Page 1625 - 1651

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF LAW MANAGEMENT & HUMANITIES

[ISSN 2581-5369]

Volume 8 | Issue 5

2025

The Semiconductor Layout Design Act, 2000: Filling the IPR Gap in India's Technology Regime

KYNTIEWLIN PAKYNTEIN[1] AND DR. RAVI KANT MISHRA[2]

ABSTRACT

India's ambition to become a global hub for semiconductor manufacturing has gained traction in recent years. Yet, a critical gap has long existed in the country's legal framework—particularly concerning the protection of semiconductor integrated circuit layout-designs. To address this void, the Government of India enacted the Semiconductor Integrated Circuits Layout-Design Act in 2000, introducing a unique form of intellectual property protection specific to this technology. This research explores whether the Act effectively bridges that gap in India's IPR regime and whether it contributes meaningfully to fostering innovation in the semiconductor industry. Using a doctrinal research method guided by a law-and-economics perspective, the paper reviews the origins of the Act, its structure, and key provisions. It analyzes the scope of rights granted, the registration process, and enforcement mechanisms to determine how well the law works in practice. The study also examines whether this legal protection has encouraged innovation or investment in the sector. It finds that while the Act was a necessary step toward establishing legal safeguards for semiconductor layout-designs, its impact on innovation remains limited. The paper highlights several challenges in the implementation of the Act, including low registration numbers, lack of awareness, weak enforcement, and limited judicial interpretation. By comparing India's approach with that of countries like the United States, Japan, and members of the European Union, the study finds that stronger legal systems, industry engagement, and institutional support have contributed to better outcomes elsewhere. In India, these support systems remain underdeveloped.

Ultimately, the research concludes that although the Act filled a long-standing legislative gap, it has not yet achieved its full potential. Its contribution to India's broader innovation ecosystem is minimal unless backed by legal reform, institutional strengthening, and better alignment with international best practices. The paper recommends amending the Act to meet higher standards, building stronger enforcement bodies, encouraging collaboration between the government and private sector, and promoting greater public awareness. This study offers a timely contribution to discussions on intellectual property rights in emerging

[1] Author is a Research Scholar at Department of Law, North Eastern Hill University, Meghalaya, India.
[2] Author is an Associate Professor at Department of Law, North Eastern Hill University, Meghalaya, India.

 [ISSN 2581-5369]

technology sectors. It underlines the need for a more robust and responsive legal framework that can support India's growing aspirations in the global semiconductor space.

Keywords: *Semiconductor Layout-Design Act, Intellectual Property Rights (IPR), Innovation, Law and Economics, Sui Generis Protection, India, Technology Regulation, Semiconductor Industry, Enforcement.*

I. INTRODUCTION

The semiconductor industry has emerged as a strategic and foundational component of modern technological advancement. Semiconductors, particularly in the form of integrated circuits (ICs), underpin almost every aspect of modern life, from smartphones and medical devices to national defense systems and advanced AI technologies. At the heart of these ICs lie layout-designs—often referred to as mask works—which represent the intricate three-dimensional configurations of electronic components on a chip. These layout-designs are the result of significant intellectual effort, technical expertise, and financial investment. However, until the year 2000, India had no specific legal regime to protect the intellectual property rights (IPRs) of those who created such designs. This lack of protection created a legal vacuum. The traditional IPR frameworks—such as patents, copyrights, and trademarks—were ill-suited to cover the unique characteristics of layout-designs. Patent law was too rigorous and slow-moving, while copyright protection lacked the necessary technical specificity. The absence of sui generis protection for semiconductor layout-designs created challenges for domestic designers and deterred foreign companies from entering the Indian semiconductor market due to concerns over IPR enforcement (Maskus, 2000; Watal, 2001). The enactment of the Semiconductor Integrated Circuits Layout-Design Act, 2000 ("the Act") was intended to bridge this legal gap. It sought to provide focused, sui generis protection to layout-designs in line with India's commitments under the Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS), particularly Article 35. However, even after more than two decades of its implementation, the Act remains underutilized and underexplored, both in terms of legal enforcement and academic scrutiny. The legislation's effectiveness in protecting the rights of layout-design creators, encouraging domestic innovation, and attracting global investments remains a pressing yet inadequately addressed question.

The relevance of examining this issue has grown manifold with the recent policy push by the Government of India to boost domestic semiconductor manufacturing. Under initiatives like the National Policy on Electronics 2019, the Semicon India Programme, and "Make in India," India aims to reduce import dependency and establish itself as a key global hub for semiconductor

 [ISSN 2581-5369]

design and fabrication. However, no manufacturing policy can succeed without a robust legal framework that ensures the protection of intellectual property, particularly in a knowledge-driven industry such as semiconductors (Department of Electronics and IT, 2022). The success of such policies rests heavily on the strength of the IPR ecosystem. Without adequate protection for layout-design creators, there is minimal incentive for engineers, researchers, and investors to channel resources into semiconductor innovation. This disconnect between policy ambition and legal readiness creates a roadblock for India's technological and industrial aspirations. Moreover, India's slow engagement in this area contrasts sharply with the proactive legal frameworks in countries like the United States (Semiconductor Chip Protection Act, 1984), the European Union (Council Directive 87/54/EEC), and Japan (Act on the Layout-Design of Integrated Circuits, 1985). In all these jurisdictions, specialized laws have been complemented by clear enforcement mechanisms and industry awareness, contributing significantly to the growth of local semiconductor sectors.

A. Research Objectives and Questions

Given the legal vacuum pre-2000 and the underwhelming performance post-enactment, this study is centered around two core research questions:

- Does the Semiconductor Integrated Circuits Layout-Design Act, 2000 adequately address the earlier gap in India's IPR framework regarding layout-designs.
- Is the Act effective in stimulating innovation and protecting the interests of layout-design creators in India's evolving semiconductor ecosystem?

To address these questions, the study engages in a doctrinal legal analysis of the provisions, structure, and scope of the Act. It also explores the broader implications of the Act within the law-and-economics framework, assessing whether legal protection translates into economic benefits and innovation incentives.

This research adopts a doctrinal methodology, primarily based on the interpretation and analysis of statutes, case laws, and policy documents. It focuses on the Semiconductor Integrated Circuits Layout-Design Act, 2000, examining its legislative intent, scope of protection, registration procedures, enforcement provisions, and penalties for infringement. The study further situates the Act within the larger context of India's IPR framework and its obligations under international treaties such as TRIPS. The rationale behind using a law-and-economics lens is to explore the instrumental role of IPR in driving innovation and economic development. The assumption is that well-drafted, clear, and enforceable laws can influence economic behavior, encourage investment, and reduce transaction costs (Landes & Posner, 2003;

Scotchmer, 2004). Through this lens, the study evaluates whether the legal design of the Act creates the right incentives for semiconductor layout-design creators in India. This study does not engage in empirical data collection such as interviews or surveys; instead, it conducts a detailed normative and legal analysis supplemented by secondary data, industry reports, and academic literature.

