E- Journal of Academic Innovation and Research in Intellectual Property Assets (E-JAIRIPA)

Vol. IV (ISSUE I) JAN-JUN 2023, Pg.109-120

THE BALANCE OF COMPETITION AND INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY RIGHTS: AN INSIGHT INTO A COMPLEX LANDSCAPE

Isha Bharti[1]

Abstract

The investigation delves into the intricate relationship between antitrust law and intellectual property rights. It is interesting to explore the incompatibility between these two legal systems, as they appear to have opposing policy goals. Have you ever wondered how intellectual property rights (IPRs) and competition law impact innovation and fair competition? IPRs provide exclusive rights to holders in order to encourage creativity and innovation, while competition law strives to promote fair competition and penalise any anti-competitive behavior.

This research delves into the intricacies of overlapping frameworks and the resulting conflicts and complementarities. It specifically focuses on patent pools, standardisation, licensing practices, and the misuse of dominant firms. The aim of this research is to explore the intricate landscape of balancing competition and intellectual property rights (IPRs) by examining policies, legal practices, and businesses' comprehension. This will be achieved by analysing relevant case law and scholarly literature.

Keywords: Antitrust Law, Intellectual Property Rights, Competition Law, Patent Pools, Standardisation

[1] 3rd Year, BA LL.B(Hons.) CMR University, Bengalore

Introduction

The interplay between competition law and intellectual property rights (IPRs) has grown more complex and nuanced in the contemporary globalised and technology-oriented economy.[2] Competition law and intellectual property rights (IPRs) play crucial roles in fostering innovation, economic development, and consumer well-being, albeit via distinct legal frameworks and goals. The intersection of these two legal domains presents a multitude of complexities and prospects, requiring a thorough analysis of their interaction.[3]

The primary objective of competition law is to maintain equitable and unaltered competition in the market by proscribing anti-competitive conduct and fostering market efficacy. Conversely, intellectual property rights (IPRs) bestow upon creators and innovators the sole entitlement to their inventions, artistic works, trademarks, and other intangible assets, thereby motivating investment in research and development. The legal frameworks in question exhibit a tension that stems from the possibility of conflicting goals, namely the promotion of innovation and the preservation of competitive markets.[4]

Upon initial examination, it may seem that competition law and intellectual property rights (IPRs) function independently of one another. The intersection of markets and technology has become more prominent due to the growing reliance on technology and emphasis on innovation. The amalgamation of these factors poses a dualistic scenario that necessitates meticulous scrutiny and assessment.[5]

One of the key obstacles arises from the possible exploitation of intellectual property rights (IPRs) as a means to impede competition. Entities possessing dominant intellectual property rights (IPRs) have the ability to utilise their exclusive privileges to restrict entry to crucial technologies or commodities, which can hinder competition and impede the progress of innovation. The matter assumes significant importance, especially in the context of standard-essential patents (SEPs),

[2] Dinwoodie, Graeme B., and Rochelle C. Dreyfuss. "A New Approach to Patent-Antitrust Intersection: The Competitive Standard for Licensing of SEPs." *Harvard Journal of Law and Technology* 31, no. 1 (2017): 1-79.

[3] Reto M. Hilty, Josef Drexl, (2017). Intellectual Property and Competition Law: New Frontiers, New Challenges. IIC-*International Review of Intellectual Property and Competition Law*, 48(8), 887-898.

[4] Moser, Petra. 2013. "Patents and Innovation: Evidence from Economic History." *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 27 (1): 23-44.

[5] Correa, C. (2007). Intellectual Property and Competition Law: Exploration of Some Issues of Relevance to Developing Countries, ICTSD IPRs and Sustainable Development Programme Issue Paper No. 21, *International Centre for Trade and Sustainable Development, Geneva, Switzerland.*

wherein the pledge of the possessor to grant licences on fair, reasonable, and non-discriminatory (FRAND) conditions assumes a decisive role.[6]

One of the difficulties encountered is the need to reconcile the conflicting policy goals of intellectual property rights and competition law. Competition law aims to deter anticompetitive conduct, whereas Intellectual Property Rights (IPRs) serve as a motivator for innovation by conferring exclusive entitlements to creators and innovators. Achieving a suitable equilibrium between these aims is crucial to guarantee that Intellectual Property Rights (IPRs) do not excessively impede competition or lead to monopolistic behaviours that negatively impact consumers' welfare.

