Page 1534 - 1547 **DOI:** *https://doij.org/10.10000/IJLMH.119828*

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF LAW MANAGEMENT & HUMANITIES

[ISSN 2581-5369]

Volume 8 | Issue 3

2025

Adapting Patent Law for Emerging Technologies in India: Challenges and Opportunities

TARANNUM KHANAM[1]

ABSTRACT

As India progresses towards technological advancement, the need to adapt patent law becomes paramount to promoting innovation and competitiveness. This paper delves into the challenges and opportunities associated with adapting patent law to accommodate emerging technologies in India. The evolution of patent law in India is crucial to providing adequate protection and incentives for innovators. However, the current legal framework may not fully address the complexities of emerging technologies, leading to ambiguities and loopholes that hinder innovation. Rapid advancements in fields such as artificial intelligence, biotechnology, and blockchain pose unique challenges to traditional patent law. These technologies often blur the lines between inventions, raising questions about patentability, disclosure, and enforcement. One of the primary challenges is the lack of clarity in patent eligibility criteria for emerging technologies. The absence of specific guidelines leads to uncertainty among innovators and potential patent applicants, hindering investment and innovation in these sectors. Despite challenges, adapting patent law presents significant opportunities for India to strengthen its position as a global innovation hub. By introducing specialized patent courts, encouraging collaboration between industry and academia, and embracing international best practices, India can create an environment for encouraging innovation and attract foreign investment. In conclusion, adapting patent law for emerging technologies in India requires a comprehensive approach that addresses challenges while leveraging opportunities to promote innovation and economic growth.

Keywords: *Patent law, emerging technologies, Challenges, opportunities.*

I. INTRODUCTION

As the world becomes increasingly digital, the importance of intellectual property rights (IPR) has grown exponentially. The intellectual property now comprises one of the most valuable assets of any organisation, with patents, trademarks, copyrights, and trade secrets playing a critical role in facilitating innovation and growth. Patents play a crucial role in protecting

[1] Author is a student at Barkatullah University, India.

 [ISSN 2581-5369]

innovations by granting inventors exclusive rights to their creations. In India, the Patents Act of 1970 lays down the framework for patent protection, outlining criteria like novelty, inventive step, and industrial applicability. However, as technology evolves, so do the complexities surrounding patenting these new inventions.[2]

The development of technology as well as permanently changing economic and social conditions pose various challenges for international, Indian and various national legislations. One such issue raised by the extremely rapid and unpredictable development is due to the swift development in technology related to artificial intelligence (AI). Technologies related to AI have implications on all areas of law. Hence, in order to ensure the changes brought about by these developments and prevent disruptions to the economy and social order, an appropriate ecosystem is the need of the hour.[3]

AI systems use complex systems of mathematical models and/or algorithms to achieve their intended results and are effectively classified as Computer Related Inventions (CRIs) in India and treated as such by the Indian Patent Office (IPO). The IPO's Guidelines for Examination of Computer-Related Inventions (CRIs) offer some direction to examiners in handling AI inventions, although some incongruities remain. Like any other invention, a CRI must fulfil the requirements of novelty, inventive step, and industrial application to be patentable under the Indian Patents Act, 1970. In India, the hurdles most likely to arise for AI inventions relates to subject matter patentability and inventive step, as well as sufficiency of disclosure.[4]

A. Research Questions

- What are the current challenges faced by emerging technologies in the context of Indian patent law?
- How do international patent frameworks address the challenges of emerging technologies, and what lessons can India learn from them?
- What specific reforms are needed in Indian patent law to accommodate emerging technologies like AI, biotechnology, and blockchain?
- How can the Indian patent system balance the need for innovation with the protection of intellectual property rights in emerging technologies?