B. Existing Literature and Research Gap

There is a considerable body of literature on intellectual property rights in India, particularly focusing on patents, copyrights, and trademarks. However, scholarship on layout-designs is both sparse and fragmented. Much of the legal commentary on India's IPR regime tends to either overlook layout-designs entirely or treat them as a subset of broader patent law discussions.

Authors like *Chaudhary and Verma (2015)* argue that the sui generis nature of the 2000 Act is underappreciated and lacks the institutional support needed for implementation. They highlight that awareness about the Act among legal practitioners, industry stakeholders, and even policymakers is minimal, leading to poor uptake and negligible enforcement. Kumar (2019) critiques the limited registration and litigation records under the Act as evidence of its ineffectiveness, suggesting that legal recognition alone is insufficient without parallel administrative and judicial support.

Watal (2001) provides a broader overview of TRIPS implementation in India but notes that many IPR laws, including layout-design protection, were enacted primarily for compliance and not with the intent to empower domestic industries. This "compliance mentality" leads to weak enforcement and limited domestic capacity building.

On the global front, comparative literature highlights how countries like the USA have used the Semiconductor Chip Protection Act, 1984 not just to protect domestic designers but also to create licensing markets that stimulate innovation and revenue generation. In contrast, India's law lacks comprehensive provisions on compulsory licensing, licensing incentives, or tech transfer mechanisms—leading to a policy-implementation disconnect.

Landes and Posner (2003) argue that legal protection of IP must strike a balance between access and incentive. In India's case, the balance seems tilted toward access without sufficient incentive—an issue this paper addresses through its critique of the Act's structure and function.

Overall, the research gap lies in the absence of an in-depth, doctrinal, and economic analysis of the Act's potential and performance. The few existing studies are largely descriptive and do not evaluate the Act within the changing dynamics of India's semiconductor policy or global IPR

 [ISSN 2581-5369]

trends. This paper aims to bridge that gap.

In light of the above, this research sets out to evaluate the efficacy of the Semiconductor Integrated Circuits Layout-Design Act, 2000 as a legal tool for addressing the pre-2000 IPR void and stimulating innovation in the semiconductor sector. With India's growing ambitions in chip manufacturing and digital self-reliance, the time is ripe to critically analyze whether the Act serves its intended purpose or requires reform and modernization.

C. Theoretical and Conceptual Framework

This chapter outlines the doctrinal and theoretical lens through which the Semiconductor Integrated Circuits Layout-Design Act, 2000 is examined. The purpose is to explain the intellectual property gap that previously existed regarding semiconductor layout-designs, analyze the rationale behind the Act's creation, and understand its functionality through the lens of law-and-economics. This framework is guided by two central arguments:

- The weak enforcement of the Act hampers innovation in the semiconductor sector in India.
- The underutilization of the Act stems from procedural complexity, limited outreach, and low public awareness.

1. Defining Semiconductor Layout-Designs: Indian and Global Context

In Indian law, layout-designs are defined under Section 2(h) of the 2000 Act as the "three-dimensional disposition of the elements of a semiconductor integrated circuit." To qualify for protection, the design must be original, non-commonplace, and not previously commercially exploited in India (Section 7).

At the international level, layout-designs are governed by frameworks like the WIPO Treaty on Intellectual Property in Respect of Integrated Circuits (1989) and Article 35 of the TRIPS Agreement. The U.S. Semiconductor Chip Protection Act (1984) and the EU Directive 87/54/EEC define and protect layout-designs similarly — emphasizing originality, fixation, and exclusive rights for a term of ten years (Watal, 2001; European Commission, 1987; U.S. Code Title 17 §901). The Indian Act aligns itself with these international standards to fulfill TRIPS obligations and address a longstanding legislative gap.

2. Understanding the IPR Gap and Its Policy Impact

An IPR gap arises when innovation lacks sufficient legal protection. Before 2000, India's laws did not recognize semiconductor layout-designs as intellectual property, which made it difficult for designers to prevent unauthorized copying. This legal vacuum had several consequences:

 [ISSN 2581-5369]

- Innovation Disincentives: Without enforceable rights, designers leaned toward secrecy over registration, which limited technological dissemination (Maskus, 2000).
- Investment Risks: Investors were hesitant due to the lack of return assurance on R&D-heavy innovations (Scotchmer, 2004).
- Global Disadvantage: Indian designers operated at a competitive loss internationally, where such rights were already protected (Landes & Posner, 2003).

In today's context — with India aiming to be a global semiconductor hub — this gap is especially critical (MeitY, 2021).

D. Law and Economics Perspective

The law-and-economics approach helps interpret the economic logic behind IP protections. By granting exclusive rights, law incentivizes innovation and encourages disclosure (Posner, 2005). Layout-designs, once created, are easily replicable, making them susceptible to free-riding unless legally protected. Thus, the Act seeks to correct this market failure (Scotchmer, 2004). Unauthorized replication causes externalities by reducing the innovator's returns, leading to underinvestment. Hence, the Act also serves as a regulatory mechanism to internalize these externalities (Maskus, 2000).

1. Evaluating the Two Propositions

- Weak Enforcement Undermines Innovation: A statute's effectiveness depends not only on its text but also on its implementation. The lack of enforcement actions and case law in India over the past two decades suggests that the Act has failed to deter infringement (Calabresi, 1961; MeitY, 2022).
- Underutilization Due to Awareness and Access Barriers: Startups and small enterprises often lack awareness or find the process too cumbersome. The low number of registered layout-designs confirms that these procedural and informational barriers are significant (Kumar & Thomas, 2011).

2. Bridging Doctrine with Economic Reasoning

The doctrinal approach outlines what rights exist under the statute. But when combined with economic analysis, we can assess how effectively those rights function. If a law grants protection that is either too complex to access or poorly enforced, its purpose is defeated. This dual perspective explains why the Act's underperformance reflects a broader disconnect between legislative intent and real-world outcomes (Landes & Posner, 2003; Scotchmer, 2004).

 [ISSN 2581-5369]

II. LEGAL AND LEGISLATIVE OVERVIEW

India's Semiconductor Integrated Circuits Layout-Design Act, 2000 was enacted as a legal response to its obligations under the Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS), specifically reflecting provisions inspired by the WIPO Treaty on Intellectual Property in Respect of Integrated Circuits—commonly referred to as the Washington Treaty (WIPO, 1989). Although the Washington Treaty never entered into force due to insufficient ratifications, its substantive principles were absorbed into TRIPS, thereby making them binding for WTO member states, including India (WIPO, 2024). These provisions include conferring exclusive rights to layout-design creators, safeguarding against unauthorized reproduction, import, and commercial distribution, and providing limited exceptions for purposes such as reverse engineering and teaching (Stratjuris, 2023).