Notwithstanding the aforementioned challenges, the intersection of competition law and intellectual property rights (IPRs) affords prospects for collaboration and mutually beneficial outcomes. Through the reconciliation of these two distinct legal domains, it becomes feasible to effectively leverage the advantages of innovation while concurrently preserving fair competition. The interplay between competition authorities and intellectual property offices can be effectively addressed through collaborative efforts, resulting in the establishment of comprehensive and uniform guidelines, frameworks, and policies that tackle the intricacies involved.[7]

Moreover, the interaction between competition law and intellectual property rights requires a re-examination of the conventional legal doctrines and principles in both domains. The adaptation of concepts such as market definition, dominance, abuse of dominant position, and anticompetitive agreements is necessary to accommodate the distinctive features of intellectual property rights (IPRs) and the intricacies of markets driven by technology.[8]

Concept of Intellectual Property Policy and Rights (IPRs)

IPRs are defined as the combination of the public's approval of an idea, invention, or creative expression with the legal protections afforded to private property. Owners of intellectual property rights (IPRs) enjoy the same exclusive use and access rights to protected subject matter as owners of

[6] Lianos, Ioannis, Competition Law and Intellectual Property (IP) Rights: Analysis, Cases and Materials (October 30, 2016). *Chapter 13 in Ioannis Lianos & Valentine Korah with Paolo Siciliani, Competition Law* (Hart Pub. 2017 Forthcoming),

[7] Pham, Alice (2008), 'Competition Law and Intellectual Property Rights: Controlling Abuse or Abusing Control?', CUTS International, Jaipur, India

[8] Pamela Samuelson, "*Intellectual Property And The Digital Economy: Why The Anti-Circumvention Regulations Need To Be Revised*"

physical property, as well as the ability to license others to commercially exploit their innovations if they lack the resources to do so themselves.

The legal frameworks of contemporary society rely heavily upon the implementation of intellectual property (IP) laws, which serve as a fundamental safeguard for intangible assets originating from both individuals and entities. The primary objective of these laws is to provide impetus to the advancement of innovation, creativity, and economic prosperity by conferring exclusive rights and legal safeguards on intellectual creations. The primary objective of this scholarly article is to offer a comprehensive analysis of the legal framework surrounding intellectual property, delving into its breadth, the categories of intellectual property that are safeguarded, and its role in promoting progress and social advancement.

Copyright law

Copyright law serves to safeguard the intellectual property rights of creators of original works in the domains of literature, art, music, and other creative fields. The legal doctrine of copyright confers upon authors and creators the privilege of possessing exclusive rights over their intellectual property, encompassing the prerogative to replicate, circulate, showcase, execute, and engender derivative works. The legal safeguard of copyright protection is an inherent attribute of creative works, triggered upon their inception and persisting for a designated duration, thereby empowering creators to regulate the utilization and monetization of their intellectual property.

Patent law

The field of patent law is designed to safeguard novel and non-obvious inventions, granting inventors the privilege of exclusive ownership over their creations for a finite duration. The provision of exclusive rights to inventors to restrict the unauthorized making, usage, sale, or import of their inventions is a significant driver of innovation in the realm of patents. The patent application undergoes a meticulous evaluation process to ascertain its novelty, non-obviousness, and industrial applicability.

Trademark law

Trademark law serves as a safeguard for unique and recognizable indicators, such as verbal expressions, graphic representations, emblematic figures, or ornamental patterns that serve to differentiate and demarcate the merchandise or amenities of a particular establishment from those of another. The concept of trademarks is rooted in the fundamental principle of enabling consumers to

identify and establish a connection between products or services and their respective sources or origins. The proprietors of trademarks enjoy the sole entitlement to employ their marks and possess the authority to impede others from utilizing analogous marks in a manner that may potentially result in perplexity among consumers.

Trade secret law

Trade secret law serves to safeguard sensitive and proprietary business data, encompassing a wide range of confidential information, including but not limited to formulas, manufacturing processes, customer lists, and business strategies. The primary objective of this legal regime is to maintain a competitive edge by preventing unauthorized access to and disclosure of such information. In contrast to patents or copyrights, trade secrets are maintained in confidentiality and are not publicly revealed. The safeguarding of trade secrets is contingent upon the implementation of appropriate measures aimed at preserving the confidentiality of the information, including but not limited to the use of non-disclosure agreements and the imposition of access restrictions.

Industrial design

Industrial design pertains to the protection of a product's visual features or aesthetic attributes. The legal concept of design protection pertains to safeguarding the distinct configurations, contours, motifs, or embellishments that confer aesthetic allure and economic significance upon merchandise. The legal framework of industrial design rights serves as a safeguard against unauthorised usage or replication of a safeguarded design, thereby fostering ingenuity in the realm of product aesthetics.