[2] *The future of IPR: Emerging technologies and legal frameworks*. (n.d.). https://www.legalserviceindia.com/legal/article-11944-the-future-of-ipr-emerging-technologies-and-legal-frameworks.html

[3] Raghuwanshi, R. B. R. a. S. S., & Law, L. (2023, April 15). AI Generated Inventions, ChatGPT, Indian Patent Act, DABUS, United States Patent & Trademark Office, European Patent Office. *Live Law*. https://www.livelaw.in/law-firms/law-firm-articles-/ai-generated-inventions-chatgpt-indian-patent-act-dabus-united-states-patent-trademark-office-european-patent-office-226394

[4] Neha Arora, Dr. Joyita Deb, Neha Arora, & Dr. Joyita Deb. (2022, February 23). *[The Viewpoint] A future-proof Indian Patent Office? Patenting AI inventions in India*. Bar And Bench - Indian Legal News. https://www.barandbench.com/law-firms/view-point/a-future-proof-ipo-patenting-ai-inventions-in-india

 [ISSN 2581-5369]

B. Objectives

- To identify and analyse the challenges posed by emerging technologies to the current Indian patent law.
- To compare and contrast Indian patent regulations with international frameworks.
- To propose specific legislative and policy reforms for enhancing the Indian patent system's ability to manage emerging technologies.
- To assess the potential impact of these reforms on innovation and intellectual property protection in India.

C. Hypothesis

The existing Indian patent law is insufficient to address the specific needs and complexities of emerging technologies, necessitating targeted reforms to promote innovation and protect intellectual property effectively.

D. Research Methodology

During the research work the researcher has followed and applied the doctrinal method. This method will involve a thorough examination of Indian patent laws, including the Patents Act, 1970, and its amendments. Relevant case law, judicial interpretations, and legislative debates will be analysed to understand the current legal framework. Comparative analysis with international patent laws, particularly those from jurisdictions like the United States, European Union, and Japan.

II. THE PATENT ACT, 1970

The Indian Patent Act of 1970 serves as the fundamental legal framework governing patents in India. It establishes the criteria and conditions for granting patents, safeguarding intellectual property rights, and promoting technological advancement in the country. Several key sections of the Act hold significant relevance in determining the patentability of an invention. These sections include:

- **Section 2(1) (j):** This section provides the definition of an invention, which includes any new product or process (or any improvement thereof) that involves an inventive step and is capable of industrial application.
- **Section 3:** This section outlines the conditions for the grant of a patent, including requirements such as novelty, inventive step (non-obviousness), and industrial application.

- **Section 3(k)** of the Indian Patents Act, 1970, proscribes patentability of "mathematical methods, business methods, computer programs per se, and algorithms". AI-based inventions that are novel, non-obvious, and useful are patentable in India.

- **Section 6:** Terminology of identifying a human "true and first inventor" also suggests difficulty accommodating AI inventors. Like copyright, approaches are debated like designating the programmer or user as deemed inventor for AI creations.
- **Section 13:** This section deals with the non-patentable subject matter, identifying certain inventions that are not eligible for patent protection, such as scientific theories, mathematical methods, and literary, dramatic, musical, or artistic works.
- **Section 29:** This section sets forth the term of a patent, which generally lasts for 20 years from the date of filing the patent application.
- **Section 30:** This section addresses the rights conferred to the patentee, including the exclusive right to make, use, sell, and distribute the patented invention within the territory of India.
- **Section 32:** This section deals with the grounds for opposition to the grant of a patent, allowing third parties to challenge the patentability of an invention based on prior art or other objections.
- **Section 34:** This section provides for the revocation of a patent if it is found to be invalid or if certain conditions are not met, such as failure to pay maintenance fees.[5]

PATENTABILITY TEST: For an invention to be eligible for patent protection, it must meet the three-pronged test of patentability known as the "NUNs Test". Forming an essential part of patent laws across jurisdictions, the test lays down that:

- The subject matter must be new or novel;
- It must have utility; and
- It must be non-obvious.[6]

[5] Kapoor, V. (2024, March 6). *An overview of emerging issues relating to patents in India - iPleaders*. iPleaders. https://blog.ipleaders.in/an-overview-of-emerging-issues-relating-to-patents-in-india/
[6] Nair, S. (2020, October 1). Tests of patentability. *IP Matters*. https://www.theipmatters.com/post/test-of-patentability