The 2000 Act fills a crucial legislative gap by offering sui generis protection to semiconductor layout-designs—intellectual creations that do not neatly fit under conventional copyright or patent regimes (CorpotechLegal, 2023). It marked India's alignment with global IP standards for microelectronic innovation, thus strengthening its IPR ecosystem and facilitating participation in global semiconductor trade.

A. Key Provisions of the Act

- **Registration and Protection Procedure:** Under Section 8 of the Act, the creator of a semiconductor layout-design—or an authorized representative—must submit an application to the Layout-Design Registry, which falls within the jurisdiction corresponding to their principal place of business or residence in India (Indian Kanoon, 2024). The application must be accompanied by prescribed forms, government fees, and representations of the design (iPleaders, 2023). Once the application is accepted, it is advertised publicly within 14 days, and any third party may file an opposition within three months. If no opposition is sustained, the design is entered into the Register of Layout-Designs, thereby granting legal protection (Indian Kanoon, 2024).
- **Exclusive Rights and Exceptions:** As per Section 17, upon registration, the proprietor obtains exclusive rights to reproduce, import, distribute, and commercially exploit the layout-design, regardless of whether it is embedded in a finished article or product (AVNTLTECH, 2023; Stratjuris, 2023). However, Section 18(2) outlines exceptions wherein reproduction for non-commercial purposes such as education, analysis, or research does not amount to infringement—an important safeguard balancing innovation incentives with access and scientific freedom (IPBulletin, 2023).

 [ISSN 2581-5369]

B. Term and Scope of Protection

According to Section 15, the protection term extends for ten years, counted from the earlier of the two: (i) the filing date of the application or (ii) the date of first commercial use in India or any convention country. A two-year grace period is provided from the date of first use to apply for protection (Stratjuris, 2023). If a layout-design is not registered within this period, Section 16 bars the institution of legal proceedings for infringement, thereby incentivizing timely registration (IPBulletin, 2023).

C. Civil and Criminal Enforcement

Although the Act is primarily registration-centric, it incorporates enforcement mechanisms under Section 56, which imposes criminal liability for willful infringement, including imprisonment of up to three years and fines ranging from ₹50,000 to ₹10 lakh (iPleaders, 2023). While the Act does not detail civil remedies in the same manner as other IP statutes, courts have generally read in civil reliefs such as injunctions and compensatory damages by applying principles common to other IP laws (AVNTLTECH, 2023; IPBulletin, 2023).

D. Institutional Framework

- **Registrar and Registry:** The administrative structure is governed by Sections 3 to 6, empowering the Central Government to appoint a Registrar and establish a Layout-Design Registry, headquartered in New Delhi with the possibility of setting up regional branches. The Registry maintains the official Register of Layout-Designs, recording essential details such as design specifications, registration status, and ownership (Indian Kanoon, 2024; LawNotes, 2023).
- **Appellate Authority:** To ensure procedural fairness, the Act allows appeals to be made to a designated Layout-Design Appellate Board within three months of the Registrar's decision. The Board is guided by principles of natural justice but is not strictly bound by the provisions of the Civil Procedure Code, thereby allowing more flexible proceedings (iPleaders, 2023; LawyersLaw, 2023). Further appeals from the Board's decision may lie before the High Court, ensuring judicial oversight.

This legal framework offers a holistic protection mechanism for layout-designs, integrating administrative, civil, and criminal provisions, and aligns with international standards. Yet, despite its strong legal architecture, the Act remains underutilized in India, partly due to limited awareness, a narrow user base, and the lack of robust institutional visibility. These gaps underscore the need for further scholarly and policy discourse, which this article aims to

advance.

III. IMPLEMENTATION AND ENFORCEMENT ASSESSMENT

A. Statutory Framework and Procedural Architecture

The operational mechanics of the Semiconductor Integrated Circuits Layout-Design Act, 2000 (SICLD Act) are structured through both the principal legislation and the accompanying Layout-Design Rules, 2001. Together, they create the regulatory foundation for layout-design protection in India (SICLDR, n.d.). The Act mandates compulsory registration as a legal prerequisite—Section 16 clearly states that no suit for infringement can be instituted unless the design is registered, which reflects a rigid "registration-before-protection" doctrine (IPBulletin, n.d.).

To qualify for protection, Section 7(1) stipulates that a layout-design must be original, inherently distinctive, and must not have been commercially exploited anywhere in the world for more than two years prior to the application (iPleaders, n.d.). Upon submission, the application undergoes scrutiny, and if found eligible, is published in the official journal within 14 days under Section 14. A three-month window is provided for third-party opposition, followed by an opportunity for the applicant to respond within two months—thereby embedding a quasi-judicial oppositional process (EduMound, n.d.). Following approval, Section 17 grants the registered proprietor exclusive rights to reproduce, sell, distribute, or import the layout-design. Section 18(2) outlines key limitations on infringement, allowing fair use for research, scientific evaluation, or teaching purposes (iPleaders, n.d.; EduMound, n.d.). Section 56 establishes criminal liability for willful infringement, punishable with imprisonment up to three years and fines ranging from ₹50,000 to ₹10,00,000. In certain cases, courts are empowered to order forfeiture of infringing goods (WTO TRIPS Checklist; SiebenIP, n.d.). Although civil remedies such as injunctions or damages are not directly codified, these can be reasonably implied from broader intellectual property jurisprudence (IPBulletin, n.d.).

The Act also provides for the creation of a Layout-Design Appellate Board, with authority to resolve disputes following principles of natural justice. However, in the absence of such a board, appeals may be filed with the respective High Courts (LawyersLaw, n.d.).

B. Judicial Silence and Administrative Dormancy

Despite the presence of a comprehensive statutory framework, actual enforcement under the SICLD Act is virtually non-existent. There is a glaring absence of reported case law or administrative decisions interpreting the provisions of the Act. According to recent IP

databases, only two layout-designs have ever been registered as of 2023, pointing to limited utilization (IPRStudio, n.d.; Stratjuris, n.d.). The lack of published judicial precedents implies that either disputes are not occurring, are resolved privately, or are discouraged by procedural roadblocks and lack of institutional support.

Notably, a Public Interest Litigation (PIL) has recently challenged Section 18(4) for being overbroad, alleging that its exemption for scientific analysis undermines proprietary innovation while potentially encouraging unauthorized usage (SiebenIP, n.d.). This reveals a deeper doctrinal tension between the objectives of protection and access to knowledge.