Geographical Indication (GI)

Geographical Indication (GI) safeguards indications of origin that serve to distinguish goods as originating from a particular geographical area, thereby possessing distinct qualities or attributes attributable to their place of origin. The implementation of geographical indication (GI) protection serves as a means to instill confidence in consumers regarding the genuineness and caliber of merchandise linked to a specific geographical region. This, in turn, facilitates the growth of local economies while safeguarding conventional expertise.

Intellectual property is a crucial safeguard for a diverse range of intangible assets, encompassing creative expressions, innovations, brand identities, confidential information, industrial designs, and geographical indications. The laws that provide exclusive rights and legal protection serve as catalysts for innovation, creativity, and investment, thereby fostering economic growth and societal

advancement. Comprehending the extent and importance of intellectual property legislation is paramount for individuals who engage in creative and innovative pursuits, commercial entities, and decision-makers to effectively navigate the intricate terrain of intellectual property and cultivate an equitable framework that incentivizes and acknowledges ingenuity while also taking into account the welfare of the public.

Concept of competition policy

Essentially, competition policy refers to any action taken by the government that has an effect on the way businesses operate or the composition of a given industry.

Efficiency and maximum welfare are the goals of competition policy. To promote competition in local and national markets, competition policy entails a liberalised trade policy, openness to foreign investments, and economic deregulation. To prevent anti-competitive business practises and unnecessary government interventions, competition policy entails measures such as legislation, judicial decisions, and regulations. Competition/antitrust law describes this factor.

Concept of Competition law in India

The legal system for competition law in India is predominantly anchored by the Competition Act of 2002, along with its subsequent modifications. The primary aim of the aforementioned Act is to foster and maintain equitable competition within the Indian market, prevent any instances of anti-competitive conduct, and safeguard the welfare of consumers. The Act designates the Competition Commission of India (CCI) as the regulatory entity tasked with the enforcement of its provisions.

The Competition Act is comprehensive legislation that encompasses diverse facets pertaining to competition, such as anti-competitive agreements, abuse of dominant position, and regulation of combinations, which include mergers, acquisitions, and amalgamations. It is noteworthy that the Act has a wide-ranging scope, encompassing all sectors of the economy, be they public or private enterprises. Furthermore, it extends to both domestic and international transactions that have the potential to significantly impede competition within the Indian market.

The core principle of the law in question is the interdiction of agreements that are deemed to be anti-competitive in nature. The aforementioned pertains to accords forged between commercial entities that possess the purpose or consequence of impeding competition, such as the establishment of fixed prices, manipulation of bids, allocation of markets, or constraining production or distribution.

According to the Act, agreements of such nature are deemed null and void, and may potentially incur penalties.

The Act additionally encompasses provisions that pertain to the prevention of enterprises from exploiting their dominant position in the market. The Competition Act serves to curtail the potential for enterprises to engage in anti-competitive behavior by leveraging their dominant market position to the detriment of competitors, customers, or suppliers. This includes the imposition of inequitable or prejudicial terms or conditions. The Competition Act serves to establish an equitable and impartial environment for all entities involved in the market.

Moreover, the Act governs mergers and acquisitions that possess the potential to have a significant detrimental impact on market competition. It is mandated that corporations seeking to engage in mergers, acquisitions, or amalgamations that exceed specific financial thresholds adhere to the regulatory protocol of notifying the CCI and procuring its authorization prior to executing such transactions. The objective of this particular provision is to curtail the formation of entities that possess an undue amount of market power and foster a climate of robust competition.

The CCI is vested with the authority to scrutinize and delve into purported instances of anti-competitive conduct, entertain grievances from aggrieved entities, and implement suitable measures for ensuring compliance. The CCI, vested with the power to enforce competition law, possesses the ability to levy sanctions, proffer directives to cease and desist, and, in extreme cases, mandate the reorganization of a commercial entity in order to reinstate a competitive market.

In recent times, the Competition Commission of India (CCI) has been proactively engaged in promoting fair competition and tackling instances of anti-competitive behavior across diverse domains of the Indian market, such as e-commerce, pharmaceuticals, telecommunications, and more. The preservation of a competitive market landscape and safeguarding the welfare of consumers have been dependent on its pivotal contribution.

The Competition Act of 2002 defines the goals of Indian antitrust law, which are to encourage healthy competition, restrict anticompetitive behavior, and protect consumers. The Act regulates combinations and prohibits anti-competitive agreements and the exploitation of a dominant market position. The Competition Commission of India is responsible for upholding the Act and fostering a level playing field in India's marketplace.