III. EMERGING TECHNOLOGIES AND PATENTABILITY

A. Artificial Intelligence (AI) and Machine Learning:

Artificial Intelligence (AI) has become a transformative force in innovation, challenging established norms and paradigms, particularly within the framework of patentable subject matter. Integrating AI into inventive processes has led to re-evaluating traditional notions of inventiveness, patentability criteria, and even the very concept of inventorship. The historical trajectory of patent law reveals a continual adaptation to technological advancements. From the early days of granting exclusive rights to inventors, patent systems have evolved to accommodate the complexities of various scientific and technological revolutions. However, the advent of AI presents a distinctive set of challenges that necessitate a fresh examination of patentable subject matter. As patent office's grapple with determining the boundaries of novelty and non-obviousness in this digital era, the landscape of patentable subject matter becomes increasingly intricate. The issue of inventorship takes centre stage when AI is involved in the inventive process. the rise of AI-generated inventions raises fundamental questions about the attribution of creativity. Can an algorithm, devoid of consciousness and intentionality, be considered an inventor? Legal scholars and practitioners are engaged in a dialogue that transcends traditional boundaries, exploring the ethical and legal dimensions of recognizing AI as inventors.[7]

B. Blockchain and Distributed Ledger Technology

Blockchain's decentralized nature challenges traditional notions of patent ownership and enforcement. Issues such as patenting cryptographic algorithms and incentivizing open-source innovation within blockchain networks require careful legal consideration.

C. Biotechnology and Genetic Engineering

Advances in biotechnology, including CRISPR technology, blur the line between natural phenomena and human inventions. India's approach to patenting life forms and genetically modified organisms (GMOs) must balance ethical concerns with the need to incentivize biotechnological innovation. Patentability in biotechnology is not solely confined to human health or agriculture; it extends to diverse applications such as environmental remediation, bioenergy, and industrial processes. The patent system must grapple with assessing the novelty and inventiveness of inventions across this expansive spectrum, where the boundaries

[7] Unnikrishnan, A. (2024). ANALYZING THE IMPACT OF EMERGING TECHNOLOGIES ON INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY RIGHTS (IPR): a COMPREHENSIVE STUDY ON THE CHALLENGES AND OPPORTUNITIES IN THE DIGITAL AGE. *Samart'ali Da Msop'lio/Samart'ali Da Msop'lio*, *10*(1), 66–79. https://doi.org/10.36475/10.1.6

 [ISSN 2581-5369]

of what is considered patentable are continually evolving.[8]

IV. AN ANALYSIS OF AI DABUS

The contemporary age of scientific and technological innovation has pushed the boundaries where the computer or the machine in itself can create and operate autonomously, even though AI still requires minimal control, commands, and direction. AI technology is undeniable and pivotal, like an organ in a body. AI is becoming part of machines, computer devices, cars, drones, robots, etc., but it also seems that it is playing an important role in creating new inventions.

AI technology has progressed at such a fast pace that it generates novel processes and creates new ideas by itself. In 2019, such an AI technology was created by Stephen Thaler, known as the Device for the Autonomous Bootstrapping of Unified Sentence (hereinafter referred to as "DABUS"). South Africa's patent office granted DABUS AI its first patent for an invention related to a food container product, based on fractal geometry, which has been accepted by the Intellectual Property Commission as well.[9]

V. COMPARISON WITH OTHER COUNTRIES

A. Indian Law

In India, the Controller General of Patents recorded objections against AI-generated invention (DABUS) having patent application numbered 202017019068. The examination report cited objection to the DABUS patent application under Section 2 and Section 6 of the Patents Act 1970 ("Act"). The Controller General of Patents raised an objection in the Examination Report, stating that application lacks from passing formal and technical review under Sections 2 and 6 of the Patents Act, 1970- as DABUS is not recognized as a person.