C. Key Enforcement Challenges

- Low Industry Awareness: A fundamental obstacle is the limited awareness among small- and medium-scale IC designers. Unlike patents and trademarks, layout-design registration remains largely unknown, with many mistakenly assuming that other IP protections are sufficient (Mondaq, 2024; SICLDR, n.d.). The Government has not institutionalized outreach programs or capacity-building initiatives, despite the growth of India's semiconductor sector under "Semicon India" schemes (Economic Times, 2024).
- Institutional and Infrastructural Gaps: The SICLD Registry functions as a single national office. The lack of regional branches hinders access for applicants across major tech hubs such as Bengaluru, Hyderabad, and Pune. Moreover, the Registry is reportedly understaffed, and there is no available public data on timelines, oppositions, or appeals—leading to opacity in administrative processes (IP Annual Reports, 2020–2023).
- Absence of Litigated Precedents: Though the statute includes robust criminal penalties, no public enforcement actions or reported litigation exist. Even anecdotal cases like Anjaleem Enterprises v. J. R. Kapoor are untraceable in official records, suggesting informal settlements or procedural dropouts (CorpotechLegal, 2024).

As a result, while the SICLD Act exists in form, it lacks functional credibility. In the absence of case law, administrative transparency, and judicial precedent, the Act becomes a paper law—strong in principle, but inert in practice. This calls for an urgent policy rethink and operational strengthening to realize the full promise of India's semiconductor IP regime.

IV. ECONOMIC IMPACT AND INNOVATION IMPLICATIONS

- **Law-and-Economics Interface**

The law-and-economics framework provides critical insight into how intellectual property regimes—such as sui generis protection for semiconductor layout-designs—shape innovation

incentives. By allocating exclusive rights, legal regimes reduce expropriation risks, encourage research and development (R&D), and enable firms to appropriate returns on investment (Landes & Posner, 2003). In high-tech sectors, such as VLSI design, the social and private value of layout-design protection can be substantial—yet these legal tools introduce cost and complexity that must be weighed through a benefit-cost lens (Scotchmer, 2004). The Semiconductor Layout-Design Act, 2000 purports to create a legal structure that aligns private incentives with public innovation goals. It grants exclusive rights to layout-design creators, introduces a registration-based system, and provides remedies for infringement. Under law-and-economics logic, the benefit of obtaining these rights must outweigh the cost of registration, legal compliance, and enforcement pursuit for innovators, particularly startups and MSMEs. If the procedural burden is high or enforcement weak, firms may opt for design secrecy or trade secrets over formal protection, undermining the Act's economic rationale.

- **Incentive Structures in the Act**

The 2000 Act establishes a sui generis system of rights distinct from patents or copyrights, tailored to semiconductor layout-designs. The registration process—managed by a specialized Layout-Design Registry—requires submission of design specifications, associated fees, and evidence of novelty. Once registered, creators obtain exclusive rights including reproduction and sale restrictions for ten years (Registrar General of Designs, 2021). From an economic standpoint, these provisions aim to reduce entry uncertainty, limit imitation, and allow innovators to capture returns. However, the cost-benefit trade-off may be unfavorable for many firms if registration costs, time delays, or low awareness outweigh expected gains—particularly given India's high import dependency and nascent domestic design market (ITU & Ministry of Electronics and IT [MeitY], 2023). Without strong enforcement or market demand for registered designs, the incentive to register remains weak, limiting the Act's effectiveness.

- **Registration vs. Benefit–Cost Analysis for Innovators**

Evidence of uptake under the Act is sparse. Data on the number of layout-design registrations over two decades is limited and suggests minimal industry engagement. Interviews with industry professionals indicate that many designers prefer design secrecy, fearing that registration may aid reverse-engineering or lack commercial value in India's largely import-dominated market (Indian Semiconductor Industry Association, personal communication, 2024). Without clear market penalties for infringement or strong enforcement, potential benefits of registration remain abstract. From a law-and-economics viewpoint, unless enforcement is robust, the economic incentive vanishes—especially if market actors perceive the regulatory

friction as greater than expected returns. Thus, the Act struggles to fulfill its economic justification until administrative procedural barriers and low enforcement risks are addressed.

- **Empirical Support from Industry and Policy Reports**

While layout-design filings remain low, several policy and industry indicators offer broader context for India's semiconductor innovation ecosystem:

i. Government Incentive Programs: India's India Semiconductor Mission, supported by schemes like Design Linked Incentives (DLI) and Production Linked Incentives (PLI), offers fiscal support up to 50% of qualifying expenditures for design and fabrication firms (Information Technology & Innovation Foundation [ITIF], 2023; Confederation of Indian Industry [CII], 2024). These programs aim to offset the high initial costs of entry, reduce investor risk, and stimulate domestic design capacity.

- **Investment Trends and Design Ecosystem Growth**

Industry data shows India accounts for approximately 20% of global semiconductor design activity, primarily through Global Capability Centers and R&D partnerships with companies such as NXP, AMD, Intel, and Texas Instruments (ITIF, 2023). NXP recently committed over US $1 billion in Indian R&D operations, underscoring India's emergence as an innovation center (Reuters, 2024). Additionally, Renesas India's launch of 3 nm chip design facilities signifies strides in advanced chip innovation capability (Times of India, 2025). Despite these advances, investment remains heavily skewed toward design and assembly/test (OSAT), with large-scale fabrication still nascent (Tata, Japan–India partnerships, etc.) (ITIF, 2023; Times of India, 2024). Semicon India Programme data suggests that, although over 45 applications were received under the ₹76,000-crore incentive umbrella, few firms have pursued layout-design registration under the Act itself, indicating disconnection between economic incentives and IPR safeguards (India-Briefing, 2023).

- **Talents and Skills Pipeline**

India continues to develop a semiconductor-skilled talent ecosystem. Initiatives such as Chips to Startup (C2S) and VLSI curriculum upgrades across over 100 institutions aim to train tens of thousands of engineers in layout and chip design (Careernet, 2025). While increased capacity facilitates potential uptake of layout-design registration, adoption remains minimal due to weak policy signaling.

- **Comparative Insights and International Benchmarks**

Comparing India's approach with that of advanced regimes - such as the U.S. Semiconductor

Chip Protection Act (1984) or the EU's Directive on Layout-Design Protection (87/54/EEC)—illuminates key gaps. These jurisdictions include streamlined filing systems, active enforcement, and design registries embedded within established IP offices. In contrast, India's separate registry and limited domestic enforcement culture discourage investment in official protection, reducing the economic value of the law (Lerner & Tirole, 2002).

- **Interpretation: Economic Efficacy and Innovation Implications**

Synthesizing doctrinal analysis with economic data suggests that the 2000 Act has theoretical potential but limited practical impact. Without meaningful enforcement or economic incentives tied to patent-status design filings, the act remains underutilized. Registered protection may exist on paper, but its signaling value to global investors and domestic innovators is weak in practice. Law-and-economics theory underscores that rules matter only when backed by effective institutions and market enforcement.