Interplay Between Competition Law and Intellectual Property Rights (IPR)

It is apparent that the objectives of intellectual property rights (IPR) and competition law may seem to be in conflict with one another. The issue suggests that the entities in question possess incompatible characteristics, leading to an inevitable state of discord and resistance. While there exists a potential intersection between intellectual property rights (IPR) and competition law with regard to the concept of friction, it is important to note that these two legal frameworks can also operate in a complementary manner. Despite the possibility of conflict, there is potential for synergy between these two areas of law. It is noteworthy that the objectives of the concerned party are congruent with their overarching aim, which is to enhance the well-being of the populace by expediting market innovation.[9]

The achievement of this objective is facilitated through diverse methods. Intellectual property rights (IPRs) provide innovators and producers with exclusive rights to receive fair compensation for their research and development expenditures. Conversely, competition law safeguards the interests of the entire community by restricting private rights, including those conferred by IPRs, to guarantee that the market remains free from anti-competitive practices. This approach fosters greater innovation and superior products for consumers. The intersection of intellectual property rights (IPRs) and competition law is a crucial aspect that contributes to the enhancement of consumer welfare through the promotion of innovation.[10]

The objective of facilitating innovation requires a delicate equilibrium in competition law to safeguard against the misuse and overuse of intellectual property rights while simultaneously fostering an environment that encourages a thriving marketplace for inventive and imaginative endeavors.
The discourse on the link between intellectual property rights (IPR) and competition law is comprised of several distinct sections.

It is noteworthy that Section 3(5) of the Indian Competition Act, 2002, provides an exemption for the reasonable use of inventions, thereby limiting the scope of competition law. This suggests that the Act's protection is reliant on the validity of the restrictions put in place by the owner of the intellectual property rights (IPR). It is pertinent to note that any condition deemed unreasonable can be subject to

[9] Keith N. Hylton, Antitrust and Intellectual Property: A Brief Introduction, in The Cambridge Handbook of Antitrust, Intellectual Property, and High Tech 81 (Roger D. Blair and D. Daniel Sokol eds., 2016),
[10] Igor Nikolic and Damien Geradin,The Interface Between Intellectual Property and Competition Law: Recent Developments and Future Challenges,European Competition Journal, 2019,

scrutiny under competition law.

The Indian Competition Act, 2002, in Section 4, pertains to the subject of abuse of a dominant position. It is noteworthy that the provision solely prohibits the act of abuse and does not extend to the mere existence of a dominant position. It is noteworthy to observe that Section does not provide any exemption for intellectual property rights (IPRs). This is likely due to the fact that IPRs do not necessarily confer a dominant position in the market. Furthermore, it is important to emphasize that the aforementioned section does not prohibit the mere existence of a dominant position, but rather the abuse of such a position.[11]

Section 4(2) of the Indian Competition Act, 2002, is a provision that deems enterprise action as abuse and is applicable to intellectual property rights (IPR) holders as well.

The Indian Competition Act, 2002, in Section (3), explicitly bars anti-competitive practices. However, it is noteworthy that this prohibition does not impede an individual's entitlement to curtail any violation or impose rational conditions that are essential for safeguarding their rights conferred by the Intellectual Property Rights (IPR) laws. These laws encompass the Copyright Act, 1956, the Patents Act, 1970, the Geographical Indications of Goods (Registration and Protection) Act, 1999 (48 of 1999), and the Designs Act, 2000.

The Proposal for Democracy

Even though there is an overlap between IP and competition, which results in an interaction, it is argued that these two concepts have different spheres of influence and operate in various regions since they serve different purposes. The two spheres are separate and should remain so.

A. **Time Frame: When Can you use each of them?**

Many people believe that intellectual property (IP) and competition (competition) should be kept completely apart, as IP is concerned with the correct assignment and defense of property rights, while competition is focused on the use and exercise of such rights in the market. It follows that the same degree of distance must be observed when carrying out legal enforcement. We agree with this viewpoint, and we offer various justifications for it.

[11] Spyros Maniatis, Intellectual Property Rights and Competition Law: Friends or Foes?,Journal of Intellectual Property Law & Practice, 2016

When an asset is created, ownership rights are transferred simultaneously. However, when intellectual property rights (IPRs) are used to exert market power, competition steps in to limit their usage. This distinction between the two is based on market dominance. The exercise of the property rights assigned by intellectual property law is also subject to some degree of regulation, albeit without consideration of market dominance. [12] When it comes to regulating property rights as a source of market power, competition does not single out IPR but rather regulates all property rights equally. Therefore, there is a distinction between the two regarding the duration and extent of enforcement.

