Indian Journal of Law
ISSN: 3048-4936 | Vol. 3 Issue 2 | Mar– Apr 2025 | Peer Reviewed & Refereed

Patent Law and Access to Essential Medicines: A Legal and Human Rights Perspective

Pooja Malik
Research Scholar
Department of Law, Punjab.

Published: 18/04/2025 * Corresponding author

How to Cite this Article:
Malik, P. (2025). Patent Law and Access to Essential Medicines: A Legal and Human Rights Perspective. *Indian Journal of Law*, 3(2), 6-11.
DOI: https://doi.org/10.36676/ijl.v3.i2.83

Abstract
The interface between patent law and access to essential medicines presents one of the most pressing global health challenges of the 21st century. While patent regimes aim to incentivize innovation and pharmaceutical R&D, they often create monopolies that lead to unaffordable drug prices, particularly in developing countries. This review explores the legal framework governing pharmaceutical patents under international and national law, with a specific focus on the TRIPS Agreement and its flexibilities. It evaluates judicial and legislative developments, particularly in India, that aim to strike a balance between intellectual property rights and public health imperatives. Through an analysis of key case law, policy interventions, and comparative frameworks, the paper identifies legal, ethical, and economic dimensions that influence medicine accessibility. The conclusion offers recommendations to harmonize patent protection with the right to health.

Keywords: Patent Law, Essential Medicines, TRIPS Agreement, Compulsory Licensing, Access to Healthcare, Public Health, WTO, India, IP Law.

Introduction
Access to essential medicines is recognized as a core component of the right to health, as enshrined in the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR), yet remains elusive for millions worldwide. Patent laws, by conferring temporary monopolies on drug manufacturers, often conflict with this right by restricting the availability of affordable generics. This conflict is particularly severe in low- and middle-income countries (LMICs), where public healthcare systems are weak and out-of-pocket health expenditures are high.

The TRIPS Agreement (1995) introduced minimum standards for IP protection globally, including for pharmaceuticals. Although it included safeguards to balance public health needs—such as compulsory licensing and parallel importation—many countries struggle to effectively implement these provisions due to trade pressures and legal ambiguities. India, through its Patents Act, 1970

(amended in 2005), has emerged as a global leader in making affordable generic medicines available, raising important legal and ethical debates about patent protection and access.
This paper aims to examine the core legal issues surrounding pharmaceutical patents and access to essential medicines, focusing on international frameworks, national legislation, key judicial rulings, and emerging policy trends.

Conceptual Framework: Patent Law and Essential Medicines

- **What Are Patents?**

A patent is an exclusive right granted for an invention, typically for 20 years, that prevents others from making, using, or selling the invention without the patent holder's consent. In the pharmaceutical sector, this right allows innovators to recover research and development (R&D) investments. However, such protection may create market monopolies, often leading to unaffordable pricing, especially in developing countries.

- **What Are Essential Medicines?**

The World Health Organization (WHO) defines essential medicines as those that "satisfy the priority health care needs of the population." They should be available at all times, in adequate amounts, in the appropriate dosage forms, and at prices individuals and communities can afford. Patent protection directly influences the pricing and availability of such medicines.

TRIPS Agreement and Access to Medicines

- **Background of TRIPS**

The Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS), administered by the World Trade Organization (WTO), mandates minimum standards for IP protection, including for pharmaceuticals. Article 27.1 requires patent protection for all inventions, including pharmaceuticals, without discrimination.

- **TRIPS Flexibilities**

TRIPS contain several flexibilities to promote access to medicines:
Compulsory Licensing (Article 31): Governments can authorize third parties to produce a patented product without the patent holder's consent.
Parallel Importation (Article 6): Allows importation of patented medicines from other countries where they are sold at lower prices.
Bolar Exception (Article 30): Allows generics manufacturers to undertake research and development before patent expiration.

- **Doha Declaration (2001)**

In response to concerns about the impact of patents on public health, WTO members adopted the Doha Declaration on TRIPS and Public Health, reaffirming the right of governments to use TRIPS flexibilities to protect public health and promote access to medicines.

Indian Patent Law and Essential Medicines

- **Pre-TRIPS Regime**

India's Patents Act, 1970 excluded pharmaceutical product patents and only allowed process patents for medicines. This enabled India's generic industry to flourish, making life-saving medicines affordable across the Global South.

- **Post-TRIPS Amendments**

To comply with TRIPS, India amended its patent law in 2005 to include product patents. However, India retained several safeguards:

Section 3(d): Excludes new forms of known substances from patentability unless they show enhanced efficacy.

Compulsory Licensing: Codified under Section 84 and Section 92, providing a legal pathway to override patents in the interest of public health.

Pre- and Post-grant Opposition: Allows third parties to challenge the validity of a patent.

Key Cases in Indian Jurisprudence

Novartis AG v. Union of India (2013): The Supreme Court denied a patent on Glivec, ruling that the drug did not meet the efficacy requirement under Section 3(d). This landmark case upheld India's commitment to preventing "evergreening" of patents.

Bayer v. Natco (2012): India granted its first compulsory license to Natco for the cancer drug Nexavar. The decision emphasized affordability and local working of the patent.

Global Case Studies and Comparisons

- **Brazil**

Brazil uses compulsory licensing proactively. In 2007, the government issued a license for Efavirenz, an HIV drug, under the rationale of public interest.

- **South Africa**

After facing a public health crisis due to unaffordable HIV medication, South Africa amended its IP laws to incorporate TRIPS flexibilities, although implementation remains politically sensitive due to global pharmaceutical lobbying.