The Controller General of Patents laid out objections in the Examination Report of Thaler's Indian patent application, stating that the application could not pass formal and technical examination under Section 2 and Section 6 of the Patents Act, 1970- as DABUS is not recognized as a person. The same was supported by a number of legal precedents, such as in ***V.B. Mohammed Ibrahim* v. *Alfred Schafranek*[10]**, *where the Court ruled that neither a corporation nor a financing partner can be the sole inventor, and inter alia held that only a*

[8] Hansen, B. (2019, August 21). *What can be patented?* IP Basics Blog. https://ipbasics.marbury.law/2019/08/21/what-can-be-patented/

[9] Kapoor, V. (2024b, March 6). *An overview of emerging issues relating to patents in India - iPleaders*. iPleaders. https://blog.ipleaders.in/an-overview-of-emerging-issues-relating-to-patents-in-india/

[10] AIR 1960 Mysore 173

natural person who actually contributes their skill and knowledge to the innovation is able to legally claim the inventorship.

The applicant responded to the aforementioned objections raised in FER regarding the inventorship of AI by asserting that DABUS is the true inventor/devisor of the invention and that, in accordance with the Indian Patent Act, the applicant have named the inventor/devisor of the invention at the time the application was filed. The definition of inventorship in various jurisdictional procedures is geared toward natural beings with the intention of preventing company invention, according to the response's further explanation of the notion. It was not the outcome of a careful consideration of autonomous machine creation; hence it should not be prohibited from retaining intellectual property rights in cases where no normal person meets the requirements of an inventor.

On the other hand, it may be claimed that an AI may also contribute its technical skills to an invention in order for it to qualify as an inventor. Another Indian case law can support the same claim: ***Som Prakash Rekhi* v. *Union of India & Anr on November 13, 1980 AIR 1981 SC 212***, the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India rendered a decision on what constitutes a "person" in the eyes of the law. The judgment concluded as a result that a jurisdictional person is the one to whom the Law considers 'personality'. When we refer to a juristic personality, we actually refer to a legal entity who have rights to sue or who can be sued by another entity. Inherently, an AI does not have the capability to use the numerous rights, nor can it perform the required duties of any legal entity independently.

B. Other Countries

- **South Africa:** The South African Patent Office became the world's first IP office to grant patent for an invention developed by the AI machine DABUS. However, it is pertinent to note that South African patent law does not define "inventor".
- **Australia:** On July 2021, the Australian Federal Court overturned the Australian Patent Office's refusal to grant inventorship to AI machines, ruling that artificial intelligence systems could be an inventors. This decision provided the following rationale:
    - An agent can be an inventing person or thing, where an agent can be described as computer, regulator, dishwasher and like; and no specific provision in the Australian Patent Act prevents an AI system from being considered as an inventor.
    - The court in its judgement cleared that the ruling affects only to the inventorship of patents and not the ownership.

- **Europe and United Kingdom:** Unlike South Africa and Australia, the European Patent Office (EPO) and United Kingdom Intellectual Patent Office (UKIPO) have refused to grant inventorship rights to an AI machine. The EPO reasoned that the term "inventor" in European Patent Convention refers only to a natural person. The EPO also stated that merely giving a machine a name does not endow the machine with a legal personality as some legal statuses associated with the title of "inventor" require a legal personality to exercise. The UKIPO made its judgment based on justifications echoed by the EPO.
- **United States:** The United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO) also rejected DABUS reasoning that a plain reading of statutory provisions of United States Code (U.S.C.) discloses the inventors only as natural persons. The USPTO referred to 35 U.S.C. Section 100(f)-(g) and Section 101, where terms such as “individual” and “whoever” are used in the context of inventorship, stating that inventors have to be natural persons. In accordance with the 35 U.S.C. Section 115(b), a person who believes "himself or herself" to be the inventor of the claimed invention must sign an oath or declaration. Additionally, the USPTO cited a number of Federal Circuit decisions that said only natural persons could be the inventors. For example, *In* ***University of Utah*** **v.** ***Max Planck Gesellschaft zur Forderung der Wissenschaften E.V,*** **734 F.3d 1315, 1323 (Fed. Cir. 2013)**, the Federal Circuit refused to list a company or state as an inventor as the USPTO concluded that an AI system cannot be listed as an inventor and also the relevant statutes limit inventors to individuals.
- **Japan:** According to the Japan Patent Office (JPO), AI policies that use machine learning or deep learning to achieve better results with slightly modified algorithms are just viewed as a routine upgrade unless it shows that this method was never applied before. Therefore, to make the patent application acceptable in Japan, the AI invention must show that the method was not known in any form of prior art, and that it is not just a mere improvement over any prior art.[11]

