectual property laws, those laws inevitably lead to that result because of the rights associated with intellectual property. Those privileges are time-bound, not permanent. Both are crucial to fostering an environment where new businesses can thrive, and existing ones can adapt to the changing market. There is a shared goal of avoiding letting the advancement of innovation that contributes to the economy of a country undermine public policy. Because of the unique characteristics of the global economy today, competition law & intellectual property rights have emerged as two of the most pressing global challenges. The purpose of competition law is to ensure free & open markets by limiting the accumulation of wealth & power by a select few. Put simply, monopolies cannot exist in a market where competition law is in place. Contrarily, IP rights were viewed as a possible source of monopolization. Innovation and productivity are boosted by market competition, which also leads to lower prices. Since there is only one manufacturer with the legal authority to make the goods in a monopolistic market, prices can be set artificially high. As a result, the price of those goods increased. This is why there is tension between antitrust regulations & IP rights.

Douglas H. Ginsburg[10] et al. (2018) Strong legal regimes in the United States & European Union both safeguard competition & encourage innovation. There can be friction between competition and intellectual property laws, so governments have codified specific criteria for how and when those laws' restrictions apply to IP rights. Each regime recognizes the consumer benefit of innovation & presumes that a patentee may lawfully use, license, and sell its IP rights unless doing so would impair competition on the merits through (i) colluding with other entities to restrain trade unreasonably, (ii) acquiring or exercising market power unilaterally (U.S. or EU), or (iii) transferring IP through an anticompetitive merger or acquisition. The pertinent legislation of the U.S. & E.U are briefly compared and summarized in this article before the main differences between the two systems are discussed. Please note that although most of the applications mentioned herein pertain to patents, the term "patents" is used throughout to apply to all forms of intellectual property unless the distinction is significant.

Hanna Stakheyeva[11] et al. (2018) The intersection of IPR & antitrust law is the subject of this chapter. If the holder of an intellectual property right (IPR) exercises those rights in a way that harms consumers or amounts to an abuse of a dominant market position, the IPR holder may be subject to the antitrust laws that protect consumers from such conduct. Rights & statutory remedies for IPR holders who feel they have been subjected to unfair competition may also be pursued. This article offers an overview of the relationship between IPR & competition law, focusing on industries such as pharmaceuticals, information technology, and luxury brands, and analyzing highly risky agreements & practices from the perspective of competition rules.

O'Donoghue[12] et al. (2016) In the last 50 years, there has been a growing discussion over the intersection of IP & European competition law. In this article's first portion, we'll take a look at how the tension between the two statutes has grown over time. After that, we'll take a deep dive into the preceding case law, paying special attention to the major rulings in Microsoft & IMS Health. The analysis delves into the complex question of whether IP holders must be saddled with the obligation of safeguarding the commercial wellness of their rivals & examines the preference of European competition authorities to protect competitors' interests over obtaining the consensus for efficiency in the market. With the precedent in mind, some economic proposals are presented that show how IPR protection & European competition law intervention may be brought into harmony. The best solution to the contradiction between the two laws is then evaluated, along with the sustainability of that solution.

[9] Chatterjee, I. (2019). Comparative Study on Competition Law and Intellectual Property Rights in Present Day Economy. *Journal of Intellectual Property Rights Law*, *2*(1), 24-33.

[10] Ginsburg, D. H., Geradin, D., & Klovers, K. (2018). Antitrust and intellectual property in the United States and the European Union. *The Interplay Between Competition Law and Intellectual Property International Perspective, Gabriella Muscolo and Marina Tavassi eds., Kluwer Law International, Forthcoming, George Mason Law & Economics Research Paper*, (18-23).

[11] Stakheyeva, H. (2018). Intellectual property and competition law: Understanding the interplay. In *Multi-dimensional Approaches Towards New Technology* (pp. 3-19). Springer, Singapore.

[12] O'Donoghue, C. (2016). The Evolving Interface between European Competition Law and IPR: Is There a Balance to be Achieved.

COMPETITION LAW AND COMPETITION POLICY

Essentially, competition policy[13] refers to any action taken by the government that has an effect on the way businesses operate or the composition of a given industry. Policy aimed at increasing competitive conditions has as its goal the improvement of efficiency & general well-being of society. To promote competition in local & national markets, competition policy entails measures such as a liberalized trade policy, openness to foreign investments, & economic deregulation. To protect anti-competitive business practices & unnecessary government interventions, competition policy entails measures such as legislation, judicial decisions, & regulations. Competition & antitrust law allude to this factor.

By preventing the misuse of market power & encouraging competition, successful competition law is probable to encourage the development of an enabling business environment that boosts static & dynamic efficacy and results in optimal resource allocation. Competition law also helps to eliminate artificial barriers to entry, opens up new markets, & supplements efforts to increase overall competition.