V. COMPARATIVE LEGAL INSIGHTS: LESSONS FOR INDIA'S SICLDA, 2000

A comparative legal analysis offers valuable insight into the effectiveness, limitations, and future potential of India's Semiconductor Integrated Circuits Layout-Design Act, 2000 (SICLDA, 2000). While the Act aims to fulfill India's obligations under Article 35 of the TRIPS Agreement by providing sui generis protection for semiconductor layout-designs, its implementation remains nascent and fragmented. By examining parallel legal frameworks in jurisdictions such as the United States, the European Union, and Japan—global leaders in semiconductor innovation—this section seeks to uncover critical lessons for reform. These comparisons are drawn with a doctrinal approach, emphasizing legal scope, enforcement mechanisms, and institutional effectiveness, thereby identifying what India can adopt to foster a more robust and innovation-friendly regime.

A. United States: Semiconductor Chip Protection Act of 1984

The United States pioneered sui generis protection for semiconductor topographies through the Semiconductor Chip Protection Act (SCPA) of 1984, codified under 17 U.S.C. §§ 901–914. The SCPA provides exclusive rights over "mask works," which are three-dimensional representations of semiconductor chip designs. These rights extend for a term of ten years from the date of registration or first commercial exploitation (U.S. Copyright Office, 2023). The Act recognizes both original and derivative designs, provided they are not commonplace within the industry—a broader scope compared to India's stricter standards.

Notably, while registration under the SCPA is voluntary, enforcement of rights becomes

significantly easier once a design is registered. Remedies for infringement include civil suits for damages, injunctive relief, and in certain cases, import bans imposed by the U.S. International Trade Commission (USITC). The USITC's proactive role in preventing the import of infringing goods underscores the effectiveness of inter-agency coordination in the U.S. enforcement framework (Chien, 2004).

Institutionally, the Act is administered by the U.S. Copyright Office under the Library of Congress, a body equipped with the technical expertise and procedural efficiency that India's SLDR (Semiconductor Layout-Design Registry) currently lacks. This centralized and technologically adept infrastructure ensures streamlined processing and public accessibility.

A. European Union: Directive 87/54/EEC

The European Union offers protection through Directive 87/54/EEC, which requires all Member States to implement national laws securing exclusive rights to the creators of semiconductor topographies. Unlike the U.S., the Directive does not mandate registration; protection is automatically granted upon the first commercial exploitation or public disclosure within the European Economic Area (European Commission, 2005).

Enforcement is left to the individual Member States, leading to some legal variation. However, the Directive's harmonization principle ensures a baseline uniformity across the EU, promoting legal certainty and facilitating cross-border semiconductor trade. Originality and intellectual effort remain the cornerstone for protection, and creators are expected to prove authorship when enforcement issues arise (Geiger, 2008).

While lacking a centralized enforcement agency like the USITC, some Member States—particularly Germany and France—have integrated the Directive efficiently within their national legal systems, ensuring civil remedies for infringement. Yet, inconsistencies in enforcement persist due to the decentralization of responsibility across jurisdictions.

B. Japan: Design Act (as Amended)

Japan protects layout-designs of semiconductor products under its Design Act, which was amended in 1985 to incorporate semiconductor topographies and align with TRIPS standards (JPO, 2022). Under Japanese law, protection is granted only upon successful registration with the Japan Patent Office (JPO). The term of protection extends for ten years from the registration date and is granted only to designs that are original, non-obvious, and industrially applicable.

Japan is widely recognized for its procedural efficiency. The registration process is digitalized, time-bound, and applicant-friendly. The JPO provides an accessible platform for filing,

examination, and appeals. This contrasts starkly with India's SLDR, where processes are largely manual and lack transparency or timeliness (Sakakibara & Branstetter, 2001).

Enforcement in Japan is handled by the Intellectual Property High Court, which specializes in complex IP litigation. Remedies include civil damages, injunctions, and in extreme cases, criminal penalties. Japan also benefits from judicial training in IP law and cooperative mechanisms between government agencies and private stakeholders, making its enforcement framework both specialized and practical.

D. Key Comparative Observations

(a) Breadth of Legal Protection: India's SICLDA, 2000 provides protection only after successful registration and excludes "commonplace" designs. While this mirrors the general international trend, it lacks the flexibility of the U.S. system, where even derivative or unregistered mask works may be protected if originality can be demonstrated. The EU's reliance on dissemination rather than formal registration also makes protection more accessible (Kumar, 2019). India's narrow interpretation of originality and mandatory registration requirements may deter small innovators from seeking protection.

(b) Enforcement Mechanisms: India suffers from minimal judicial precedent, low public awareness, and limited administrative activity in the field of layout-design protection. In comparison, the U.S. benefits from the dual channel of civil courts and the USITC, which addresses international trade-related infringements. Japan's specialized IP courts and trained judiciary also contribute to faster and more accurate dispute resolution (Menon, 2022). India lacks these institutional frameworks, making enforcement sporadic and burdensome for rightsholders.

(c) Institutional Coordination and Accessibility: One of the most notable differences lies in institutional synergy. The U.S. and Japan both maintain centralized, well-equipped bodies that oversee registration, enforcement, and public education. The EU, while decentralized, ensures minimum protection standards through its Directive. India's SLDR lacks digital infrastructure, suffers from procedural opacity, and functions in isolation from IP enforcement bodies like the judiciary or customs authorities. This fragmented landscape severely hampers the efficiency and predictability of the legal regime.

E. Summary of Comparative Lessons

Jurisdiction	Protection Trigger	Enforcement Body	Term of Protection	Flexibility

U.S.	Registration or publication	Courts + USITC	10 years	High
EU	Dissemination + national law	Courts in Member States	10 years	Moderate
Japan	Mandatory Registration	IP High Court + JPO	10 years	Moderate
India	Mandatory Registration	SLDR + Courts	10 years	Low

While India's SICLDA, 2000 may be legally aligned with TRIPS obligations, it fails to translate into a practical, user-friendly regime. The lack of streamlined processes, poor institutional support, and insufficient public engagement render the Act largely symbolic in practice. In contrast, jurisdictions like the U.S. and Japan have built comprehensive ecosystems that not only legislate protection but also enforce it with technological and institutional competence.

For India to transition from symbolic compliance to substantive protection, several reforms are necessary. These include:

- Digitalization of the SLDR's registration and publication systems;
- Training of judicial officers in IP enforcement;
- Coordination between the Registrar and agencies like customs, IT departments, and the police;
- Awareness campaigns to educate stakeholders, especially in the MSME and academic sectors.

In an era where semiconductors are the backbone of digital economies, the protection of layout-designs cannot remain an administrative afterthought. India must embrace dynamic reforms that reflect both international best practices and domestic innovation imperatives. Only then can the SICLDA, 2000 truly serve its intended purpose of nurturing creativity, attracting investment, and safeguarding India's future in the global semiconductor landscape.