VI. CHALLENGES IN ENFORCEMENT AND PROTECTION

- **Cross-border patent enforcement**: Emerging technologies often operate in a global context, raising jurisdictional issues and challenges in enforcing Indian patents abroad and vice versa. Harmonization efforts under international treaties such as TRIPS (Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights) aim to streamline cross-border enforcement but present challenges in implementation.

[11] Supra note 2 at 4

 [ISSN 2581-5369]

- **Patentability criteria**: Existing patentability criteria such as novelty, non-obviousness, and industrial applicability may require reinterpretation to accommodate emerging technologies. Criteria tailored to specific technologies, such as AI-generated inventions or blockchain protocols, could enhance clarity and predictability in patent examination.
- **Lack of Specific AI Provisions:** The Indian Patent Act, 1970, does not explicitly mention AI. As a result, applying existing patent provisions to AI-related inventions can be complex.
- **Inventorship and Ownership:** Determining who qualifies as the inventor of an AI-generated invention can be tricky. Is it the programmer, the AI system, or both? Clear guidelines are needed to address this issue.
- **Inventive Step:** AI inventions must demonstrate an inventive step beyond existing knowledge. Evaluating this in the context of AI algorithms can be intricate.
- **Adequacy of Disclosure:** Patents require detailed disclosure. For AI, striking the right balance between revealing enough information and protecting trade secrets is crucial.
- **Guidance from the Controller General of Patents and Designs (IPO):** Despite the growing number of AI-related patent filings, there's no official guidance from the IPO. Clear policies are essential to encourage innovation.
- **Access to technology and public interest:** Balancing the rights of patent holders with broader societal interests in access to essential technologies remains a critical challenge. Mechanisms such as compulsory licensing and patent pools may need adaptation to ensure equitable access while promoting innovation.[12]

VII. OPPORTUNITIES FOR REFORMS

- **ENHANCED EXAMINATION GUIDELINES:** Developing specialized guidelines for patent examiners could facilitate more consistent and informed decision-making on emerging technologies. Incorporating technical expertise and stakeholder input in the patent examination process can enhance the quality of granted patents.
- **TRADE SECRETS:** It is one of the IP rights available to rightful holders that keeps the information confidential and is not disclosed in the public domain or published. For trade secrets to be granted there is no mandatory requirement for an innovation to be recognized in the ambit of being created by a natural person.

[12] *Intellectual property globalization: How to Adapt and Compete in the Global Intellectual Property Market*. (2024, April 1). fastercapital.com. https://fastercapital.com/content/Intellectual-property-globalization--How-to-Adapt-and-Compete-in-the-Global-Intellectual-Property-Market.html

- **REGULATORY SANDBOXES AND PILOT PROGRAMS:** Implementing regulatory sandboxes or pilot programs can provide a controlled environment for testing new patent policies and procedures related to emerging technologies. Such initiatives encourage experimentation while mitigating risks associated with regulatory uncertainty.
- **INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION AND HARMONIZATION:** Engaging in international forums and harmonization efforts can align Indian patent law with global standards, enhancing predictability for multinational technology companies and fostering cross-border innovation.[13]
- **GOVERNMENT INITIATIVES AND SUPPORT:**
    - **National Intellectual Property Rights (IPR) Policy:** The Indian government, recognizing the importance of intellectual property, has formulated the National IPR Policy. This policy aims to create a conducive environment for innovation and intellectual property protection across various sectors, including AI.
    - **Promoting Innovation:** Government initiatives that promote innovation, research, and development contribute to a thriving ecosystem for AI advancements. Incentives for startups, research grants, and collaborative programs enhance the overall innovation landscape.[14]

