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ABSTRACT: This paper focuses on the study of whether a strategy veiled as the right to strategize and exercise resistance to the perception of existing unequal treatment with respect to intellectual property rights (IPR) and its plant variety regimes is the rights of the farmer fraternity. The traditional seed-saving customs of farmers have gradually been de-empowered as marketable intellectual property models have made their own way into agriculture. Regarding this crusade, there are various insinuations. In the one hand, farmers' rights are a special category of right that can help turn intellectual property transactions into more suitable registry approaches. Promotion of new ways of innovation, such as those suggested by agricultural societies, and substantial promotion. Farmers' rights, on the other hand, have been extremely hard to execute. And the movement risks further legitimizing the unfairness to which it responds by positioning the needs of farmers alongside the rights of commercial breeders that are readily followed. This article analyses and discusses the same.
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INTRODUCTION

Industrially advanced countries have started to recognize and present intellectual property rights to the groundbreaking position of industrial plant breeders at the national level.

The first step was taken by the U.S., the EU, Australia, Africa and the Philippines. Indian legislation sanctioned the one-of-a-kind law called the Plant Variety Protection and Farmers' Rights Act, 2001, intelligently exploiting the flexibility provided by TRIPs. This Act has recognized multiple farmers' rights. Indian law is important both in the national and international context, since many other nations are attempting to establish similar laws. By developing a new intellectual property system that suits their interests and protects the interests of breeders and farmers at the same time, other emerging countries are now trying to fulfill these demands[1].

The primary purpose is to discuss the very nature of security to be provided to farmers within the issues listed for consideration. In order to properly understand farmers' position in the intellectual property fortification system, the nature of the protection of farmers' rights was studied. In two contexts, first, the suitability of any patent or plant variety protection law for farmers and second, the suitability of any patent or plant variety protection law for farmers, the essence of the preservation of farmers' rights has been studied[2].

Intellectual property rights (IPRs) have emerged as one of the most ardently questionable sites of political scuffles in the debates over the modern political economy and the establishment of institutions of global dominance. This is nowhere truer than in the war for biological capital. While the Third World Access to Proprietary Drugs movement grabbed the headlines leading up to, after, and after the World Trade Organization (WTO) conference in Cancun in the fall of 2003, there was another relevant and equally critical fight in agriculture over seedling power. After the successful attempts of commercial agriculture and pharmaceutical interests to connect intellectual property of biological products with foreign trade in the 1980s and the resulting institutionalization of security of IPRs in the WTO, intellectual property has taken on considerable significance for agricultural producers around the world[3], [4].

DISCUSSION

In a critical and contentious clause in the Trade-Related Facets of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS) Agreement of the WTO, the signatory countries were obliged to expand the fortification of property rights to plant varieties. In addition, this suggests that the endowment of state-supported monopolies on the commercial supply of scientifically modified seeds is indebted to them. A virtual seed war has emerged in the shadow of this IPR order[5], [6].
The development of such fortification by so-called breeders’ rights for the biotech industry gives a longstanding acknowledgment and just compensation to commercial seedmen who have taken over the rights of the breeders. Comprehensive view of the invention of seeds from decades earlier by growers. However, the growth of IPRs to include plant varieties for many farmers in developed countries marks an exodus from traditional traditions and values and poses a danger to their sovereignty and existing ways of life[7].

Many are concerned about the consequences of global agribusinesses being able to use bioengineered seed IPRs to legally prohibit farmers using new seeds from recycling and exchanging seeds harvested from their own fields, activities that are highly important for small-scale farming communities dependent on small consignments of traded seeds to respond to shifting land conditions[8].

The view that conventional variabilities may then be forced out by the prospect of high yields and thus compel farmers to buy new seeds for each crop has caused fear about farming communities becoming increasingly dependent on international seed merchants.

In addition, as global seed corporations reap great benefits from their inventions, many farmers feel that the past contributions to biodiversity and seed production there and in their societies remain largely unrecognized. In response, Third World farmers’ networks have been coordinating widespread agitation and advocacy activities for more than a decade, in coalition with activist non-governmental organizations (NGOs). As in other democratic coalition campaigns, among the numerous parties concerned, the basic concerns and tactics differ. And yet the discernment within these communities that the international IPR command is strongly weighted toward farmers is notable in clarity. The correlation in vocabulary used by the groups is as prominent as converging.

The idiom of "rights," the same idiom used by the now dominant IPR government, has entered the discourse around the board. While "breeder's rights" is the pivot on which agribusinesses advocated for commercial law vicissitudes, "farmers' rights," "indigenous rights," and, more recently, "human rights" provide the foundation for conflict. There may be two key reasons that it was found unacceptable for the patent scheme.

1. As dexterous in fulfilling the criteria of innovation, imaginative move and disclosure, plant content was not experiential.

2. Given their collective prestige, it was not meant to be in the public interest to license such an extensive monopoly on plant diversity.

An underlying opinion is that it was beneficial to maintain the practice of free alteration of new plant material between plant breeding organizations to the extent practicable. This will ensure the possible distribution and use of modern amalgamations of genetic knowledge in a systematic manner. The interests of farmers are tied to fewer basic rights.

CONCLUSION

Intellectual property rights are meant, as the term implies, to be rights to concepts, ideas and knowledge, notably in relation to new technologies and processes. The method by which they are expected to be understood is to enable an inventor for a specified time to remove imitators from the market. Such a right is meant to encourage industrial innovation by providing greater returns than would usually be offered by the sector. Thus, in its actual implementation, the commodification of its subject-matter is the effect of IPRs.

With globalization and the growing opening up of the economy, new issues emerge with regard to the protection of technology, as the protection of new inventions is no longer confined to developed countries. As a result of the Uruguay Round of GATT, the WTO umbrella body came into being, forcing all Member States to enact and update legislation in compliance with and compatible with the purposes of the WTO.
India is a WTO member and a signatory to the Agreement on TRIPs. Signatory States are expected, in compliance with the terms of the TRIPs Agreement, to provide protection for a variety of intellectual property rights, including protection for plant varieties.

The Plant Variety Protection and Farmers' Rights Bill was eventually passed by both houses of the Indian Parliament in compliance with the compulsions under the TRIPs Agreement, ending a long and complicated struggle for the recognition of farmers' rights in the sui generis law of India. India has now put a law in force for the first time to give rights to plant breeders (PBRs) for new varieties of plants.

The Indian Plant Variety Law (The Plant Variety Safety and Farmer Rights Act, 2001, hereinafter referred to as the Act) is scrutinized in this paper from a delicate perspective.

It addresses different facets of the defense of agricultural innovation, including access to genetic resources and other instruments to conserve and explain the use of plant genetic resources for food and agriculture, as well as evolving food security circumstances.

It tries to extravagant on the plant variety fortification templates and to delinquently patent plant life. It clarifies the international structure for IPRs (TRIPs, UPOV stipulations, etc.) pertaining to biodiversity, plant variety, genetic capital, and access to them. Possible alternatives under the current regulations that reduce the disadvantages of long-term fortification are also discussed.
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