Page 806 - 812 **DOI:** *https://doij.org/10.10000/IJLMH.119752*

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF LAW MANAGEMENT & HUMANITIES

[ISSN 2581-5369]

Volume 8 | Issue 3

2025

A Critical Analysis of the Global Patent System: Assessing the Efficiency, Equity, and Implications of International Patent Treaties in Promoting Innovation and Balancing Public Interest

DHRUV NARWAT[1], DR. MONIKA RASTOGI[2] AND SUMAR MALIK[3]

ABSTRACT

The global patent system is designed to incentives innovation by granting inventors temporary monopolies to profit from their creations. However, its efficiency, equity, and alignment with public interest are increasingly debated. This paper examines the global patent system through the lenses of efficiency (does it effectively spur innovation?), equity (is it fair across nations and stakeholders?), and the role of international patent treaties like the TRIPS Agreement in shaping outcomes. While the system drives technological progress in some contexts, it often favours wealthy nations and corporations, marginalises developing countries, and restricts access to essential goods like medicines. Reforms are needed to balance innovation incentives with public welfare and global fairness.

I. INTRODUCTION

The patent system is a cornerstone of modern economies, rewarding inventors with exclusive rights to their creations for a limited time. In exchange, they disclose their inventions, fostering knowledge sharing and further innovation. Globally, treaties like the Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS) standardise patent rules across nations. Yet, the system faces criticism for inefficiencies, inequities, and failing to adequately serve the public interest. The global patent system serves as a cornerstone of modern innovation, designed to incentivize creativity by granting inventors temporary monopolies to profit from their inventions. Governed by international treaties such as the Paris Convention, the Patent Cooperation Treaty (PCT), and the Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS), this system aims to standardize intellectual property

[1] Author is a Research Scholar at Department of Law, Lingayas Vidyapeeth Deemed University, Faridabad, India.
[2] Author is the Head of Department at School of Law, Lingaya's Vidyapeeth, Faridabad, India.
[3] Author is an Assistant Professor at Department of Law, Lingayas Vidyapeeth, Faridabad, India.

 [ISSN 2581-5369]

protections across borders. However, its efficiency, equity, and ability to balance private incentives with public interest remain contentious. While patents encourage investment in research and development, they can also stifle innovation through monopolistic practices, restrict access to essential technologies, and exacerbate inequalities between developed and developing nations. This analysis critically evaluates the global patent system's structure, its alignment with the goals of fostering innovation, and its implications for equitable access to technology and knowledge. By examining the interplay of legal frameworks, economic incentives, and societal impacts, this study seeks to illuminate the system's strengths, flaws, and potential for reform in an increasingly interconnected world.

Efficiency: Does the system effectively promote innovation

Equity: Is it fair to all stakeholders, especially across developed and developing nations?

Implications of Treaties: How do international agreements like TRIPS shape innovation and public welfare?

By exploring these dimensions, this paper highlights the system’s strengths, flaws, and potential paths for reform.

Efficiency: Does the Patent System Promote Innovation

The primary goal of patents is to incentives innovation by ensuring inventors can profit from their work. In theory, the promise of a temporary monopoly encourages investment in research and development (R&D). Evidence supports this in some sectors:

Pharmaceuticals: The high cost of drug development (often billions of dollars) relies on patent protection to recover investments. Studies show that patents drive significant R&D in this industry, leading to new treatments.

Technology: Companies like Apple and Samsung use patents to protect innovations in smartphones and software, fulling competition and rapid technological advancements.

However, inefficiencies undermine the system’s effectiveness:

Patent Thickets: In industries like tech, overlapping patents create “thickets,” where companies must navigate complex licensing agreements. This stifles innovation by raising costs and delaying product releases.Defensive Patenting: Firms often amass patents not to innovate but to protect against lawsuits or block competitors. For example, large tech companies hold thousands of patents, many of which are never commercialised.

Low-Quality Patents: Weak patent examination processes lead to vague or overly broad patents. These “bad patents” clog the system, spark litigation, and divert resources from

 [ISSN 2581-5369]

genuine innovation.

Short-Term Focus: Patents incentives profitable innovations over socially valuable ones. For instance, pharmaceutical companies prfioritize drugs for wealthy markets over treatments for diseases like malaria, which primarily affect poorer populations.

In short, while patents drive innovation in some areas, inefficiencies like thickets, defensive patenting, and misaligned incentives limit the system's overall effectiveness.

II. EQUITY: IS THE PATENT SYSTEM FAIR ACROSS STAKEHOLDERS

The global patent system often favours wealthy nations and large corporations, creating inequities that disadvantage developing countries, small innovators, and the public.

Developed vs. Developing Nations

Access to Technology: Patents concentrate technological advancements in rich countries, where firms can afford R&D and patent filings. Developing nations, with limited resources, struggle to access patented technologies, widening the global innovation gap.

TRIPS Compliance: The TRIPS Agreement, enforced by the World Trade Organization (WTO), requires all member countries to adopt strong patent protections. While this benefits multinational corporations, it restricts developing nations' ability to produce affordable generics or adapt technologies to local needs. For example, during the HIV/AIDS crisis, patented drugs were unaffordable in Africa until international pressure led to exceptions.