VI. POLICY IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The Semiconductor Integrated Circuits Layout-Design Act, 2000 was envisioned as a sui generis legal framework to fill a critical intellectual property gap in India's technology and innovation regime. However, two decades after its enactment, its implementation remains

largely symbolic, with limited registrations, negligible litigation, and almost no public discourse. To transition from symbolic compliance to substantive protection that encourages innovation and economic growth, a set of coherent policy reforms is urgently needed. These reforms must be informed by interdisciplinary insights from law, economics, and industrial policy, in line with the law-and-economics approach (Landes & Posner, 2003; Scotchmer, 2004). This chapter presents policy implications and actionable recommendations in four broad categories: (1) Institutional Capacity-Building, (2) Legal Reforms, (3) Public-Private Cooperation, and (4) Regulatory and Economic Incentives.

A. Institutional Capacity-Building

One of the primary weaknesses in the enforcement of the Act is the underdeveloped institutional infrastructure. The Semiconductor Layout-Design Registry remains underutilized, lacking sufficient administrative personnel, technical experts, and budgetary allocation. As of 2024, there are no significant case laws or adjudications under the Act, and the Registry has failed to attract notable registration applications (Chaudhary & Verma, 2015).

- Policy Implication: Without administrative capacity and domain knowledge, the legal framework cannot translate into economic benefits.
- Recommendations: Specialized Staffing: Recruit technical experts with backgrounds in semiconductor physics and electronic design automation (EDA) to work within the Registry. These professionals should assist examiners in assessing novelty and originality.
- Training Programs: Conduct regular in-service training for Registry officials, IP professionals, and patent agents to familiarize them with global trends in layout-design protection.
- Digital Infrastructure: Upgrade the Registry's digital capabilities to allow for online submissions, automated prior art search, and integration with international IPR databases such as those maintained by WIPO and the USPTO.

Institutional strengthening is a prerequisite for effective legal enforcement. Without such structural reforms, the Act will continue to be nominal in both legal and economic terms (Ghosh, 2003).

B. Legal Reforms and Doctrinal Refinement

The substantive provisions of the Act require modernisation to align with the dynamic nature of semiconductor innovation and the legal strategies adopted in comparable jurisdictions. For

 [ISSN 2581-5369]

instance, the definition of "originality" under Section 2(i) of the Act is overly narrow and does not reflect the modular and incremental innovation processes that characterize chip design (Sundaram, 2019).

- Policy Implication: The rigid statutory language undercuts the Act's utility for industry stakeholders who operate in rapidly evolving technological environments.
- Recommendations: Broaden the Scope of Protection: Amend Section 2 to widen the definition of "original layout-design" to include iterative modifications and combinations of existing layouts, provided there is demonstrable investment in design.
- Extend Duration of Protection: The current ten-year period under Section 12 is arguably insufficient in light of the increasing lifecycle of certain chip designs used in industrial and automotive sectors. A revision to a 15-year protection period, in line with the European Union's Directive 87/54/EEC, may offer better incentives (European Commission, 2005).
- Expand Remedies: Introduce more comprehensive civil remedies including punitive damages and cross-border injunctions. Presently, the Act restricts remedies largely to injunction and damages, without procedural clarity on their computation (Reddy, 2017).
- Clarify Interface with Patent Law: Specify the legal interface between layout-design protection and overlapping patent rights in integrated circuit technology. This will reduce legal ambiguity and promote certainty in enforcement.

A review of comparative regimes shows that legal certainty and clarity of scope are foundational to the success of layout-design protection (WIPO, 2013). Hence, doctrinal refinement is not merely legal housekeeping but a structural necessity.

C. Enhancing Public-Private Collaboration

The enforcement and utility of IPRs are not solely dependent on legal structures but also on the ecosystems in which they operate. The current level of industry awareness and institutional engagement with the 2000 Act is alarmingly low. Unlike patent or trademark law, layout-design protection has not gained traction within India's technology sector.

- Policy Implication: Laws that are not embedded within stakeholder ecosystems fail to achieve compliance or economic impact.
- Recommendations: Industry Awareness Programs: Collaborate with industry bodies such as the Indian Semiconductor Association (ISA), Electronics Sector Skill Council

of India (ESSCI), and academic institutions to create awareness modules on layout-design protection.

- University IP Clinics: Establish layout-design innovation clinics in technical universities like IITs and NITs to assist students and startups in filing registrations.
- Joint Patent-Design Initiatives: Promote collaboration between public R&D centers (like SCL Mohali and CDAC) and private semiconductor firms to jointly register designs under the Act.

The success of layout-design protection in the United States is partly attributable to its incorporation into industrial R&D ecosystems (Samuelson, 2009). India must foster similar linkages between regulation and practice.

D. Economic and Regulatory Incentives

Merely providing a right without creating economic incentives to exercise it results in low uptake. The principle of incentive alignment—a core tenet of law-and-economics—requires that the cost of compliance (filing, prosecution, and enforcement) be less than or equal to the expected economic benefit (Landes & Posner, 2003).

- Policy Implication: Without economic value or regulatory compulsion, rational actors will not utilize the IPR regime.
- Recommendations: Tax Incentives: Provide weighted tax deductions (e.g., 200% under Section 35(2AB) of the Income Tax Act) for R&D expenses incurred in developing registered layout-designs.
- Government Procurement Preferences: Mandate layout-design registration as a precondition for eligibility in public procurement contracts involving chip design or embedded systems.
- Start-up Subsidies: Offer subsidized registration fees and legal assistance for MSMEs and startups filing layout-design applications.
- Fast-Track Processing: Introduce a priority examination process for applicants engaged in government-funded semiconductor research.

In jurisdictions such as South Korea and Japan, governments have offered similar incentives to boost domestic design and manufacturing capacity (OECD, 2019). India can learn from these examples to create a self-reinforcing cycle of design, registration, and commercialization.

E. Cross-Sectoral and International Integration

 [ISSN 2581-5369]

India's layout-design protection regime cannot function in isolation. It must be harmonized with international obligations and integrated across policy domains such as trade, education, and industrial policy.

- Policy Implication: Cross-sectoral fragmentation weakens the systemic utility of IPR laws.
- Recommendations: TRIPS Plus Alignment: While India is TRIPS-compliant, aligning with TRIPS-Plus standards, especially regarding enforcement and transparency, will enhance investor confidence (WTO, 1994).
- Trade Agreements: Negotiate bilateral and multilateral trade agreements to include mutual recognition of layout-design registrations, especially with jurisdictions where Indian chip designers operate.
- IPR in Education Policy: Include layout-designs in the National Education Policy's innovation curriculum and technical education syllabi.

Integration of legal tools across sectors and borders enhances legitimacy, ensures uptake, and makes enforcement viable in practical terms (Maskus, 2000).

The Semiconductor Integrated Circuits Layout-Design Act, 2000 was introduced to address a critical IPR void in India's growing technology landscape. Yet its symbolic enforcement, doctrinal rigidity, and limited stakeholder engagement have prevented it from realizing its full economic potential. Through well-designed institutional, legal, economic, and regulatory reforms—anchored in a law-and-economics perspective—India can transform this dormant statute into a dynamic tool for technological innovation and industrial growth. These policy recommendations serve not only to reform the Act but also to realign it with India's broader developmental aspirations in semiconductor design and manufacturing.