IP LAWS AND IP POLICY

The "public desire to confer the status of property" on ideas, inventions, and creative expressions is part of the definition of intellectual property rights (IPRs). IPRs, like tangible property, grant their owners the exclusive right to utilize the protected subject matter for a certain amount of time & right to license others to commercially exploit the innovation if the owner is not in a position to do so.

Patents, copyright (and neighboring rights), industrial designs, geographical indications (GIs), trade secrets, & trademarks are the principal legal instruments for protecting IPRs. Utility models, plant breeder's rights, and integrated circuit rights are only a few examples of the new, specialized types of intellectual property protection that have arisen to meet the unique needs of knowledge creators.

In addition, many nations have laws in place to protect trade secrets that provide an unfair benefit to those who expose them. Legal measures such as these are simply one part of a larger national IP protection infrastructure. The entities responsible for managing the IPRs system and the accessible method for enforcing these rights are also important components of a successful system.

The traditional economic justification for protecting intellectual property rights is that it encourages innovation and its dissemination and commercialization by providing creators of new and beneficial products with enforceable property rights, protecting more effective procedures & creative works of art, as well as stopping quick piracy from diminishing the commercial worth of innovation & destroying incentives to invest against the interests of customers. This line of thinking is frequently employed when discussing the monetary aspects of intellectual property laws like patents and copyright regulations. Protection for trademarks & industrial designs is typically justified as an incentive for reputational (quality) investments rather than for the innovation itself. Instead, trade secrets are defended as an essential complement to patents, with the primary benefit being the promotion of "sub-patentable" or incremental discoveries.

FUNCTIONAL ASPECTS OF INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY AND COMPETITION LAW

Competition law & IPRs are complementary to one another when one examines the areas of operation of both legal regimes in greater detail. It's also important to note that the two fields cover different grounds: intellectual property rights focus on the granting of rights by the state, while competition law examines how those rights are put to use in the market. The logic of both approaches converges on the same point[14]. Looking at the justifications for IPR can shed further light on this.

Rationale for Intellectual Property Protection

[13] Pham, Alice (2008), "Competition Law and Intellectual Property Right: Controlling Abuse or Abusing Control?", CUTS International, Jaipur, India. at 2.

[14] *Supra note* 1, at 170.

The following factors justify the establishment of an IP regime:

(i) *Incentive to Invent:*

Incentives for inventors often take the form of granted IP rights. However, the 'free riders' dilemma inherent in intellectual property means that without this motivation, the creator would not be able to reap the full benefits of his work[15].

(ii) *To Encourage Disclosure:*

If the government doesn't pay for the inventor to share his discoveries, he will keep them to himself. Inventors are incentivized to come forward with their discoveries by being granted limited monopoly rights.

(iii) *Commercialization of Technology:*

Protecting inventors' ideas through trademarks and patents makes them more marketable. Legal protections for intellectual property allow its owners to more easily license it to businesses that can more effectively and profitably use it in their operations[16].

(iv) *To Increase Dynamic Efficiency:*

Innovations in products and methods that benefit society as a whole are examples of dynamic efficiency. Individuals and businesses alike are driven to innovate and reap the rewards of their labor within a set time frame when the state grants them a monopoly[17].

Rationale for Competition Law Regulation

Current conventional wisdom holds that competition law serves society well by discouraging business strategies that build monopoly power in the marketplace. The goal of competition legislation is to preserve market conditions that favor both locational and productional efficiency (together referred to as static efficiency). Having a high level of productive efficiency implies you can crank out goods while keeping your overhead to a minimum, and having a high level of active efficiency means you're using your resources to their full potential. The establishment of a perfect or free market requires a high level of static efficiency. In economics, the term "perfect market" refers to a scenario in which there is an abundant supply of sellers and no obstacles to their participation. Only in a highly competitive market are consumers able to enjoy the greatest variety of goods and services at the most affordable costs.

IPRs Standards as Competition Regulation

As a general rule, IPR policy can act as an exemption to the general prohibition of horizontal & vertical constraints by competition law. Economics dictates that conventional antitrust laws must frequently yield to concerns like transaction cost reduction or pre-competitive collaboration when IP is at the core of a collective agreement or joint venture on product marketplaces.

IP rights policy is not subject to antitrust laws because it serves as an institutional regulatory framework that is necessary for the smooth operation of markets for intangible property. Most countries' competition laws explicitly or implicitly exempt constraints that would otherwise be the subject of antitrust investigations because the exclusive rights inherent in IP protection granted by the state are viewed as justifying those limits.