VIII. ROLE OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE IN ECONOMIC GROWTH IN INDIA

The Parliamentary Standing Committee ("Committee") constituted under the Department of Commerce, analysed the current landscape of the IPR regime in India and noted its contribution to fostering innovation and entrepreneurship in the country in its report titled as "Report 161: Review of the Intellectual Property Rights Regime in India" presented in the Rajya Sabha on July 23rd, 2021. Particularly, the report examined the existing challenges related to the current legislative structure including the inventorship rights of an AI. The same report was also taken as a support in the response to the objections of first examination report of Indian application, filed by Dr. Stephen Thaler.

The committee recognized the relevance and usefulness of AI-based cutting-edge technologies and machine learning. Digital technology is proving essential in responding to the global crisis, especially in this time of great impact from the pandemic. Further, the Committee

[13] Ertl, B., & Ertl, B. (2024, April 5). *Safeguarding intellectual property when collaborating with external parties*. Kiteworks | Your Private Content Network. https://www.kiteworks.com/third-party-risk/safeguard-your-intellectual-property/

[14] Interns, I. (2023, June 9). *National IPR policy: Substantiating the need for a new regime*. Intepat IP. https://www.intepat.com/blog/national-ipr-policy-substantiating-the-need-for-a-new-regime/

placed reliance on a report published by Accenture titled as *"How AI Boosts Industry Profits and Innovation*" which estimated AI to add US $ 957 Billion into the Indian Economy by 2035, if used optimally, give a better understanding of the impact and role of AI and technology increase in relation to the contemporary landscape and intellectual property.

The Commission therefore recommended giving priority consideration to the relevant provisions of the Indian Patents Act, 1970 [i.e. Section 3(k)], and the Copyright Act, 1957 to grant invention rights to AI in India. The report also stated that "*The Committee recommends the Department that the approach in linking the mathematical methods or algorithms to a tangible technical device or a practical application should be adopted in India for facilitating their patents as being done in the EU and U.S. Hence, the conversion of mathematical methods and algorithms to a process in this way would make it easier to protect them as patents*".

The Committee came to the conclusion that the changes to the legal framework would safeguard AI creations (whether created autonomously or with human assistance or input), encourage ground-breaking research and development in the nation, and keep the environment favourable for the protection of innovations involving human intelligence. The Committee argued that because such AI-induced innovations would not be protected domestically, the restrictions placed on the inventorship rights of an AI would deter large investments in the industry.[15]

IX. CONCLUSION

Emerging technologies and legal frameworks will have a significant impact on the future of IPR in India. With AI and ML, blockchain, and IoT being adopted at a fast pace, it's essential to put in place legal and regulatory frameworks that support the growth of the digital ecosystem in India. The laws created by the government must be designed so that we can benefit from technology without jeopardising our rights. As India strives to become a digital-first economy, it is becoming increasingly important to establish IP protection mechanisms that secure creativity and innovation. A comprehensive and robust legal framework for IPR protection coupled with a policy framework to guard against cyber threats will help secure India's intellectual property while promoting innovation and creativity. The Patent Act, 1970 and the Design Act, 2000 do not have any provisions to recognize a programmer/developer as an inventor/owner of any innovation that results from operation of any software, AI or algorithm. The problem is further aggravated when the work or innovation is solely the result

[15] Supra note 2 at 4.

 [ISSN 2581-5369]

of the endeavours of the software, AI or algorithms without any human intervention. With rampant innovation and technological progress, the rapidly evolving industry and world view is that formal IP recognition should be extended to such developers, if not the software per se, by way of express legal provisions to maintain a healthy and dynamic innovator ecosystem.