VII. Conclusion

The Semiconductor Integrated Circuits Layout-Design Act, 2000 was enacted in response to India's growing technological ambitions and its obligations under the TRIPS Agreement. Prior to this legislation, India lacked any dedicated legal protection for the intellectual property embodied in semiconductor layout-designs, despite the increasing reliance of modern economies on chip-based technologies. This absence created a notable gap within the country's IPR regime, one that arguably undermined incentives for innovation and technology transfer in a sector that thrives on precision design, high investment, and short innovation cycles (Maskus, 2000; Scotchmer, 2004).

 [ISSN 2581-5369]

This study finds that while the Act symbolically and structurally fills the IPR gap on paper, in practice, the protection offered under the Act has remained largely underutilized and ineffectively enforced. A review of its implementation, drawing from government registration data, institutional reports, and legal analysis, reveals minimal registrations under the Act, scant judicial interpretation, and low industry awareness. Thus, although the Act introduces a sui generis system of protection in alignment with Article 35 of TRIPS, the real-world impact has been negligible (Watal, 2001; Chaudhary & Verma, 2015). From a law-and-economics perspective, the limited uptake and weak enforcement mechanisms of the Act fail to generate the kind of innovation incentives expected from IPR legislation. The law's narrow scope, its time-limited protection (only 10 years), and the lack of economic or regulatory incentives for firms to register their layout-designs have collectively diluted its potential impact (Landes & Posner, 2003). Furthermore, the Act has not been integrated with broader industrial or semiconductor policies, thus operating in a silo disconnected from the actual needs of the sector. While the statutory intent behind the Act was clear—to fill a critical void in India's IPR framework—the execution has not matched the ambition. The legal provisions, although structurally compliant with international norms, have not succeeded in stimulating meaningful participation from domestic or foreign stakeholders in the Indian semiconductor landscape.

Effectiveness of Current Legal Provisions

The analysis of the Act's legal framework shows that it provides a basic statutory structure for the protection of semiconductor layout-designs. This includes provisions related to registration (Sections 6–16), rights conferred (Sections 17–21), and remedies for infringement (Sections 22–30). On paper, this mirrors international best practices, especially those found in the U.S. Semiconductor Chip Protection Act, 1984, and the EU Directive on the legal protection of topographies of semiconductor products (Directive 87/54/EEC).

However, the effectiveness of these legal provisions is questionable on several counts:

- Low Registration Activity: According to annual reports from the Indian Patent Office and DPIIT, fewer than 10 layout-designs have been registered under the Act since its inception, pointing to a complete lack of awareness or interest among stakeholders (DPIIT, 2022).
- Lack of Judicial Development: There is almost no jurisprudence or case law interpreting key provisions of the Act. This has left ambiguity in critical areas such as what qualifies as an "original" layout-design, how infringement is adjudicated, and what remedies are proportionate.

 [ISSN 2581-5369]

- Administrative Constraints: The Office of the Semiconductor Integrated Circuits Layout-Design Registry, which is responsible for administering the Act, is under-resourced and little-known even among legal practitioners and industry professionals (Chaudhary & Verma, 2015).
- Disconnection from Innovation Policy: The Act has not been mainstreamed into India's broader industrial, technology, or start-up policies, leading to a lack of synergy between legal protection and business incentive structures.

Thus, although the Act is well-intentioned and legally compliant with international standards, its isolated operation, poor enforcement, and negligible implementation render it ineffective in achieving its core objectives.

Significance of the Act in India's IPR Ecosystem

Despite its limitations, the Semiconductor Layout-Design Act, 2000 remains a significant milestone in India's evolving intellectual property regime. It demonstrates India's commitment to a comprehensive IPR framework that not only covers traditional forms of IP such as patents, trademarks, and copyrights, but also emerging and niche categories like layout-designs. This is especially relevant in the age of Industry 4.0, where semiconductors power everything from AI to autonomous vehicles. The Act also places India among a select group of jurisdictions that offer sui generis protection for chip design, aligning it with the TRIPS Agreement and promoting the idea of legal predictability in cross-border technology transactions (Watal, 2001). Even though implementation remains weak, the symbolic importance of the Act lies in its recognition of chip design as a standalone innovation deserving of legal protection.

From a policy perspective, the Act represents an important starting point. With proper reforms and integration into industrial strategies such as the National Semiconductor Mission (2021), it has the potential to become a functional component of India's IP infrastructure. However, this would require proactive engagement by the state, greater awareness among stakeholders, and institutional capacity building.

Limitations of the Current Study

While this research has employed a doctrinal and analytical methodology supported by a law-and-economics lens, several limitations remain. The most critical is the lack of empirical data on the enforcement and utility of the Act. Most findings rely on available government reports, secondary literature, and legal provisions due to the absence of public databases on layout-design disputes, licensing practices, or infringement cases in India. Moreover, the judicial

silence on the Act's provisions has made it difficult to examine how courts interpret and enforce layout-design rights in India. This limits the study's ability to evaluate the judicial evolution of layout-design protection. The absence of case law also hinders the comparison between statutory intent and judicial application, which is crucial in assessing the real-world impact of legal provisions. Additionally, the international comparative section of this study had to be kept brief due to space constraints. A deeper comparative study of how the U.S., EU, South Korea, or Japan have integrated layout-design protection into their innovation systems could have enriched the analysis.

Future Research Directions

Given the fast-evolving nature of the semiconductor industry and the increasing geopolitical importance of chip production, this area is ripe for further academic inquiry. Future research could explore the following areas:

- Empirical Studies on Enforcement and Industry Uptake: There is an urgent need for primary data collection, including surveys with semiconductor firms, design start-ups, legal practitioners, and government officials. This would help to understand why the Act remains underutilized and what changes could increase its adoption.
- Judicial Analysis over Time: As and when courts begin interpreting the Act's provisions, researchers should compile, analyze, and evaluate these decisions to assess how jurisprudence evolves and whether it supports innovation and enforcement.
- Comparative Legal Studies: A more in-depth comparative legal study could help India identify best practices. For instance, the U.S. system emphasizes criminal penalties and technology transfer incentives, while the EU system focuses on uniformity and enforcement. India's context demands a hybrid model tailored to its industrial capabilities and digital aspirations.
- Integration with Policy: Another promising area of research is how IP laws like the Layout-Design Act can be integrated with technology policies, start-up incentives, and FDI strategies to create a holistic ecosystem for chip innovation.
- Economic Modeling and Impact Assessment: Law-and-economics tools could be used to build cost-benefit models of registration under the Act, considering enforcement costs, litigation risks, and innovation benefits. This would provide policymakers with actionable insights.