Section 1 of Article 81 (formerly Article 85) of the Treaty of Rome outlaws any pacts "that may affect trade between Member States" and have the intent or consequence of impeding, stifling, or distorting competition in the European Union's single market. However, agreements that help "improve the production

---

[15] P.A. Geroski, "Intellectual Property Rights, Competition Policy and Innovation: Is there a Problem? (2005), available at http://www.law.ed.ac.u,/ahrb/script=ed/vol2-4/geroski,asp.

[6] *Supra note* 1, at 171.

[16] Robert Stoner, Presentation at FTC/DOJ Hearing on Competition and Intellectual Property Law and Policy in the Knowledge-Based Economy, Intellectual Property and innovation (FTC/DOJ, 26th Feb. 2003) http://www.ftc.gov/opp/intellect.

[17] J. Locke, Second Treatise of Government, (P. Laslett Rev. Ed. 1963) (3rd ed. 1698)

[10] Justin Hughes, "The Philosophy of Intellectual Property", (Georgetown Law Journal, 1998), P. 287

or distribution of commodities or promote technical or economic growth" are exempt under Section 3 of the same article.

Regulation of IPRs through Competition Law

On the other hand, "as a piece of individual property, IPRs are fully subject to general antitrust principles because what is conferred upon its owner is precisely that autonomy of decision in competition and freedom of contracting according to individual preferences that results from any private property, no matter tangible or intangible, and that is the object of and connecting factor for restraints of competition". Therefore, competition law serves to restrict the exercise of property rights within the appropriate bounds and limitations that are inherent in the exclusivity granted by the ownership of intellectual property, even while it has no bearing on the very existence of IPRs.

- Competition Issues in Exclusionary Licensing
- Anti-competitive Dimensions of Licensing Arrangements
- Intellectual Property Rights & Misuse of Power
- IPRs in Commercial Combinations & Partnerships
- Denial to Deal
- Obligatory Licensing
- Parallel Import
- Transfer of Technology

CONCLUSION

The integration of Intellectual Property Rights (IPR) and Competition Law represents a complex and dynamic legal landscape that demands a nuanced and adaptive approach. The synthesis of these two critical legal frameworks is essential for fostering innovation, protecting intellectual creations, and ensuring fair market competition. The analysis of case studies and regulatory trends underscores the global effort to harmonize IPR and Competition Law. In essence, the integration of IPR and Competition Law is not a static achievement but an ongoing process that requires continuous refinement. As technology advances and industries evolve, legal frameworks must evolve in tandem to ensure a fair, innovative, and competitive global marketplace. This integration is not just a legal imperative but a foundational element in shaping the future of economic progress, technological advancement, and the protection of the public interest.

REFERENCES

- Anderman, Steven and Ezra chi, Ariel (Eds), Intellectual Property and Competition Law, New Frontiers, Oxford University Press
- Blair, Roger D. and Cotter, Thomas F. Intellectual property: Economic and legal Dimensions of Rights and Remedies, Cambridge University Press,2005.
- Chakravarthy, Dr. S., "IPR and Competition Law", Corporate Law Adviser, Vol. 45, pp. 59-71, 2001.
- Chatterjee, I. (2019). Comparative Study on Competition Law and Intellectual Property Rights in the Present Day Economy. Journal of Intellectual Property Rights Law, 2(1), 24-33.
- Colton. C and Middleton. K, Modern Intellectual property law, London Cavendish Publishing Limited, (2005).
- Comino, William S., Goto, Akira, Waver man, Leonard, (Eds), Competition Policy in the Global Economy Modalities for Co-operation, Routledge Publication
- Frances Hanks, The interface between intellectual property rights and competition policy, (edited) Steven Anderman, Cambridge University Press, (2007).
- Gadbow. R and Richard, (eds), Intellectual Property Rights: Global Consensus, Global Conflict, Boulder, 1988.
- Gerber, D. J., Global Competition: Law, Markets, and Globalization, Oxford University Press, Oxford 2010
- Guido Westham, "Emerging Issues in intellectual Property Rights", (U.K:Edward Elgar Publishing ltd.,2006).

- Pal, Prankrishna (Ed), Intellectual Property Rights in India: General Issues and Implications, Regal Publications (New Delhi, 2008)
- Peritz. R., The Interface Between Intellectual Property Rights and Competition Policy, (edited) Steven Anderman, Cambridge University Press, (2007).
- Ramapo T., Competition Law in India – Policy, Issues and Development, Oxford University Press, 2006
- Shahid Alikhan and Raghunath Mashelkar, "Intellectual property Rights and Competition Policy in the 21st Century", (New Delhi: Aditya Books Private Ltd., 2006).
- Stevan D. Anderman, "The Interface between Intellectual property Rights and competition policy, (U.K: Cambridge University Press,2007).