The Competition Law Doesn't Do

Competition legislation does not jeopardize the primary goals of IPRs. It does not call into question the use of excluding power per se against third parties seeking access to the IPR-protected innovation or creation, but rather the implementation of additional anti-competitive behavior aimed at exploiting the position of strength on the market in dealings with third parties and the consequent generation of further anti-competitive effects. Only the additional use of IPRs to leverage and expand market dominance beyond the essentially provided anti-free-riding function is subject to antitrust law's limitations.

Strengthening Competition law

Intellectual property is an exception to the rule favoring open markets. When the goals of intellectual property have been met, protection should end. If intellectual property fails to restrain the use of such authority beyond the scope of its intended protection, then market forces can. So anti-trust advocates don't view intellectual property rights with hostility. If the IP holder goes above and beyond the core function for which the right is issued, such as protecting the achievements of inventors against free riders and protecting the IP itself, this mechanism steps in to make sure that the rights' basic purpose is not destroyed.

The company's brand and reputation. Such a situation may occur if the owner's IPRs are contractually exercised in a way that significantly limits competition beyond what is necessary to prevent free-riding. In other cases, where IPR grants such market dominance, a third party's forced license of the right may be warranted.

[12] Donna M. Gitter, The Conflict in the European Community between Competition Law and Intellectual Property Rights: A Call for Legislative Clarification of the Essential Facilities Doctrine, 40 Am. Bus. L.J. 217, 293 (2003)

When the effect of exercising the right goes beyond the initial motivation for granting it, IP law may be powerless to prevent the abuse of that right. The exercise of property rights can have far-reaching effects, and it is at this point that competition law comes into play. In these cases where IP law may fail to achieve its ultimate aim, competition law steps in to provide the necessary protections.
This case illustrates the partition between intellectual property and rivalry. Maintaining the functions' independence from one another in terms of when they take effect and under what circumstances ensures the system's effectiveness and the security of its objectives.

Differences

In the context of patent laws, the tension between competition policy and the IP rights regime has been particularly heated. Competition policy and patent law intersect at their shared mechanisms of implementation. While antitrust law mandates that businesses be free to operate without undue barriers to entry, patent laws provide innovators with a brief monopoly that shields them from other firms' exploitation of patented products.[13]

Protecting intellectual property (IP) helps spur economic progress and new product creation, both of which are good for consumers. Patent protection allows creators of new items and techniques to legally prevent others from profiting from their work for a certain period of time. To recoup the costs of their groundbreaking research and development, innovators and holders of intellectual property rights are granted a limited monopoly under the law. They generate a fair profit, which encourages them to keep pushing the boundaries of their industry.

On the other hand, consumers and businesses alike benefit greatly from competition law's ability to eliminate price gouging, and monopoly abuse, induce more efficient resource allocation, and level the playing field for businesses and consumers alike. Therefore, it prevents the monopoly power associated with IPRs from being abused, extended, or made too complex. As a result of competition law's emphasis on protecting competition and the competitive process, which in turn encourages innovators to be the first to market with a new product or service at a price and quality that consumers want, competition law also seeks to stimulate innovation as competitive inputs and thereby works to improve consumer welfare.

[13] Nikhil Kumar,The Interface Between Ipr And Competition Law, November 23, 2019

Despite their differences, the two regimes often coexist, with each discipline limiting the rights of the other to ensure its own dominance. Compulsory licensing was developed to strike a balance between intellectual property rights and public interest in industries like the pharmaceutical industry, where a lack of consumer knowledge has led to issues like pay-for-delay and delay settlements, discrimination in patient assistance programs, EV programs, the use of patents, and so on.

Conclusion

To fully grasp the magnitude of the complex and multidimensional linkages between Competition Law and Intellectual Property Rights in contemporary India's thriving markets, a nuanced understanding of both is required. Competition law aims to prevent abuses that may arise as a result of monopolistic power, whereas intellectual property rights seek, in many situations, to grant exactly such monopolistic powers in order to incentivize innovators to innovate. Having the two regimes function in a way that promotes widespread competition and provides adequate protection for innovators to recoup their investments in R&D is in the best interests of Indian society.

These two aims have a common denominator: improving the lives of consumers by creating favorable conditions for new ideas to flourish. While increased competition between businesses leads to higher quality and lower prices for consumers, intellectual property rights (IPRs) increase innovation by giving creators a greater chance to profit from their work.

Regarding jurisdiction, India would immensely benefit from a more developed legal structure defining the CCI’s authority. Wherever the exercise of IPRs goes beyond "reasonable conditions," as defined in Section 3(5) of the Indian Competition Act, 2002, competition law should impose curbs to restore a sense of equilibrium to the IPR regime; however, such curbs should not go beyond the extent to which the exercise of IPRs causes an appreciable adverse effect on competition.

****