Adapting Indian patent law to fit developing technologies involves both obstacles and opportunities. By addressing issues of patentability, enforcement, and international harmonization, India may create a climate that encourages innovation while protecting public interests. Strategic reforms and coordinated efforts will be essential in navigating the challenges of rapid technological advancement and ensuring India's competitiveness in the global innovation system.

X. SUGGESTIONS

- Specialized Examination Guidelines: Develop specific guidelines tailored to emerging technologies such as AI, blockchain, and biotechnology. These guidelines should provide clarity on patentability criteria and ensure consistent decision-making by patent examiners.
- Enhanced Training for Patent Examiners: Provide comprehensive training programs for patent examiners to equip them with technical expertise necessary for assessing inventions in emerging technology sectors. This will improve the quality and efficiency of patent examination processes.
- Flexible Patentability Criteria: Modify patentability criteria (novelty, non-obviousness, industrial applicability) to accommodate the unique characteristics of emerging technologies. Consider factors like algorithmic inventions in AI and decentralized innovation in blockchain.
- Regulatory Sandboxes: Establish regulatory sandboxes or pilot programs to test new patent policies and procedures related to emerging technologies. These initiatives can provide a controlled environment for experimentation while managing regulatory risks.
- International Collaboration and Harmonization: Engage actively in international forums and harmonization efforts to align Indian patent law with global standards. This alignment will enhance predictability for multinational technology companies and facilitate cross-border innovation.
- Promoting Open Innovation: Encourage mechanisms such as patent pools and open-source licensing models to foster collaborative innovation in emerging technology sectors. These

 [ISSN 2581-5369]

approaches can facilitate broader access to essential technologies while promoting competition.

- Public Awareness and Education: Increase public awareness about the importance of patents in fostering innovation and economic growth, particularly in emerging technology domains. Educational campaigns can help stakeholders understand the benefits and challenges of patent protection.
- Ethical Considerations: Incorporate ethical considerations into patent law reforms, especially in biotechnology and genetic engineering. Balance patent rights with societal interests in areas like access to healthcare and environmental sustainability.
- Monitoring and Review Mechanisms: Establish regular monitoring and review mechanisms to assess the effectiveness of patent law reforms in accommodating emerging technologies. This ongoing evaluation will facilitate timely adjustments and improvements.
- Consultation with Stakeholders: Conduct consultations with stakeholders, including technology developers, academia, legal experts, and civil society organizations, to gather diverse perspectives and insights on evolving patent law requirements.

Implementing these recommendations will require coordinated efforts from policymakers, legal professionals, and stakeholders to ensure that India's patent regime remains adaptive and supportive of innovation in emerging technologies. By addressing these challenges proactively, India can position itself as a leader in fostering technological innovation while safeguarding public interests.

*****

 [ISSN 2581-5369]

XI. REFERENCES

1. AI Generated Inventions, ChatGPT, Indian Patent Act, DABUS, United States Patent & Trademark Office, European Patent Office (livelaw.in)
2. The Evolving Landscape of International Patent Laws: Current Trends and Challenges (legalserviceindia.com)
3. The Future of IPR: Emerging Technologies and Legal Frameworks (legalserviceindia.com)
4. Intersection of Intellectual Property Rights and AI-Generated Works – Part I (barandbench.com)
5. India - Patent - Reviewing Key Aspects Of Indian Patent Law In View Of AI Related Inventions (mondaq.com)
6. AI Patents: Driving Emergence of India as an AI Innovation Hub (indiaai.gov.in)
7. Artificial intelligence And Intellectual Property Rights (iiprd.com)
8. Artificial Intelligence and Patent Law: Navigating the Landscape in 2023 | Article | Chambers and Partners
9. Emerging Technologies and Patents: Patenting Artificial Intelligence Innovation in India - Aishwarya Sandeep- Parenting and Law
10. Reviewing key aspects of Indian Patent Law in view of AI related inventions - Lexology

*****