- **United States**

The U.S. prioritizes patent protection and often imposes TRIPS-plus provisions in its Free Trade Agreements (FTAs), which restrict the use of compulsory licensing and data exclusivity, making it harder for partner countries to access cheaper generics.

Patent Law vs. Human Rights Law

The right to health is enshrined under Article 12 of the ICESCR, and the UN Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (General Comment No. 14) affirms that access to essential medicines is a core obligation.

Patent protection must not override the core human right to health. States have a positive obligation to ensure the availability and accessibility of life-saving medications, even if it involves overriding patent rights in the public interest.

Challenges and Criticisms

Patent Evergreening

Pharmaceutical companies often seek patents for minor modifications of existing drugs (e.g., new formulations or dosage forms) to extend their monopolies. While Section 3(d) of India's law tackles this issue, many jurisdictions lack equivalent protections.

TRIPS-Plus Agreements

Bilateral and regional FTAs increasingly contain provisions beyond TRIPS, including data exclusivity, patent term extensions, and stronger enforcement measures, restricting access to generics.

Delay in Compulsory Licensing

Many governments hesitate to invoke compulsory licensing due to fear of trade sanctions, diplomatic pressure, or lack of technical expertise in patent litigation.

COVID-19 and Vaccine Inequity

The pandemic exposed the limitations of global IP frameworks. Calls for a temporary TRIPS waiver for COVID-19 vaccines and treatments were only partially supported, reflecting persistent imbalances in global health governance.

The Role of Civil Society and NGOs

Organizations like Médecins Sans Frontières (MSF) and Third World Network have been instrumental in advocating for access to generics and fighting TRIPS-plus provisions. Their activism has shaped public discourse, influenced government policies, and supported litigation efforts.

Policy Recommendations

Strengthen TRIPS Flexibility Use: Countries must build institutional capacity to implement compulsory licensing effectively and resist undue trade pressures.

Promote Generic Competition: Shorten regulatory timelines for generic approvals and prevent abuse of patent linkage.

Reform Patentability Standards: Introduce or retain strict patentability criteria to avoid evergreening.

Transparency in Pricing and Licensing: Require pharmaceutical companies to disclose R&D costs and patent agreements.

Promote Open Innovation Models: Encourage patent pooling, open licensing, and collaborative R&D, particularly for neglected diseases.

Support the TRIPS Waiver: Countries should support broader and more inclusive waivers during public health emergencies.

Conclusion

Patent law and access to essential medicines represent a complex and dynamic intersection of innovation, public health, trade, and human rights. While intellectual property rights are essential to incentivize drug development, excessive monopolistic protections often hinder access to life-saving drugs, especially in resource-poor settings. Legal frameworks like TRIPS provide flexibilities, but their use is hindered by political, legal, and economic barriers.

India's legal regime provides a valuable model for balancing innovation and access through its strict patentability standards and proactive use of compulsory licensing. However, the global community must adopt a coordinated and equitable approach to ensure that patent systems do not undermine the universal right to health. A reimagining of the global IP regime—centered on public health and social justice—is not just desirable but essential.

References

Andreas Oser, the COVID-19 Pandemic: Stress Test for Intellectual Property and the Pharmaceutical Laws, 70(9) GRUR INTERNATIONAL 846–854 (2001)

Changpia, C., Suksod, P., & Chantanasombat, W. (2020). How the innovation takes place in the pharmaceutical industry?: An empirical investigation from Thailand. Systematic Reviews in Pharmacy, 11(4), 52–59. https://doi.org/10.31838/srp.2020.4.10

Chaudhuri, K., & Das, S. (2006). WTO, THE TRIPS, AND THE INDIAN PHARMACEUTICAL INDUSTRY. Journal of Quantitative Economics, 4(1), 97–110.

Dai, R., & Watal, J. (2021). Product patents and access to innovative medicines. Social Science & Medicine, 291, 114479. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2021.114479

Godinho, M. M., & Ferreira, V. (2012). Analyzing the evidence of an IPR take-off in China and India. Research Policy, 41(3), 499–511. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2011.09.009Kyle, M.K., Strategic Responses to Parallel Trade, NBER WORKING PAPER NO. 12968, (2007) 59

Ganslandt, M. and K.E. Maskus, Parallel Imports and the Pricing of Pharmaceutical Products: Evidence from the European Union, 23 JOURNAL OF HEALTH ECONOMICS 1035-1057 (2004) 60

James Bacchus, An Unnecessary Proposal A WTO Waiver of Intellectual Property Rights for COVID-19 Vaccines, 78 CATO INSTITUTE (2020) 62

Kanavos, P., J. Costa i Font, S. Merkur and M. Gemmill, the Economic Impact of Pharmaceutical Parallel Trade in European UNION MEMBER STATES: A STAKEHOLDER ANALYSIS, SPECIAL RESEARCH PAPER, LSE HEALTH AND SOCIAL CARE (2004) 61

Nomani, M. Z. M., Alhalboosi, A. K. K., & Rauf, M. (2020). Legal & Intellectual Property Dimension of Health & Access to Medicines in India. Indian Journal of Forensic Medicine & Toxicology, 14(1), 120–122. www.ijfmt.com

Pogge, T. (2012). The Health Impact Fund: Enhancing Justice and Efficiency in Global Health. Journal of Human Development and Capabilities, 13(4), 537–559. https://doi.org/10.1080/19452829.2012.703172