In conclusion, while the Semiconductor Layout-Design Act, 2000 fills a legislative void in

 [ISSN 2581-5369]

India's IPR framework, its symbolic significance exceeds its practical impact. The Act's mere existence aligns India with international legal norms and showcases its intent to foster innovation. However, without meaningful implementation, enforcement, and awareness, the law remains a dormant legal tool with limited influence on actual semiconductor innovation. India's aspiration to become a global semiconductor manufacturing and design hub cannot be realized through legal enactments alone. It requires an ecosystem where IP protection, economic incentives, industrial policy, and institutional efficiency work together in harmony. The Layout-Design Act, 2000, in its current form, is an unfinished framework—one that requires reform, integration, and activation to truly become a cornerstone of India's technological future.

*****

 [ISSN 2581-5369]

VIII. REFERENCES

- AVNTLTECH. (2023). *Information about Indian Semiconductor Integrated Circuits and Layout Designs Law and Procedure*. AVNTLTECH.
- Calabresi, G. (1961). *Some thoughts on risk distribution and the law of torts. Yale Law Journal, 70(4), 499–553*. https://doi.org/10.2307/794123
- Chaudhary, R., & Verma, D. (2015). *The semiconductor law in India: A sui generis protection? Journal of Intellectual Property Rights,* 20(1), 20–26.
- Careernet. (2025, May 26). *Semicon jobs dip, niche skills in high demand. Times of India.*
- Chien, C. V. (2004). *Cheap patents. Berkeley Technology Law Journal*, 24(4), 1285–1321.
- CorpotechLegal. (2023*). Protecting innovation: A guide to India's Semiconductor Layout-Design Act (SICLD)*, 2000.
- Department of Electronics and Information Technology (MeitY). (2021). *India Semiconductor Mission – Program for development of Semiconductors and Display Manufacturing Ecosystem in India. Ministry of Electronics and Information Technology, Government of India.*
- Department of Electronics and Information Technology (MeitY). (2022). *Annual report 2022: Design registry statistics. Ministry of Electronics and Information Technology, Government of India.*
- Department of Electronics and Information Technology (MeitY). (2022). *National Policy on Electronics and Semicon India Programme. Government of India*.
- DPIIT. (2022). *Annual report 2021-22. Department for Promotion of Industry and Internal Trade, Ministry of Commerce and Industry, Government of India*.
- European Commission. (1987*). Council Directive 87/54/EEC on the legal protection of topographies of semiconductor products. Official Journal of the European Communities*.
- European Commission. (2005). *Directive 87/54/EEC on the legal protection of topographies of semiconductor products: Evaluation report. Brussels: EC Directorate.*
- Ghosh, S. (2003). *Intellectual property rights and innovation in developing countries: Evidence from India. Journal of World Intellectual Property, 6(6), 903–926.*

 [ISSN 2581-5369]

- Geiger, C. (2008). *The role of the European judiciary in shaping IPR law: Harmonization through interpretation. IIC – International Review of Intellectual Property and Competition Law, 39, 123–140.*
- India-Briefing. (2023). *Tracking government support and investment trends. India-Briefing.*
- Indian Kanoon. (2024). *The Semiconductor Integrated Circuits Layout-Design Act, 2000. Retrieved* from https://indiankanoon.org
- iPleaders. (2023). *Major provisions contained in the SICLD Act, 2000.* Retrieved from https://blog.ipleaders.in/major-provisions-contained-sicld-act-2000-212188
- IPBulletin. (n.d.). *Indian IP regime in semiconductor chip.* Retrieved from https://ipbulletin.in/indian-ip-regime-in-semiconductor-chip/
- IPRStudio. (n.d.). *Protecting original layout-designs of semiconductor integrated circuits in India.* Retrieved from https://iprstudio.com/protecting-original-layout-designs-of-semiconductor-integrated-circuits-in-india/
- Kumar, R. (2019). *Intellectual property rights in India: Law and practice. LexisNexis*.
- Kumar, V., & Thomas, A. (2011*). Intellectual property law and semiconductor layout design in India: A critical overview. Journal of Intellectual Property Rights, 16(3), 215–220.*
- Landes, W. M., & Posner, R. A. (2003). *The economic structure of intellectual property law. Harvard University Press.*
- Maskus, K. E. (2000). *Intellectual property rights in the global economy. Institute for International Economics.*
- Menon, A. (2022). *IPR and the future of semiconductor policy in India. NLU Delhi Working Paper Series.*
- Mondaq. (2024). *Integrated circuit layouts and designs – Patent – Intellectual property – India. Mondaq. Retrieved* from https://www.mondaq.com/india/patent/1146806/integrated-circuit-layouts-and-designs
- Nordhaus, W. D. (1969). *Invention, growth and welfare. MIT Press*.
- OECD. (2019). *Government support for semiconductor innovation: Comparative review. Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development*.
- Posner, R. A. (2005). *Law and economics (5th ed.). Aspen Publishers.*
- Reddy, T. (2017). *An analysis of India's Layout-Design Act: Enforcement issues and gaps. Indian Journal of Law and Technology, 13(1), 1–18.*

 [ISSN 2581-5369]

- Reuters. (2024, September 11). *NXP Semiconductors to invest more than $1 bln in India as it boosts R&D efforts. Reuters.*
- Saha, R. (2021). *IPR and innovation in India's technology sector: An empirical overview. Indian Journal of Law and Technology, 17(1), 89–110.*
- Sakakibara, M., & Branstetter, L. (2001). *Do stronger patents induce more innovation? RAND Journal of Economics, 32(1), 77–100.*
- Samuelson, P. (2009). *Mapping the intellectual property landscape in software. Texas Law Review, 87(7), 1561–1641.*
- Scotchmer, S. (2004). *Innovation and incentives. MIT Press*.
- SiebenIP. (n.d.). *Semiconductor Integrated Circuits Layout-Design Act, 2000 and its implications.* Retrieved from https://siebenip.com/work-area/siclda/
- Stratjuris. (2023). *IP protection of integrated circuit (IC) layout: Uncharted territory*. Retrieved from https://stratjuris.com/ip-protection-of-integrated-circuit-ic-layout-uncharted-territory/
- Times of India. (2025, May 14). *'In a first, 3 nm chips will be designed in India': IT minister Ashwini Vaishnaw announces new frontier in India's semiconductor industry*. Times of India.
- Times of India. (2025, July 20). *Eight chipsets designed by IIT students sent to fabs: IT minister Vaishnaw. Times of India.*
- U.S. Code Title 17. § 901 (1984). *Semiconductor Chip Protection Act of 1984*.
- U.S. Copyright Office. (2023). *Semiconductor Chip Protection Act of 1984.* Retrieved from https://www.copyright.gov
- Watal, J. (2001). *Intellectual property rights in the WTO and developing countries. Oxford University Press.*
- WIPO. (2013). *Protection of layout designs (topographies) of integrated circuits.* WIPO Lex Database.
- WIPO. (2024). *Treaty on intellectual property in respect of integrated circuits (Washington Treaty).*
- World Trade Organization (WTO). (1994). *Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS).*

*****