Capacity Gaps: Filing and defending patents is expensive and complex. Wealthy nations have robust patent offices and legal systems, while poorer countries often lack the infrastructure to support inventors or enforce rights.

Corporations vs. Small Innovators

Cost Barriers: Patent applications cost thousands of dollars, excluding small businesses and individual inventors. Large corporations dominate patent filings, reinforcing their market power.Litigation Disparities: Patent lawsuits favour deep-pocketed firms. Small innovators risk bankruptcy defending their patents or challenging infringements, discouraging grassroots innovation.

Public Interest

Access to Essentials: Patents on medicines, seeds, and green technologies can restrict access to life-saving or environmentally critical goods. For instance, during the COVID-19 pandemic, patent protections delayed vaccine distribution in low-income countries.

 [ISSN 2581-5369]

Knowledge Sharing: While patents require disclosure, the information is often technical and inaccessible to smaller players, limiting the system's knowledge-sharing benefits.

The system's inequities—favouring rich nations, corporations, and profitable sectors—undermine its fairness and exclude many from its benefits.

III. IMPLICATIONS OF INTERNATIONAL PATENT TREATIES

International treaties, particularly TRIPS, shape the global patent system by harmonising rules across borders. While they aim to promote innovation, their implications are complex.

The TRIPS Agreement

Adopted in 1995, TRIPS requires WTO members to enforce minimum patent standards, including 20-year patent terms and protections for pharmaceuticals. Its impacts include:

Pros:

Global Standards: TRIPS creates a predictable environment for multinational firms, encouraging cross-border investment in R&D.

Innovation in Emerging Markets: Countries like India and China have developed stronger innovation ecosystems partly due to TRIPS-compliant patent systems.

Cons:

One-Size-Fits-All: TRIPS applies the same rules to countries with vastly different economic and technological capacities, disproportionately burdening poorer nations.

Restricted Access: By enforcing strong patents, TRIPS limits access to affordable medicines and technologies. For example, patented drugs for hepatitis C remain unaffordable in many developing countries.

Flexibility Limitations: While TRIPS allows "flexibilities" like compulsory licensing (allowing governments to override patents in emergencies), political and economic pressures from wealthy nations often deter their use.

Other Treaties

Patent Cooperation Treaty (PCT): The PCT streamlines international patent filings, reducing costs for applicants. However, it primarily benefits firms with global ambitions, not local innovators in developing nations.

Bilateral Agreements: Wealthy nations often push for "TRIPS-plus" provisions in trade deals, imposing even stricter patent rules. These agreements further limit generic drug production

and technology transfer.

IV. BALANCING INNOVATION AND PUBLIC INTEREST

Treaties like TRIPS prfioritize innovation incentives for patent holders but often neglect public welfare. For instance, during global crises (e.g., COVID-19), patent waivers or compulsory licensing could have accelerated access to vaccines and treatments, but resistance from patent-holding nations and firms delayed action.

. Recommendations for Reform

To address the patent system's inefficiencies and inequities, reforms should balance innovation incentives with public interest and global fairness:

Improve Patent Quality: Strengthen examination processes to reduce vague or overly broad patents. This would minimise litigation and patent thickets, fostering genuine innovation.

Tiered Patent Systems: Allow shorter patent terms or lower fees for small businesses and developing nations, making the system more accessible.

Enhance TRIPS Flexibilities: Simplify the use of compulsory licensing and parallel importing for essential goods like medicines, especially during crises.

Promote Open Innovation: Encourage patent pools or voluntary licensing for critical technologies (e.g., green energy, public health). The Medicines Patent Pool, which facilitates affordable drug access, is a successful model.

Support Technology Transfer: Wealthy nations and firms should share patented technologies with developing countries through licensing or capacity-building programs.

Public Interest Safeguards: Introduce mechanisms to prfioritize patents for socially valuable innovations, such as treatments for neglected diseases or sustainable technologies.

V. CONCLUSION

The global patent system is a powerful tool for driving innovation, but its efficiency and equity are undermined by inefficiencies, inequities, and rigid international treaties. While it incentivises R&D in sectors like pharmaceuticals and technology, it often prioritises profits over public welfare and favours wealthy nations and corporations over smaller players and developing countries. International treaties like TRIPS standardise rules but exacerbate disparities by imposing uniform standards on diverse economies.

Reforming the system requires a delicate balance: preserving incentives for inventors while ensuring fair access to knowledge and essential goods. By improving patent quality,

 [ISSN 2581-5369]

enhancing treaty flexibilities, and promoting open innovation, the global patent system can better serve its dual mission of fostering innovation and advancing the public good. As the world faces pressing challenges like climate change and global health crises, a more equitable and efficient patent system is not just desirable—it's essential.

*****

 [ISSN 2581-5369]

VI. REFERENCES

1. World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO). (2023). Global Patent Trends.
2. Medicines Sans Frontier's. (2021). Patents and Access to Medicines.
3. WTO. (1995). TRIPS Agreement Text.
4. Bold run, M., & Levine, D. K. (2008). Against Intellectual Monopoly.
5. Drakes, P., & Brathwaite, J. (2002). Information Feudalism: Who Owns the Knowledge Economy?

*****