Navigating the IPR-Competition Law Nexus: A Governance Professional's Strategic Framework

This article throws light on the convergence of Intellectual Property Rights and Competition Law, in fostering innovation-driven economic growth. IPR laws incentivize creativity while Competition Law ensures these monopolies don't morph into perpetual market dominance. Artificial intelligence, big data analytics, and platform economics have fundamentally altered how businesses create, protect, and monetize intellectual assets. As Company Secretaries navigate this complex terrain, they must recognize that their role extends beyond mere compliance.

CS Mantra Nath Jha, FCS
Company Secretary
Founder & Managing Partner
LEGALNEST Professional Advisory LLP
Mumbai
fcsmantra@gmail.com

INTRODUCTION

The convergence of Intellectual Property Rights and Competition Law presents one of the most intellectually demanding challenges for governance professionals today. These two legal regimes, while appearing contradictory at first glance, actually serve complementary purposes in fostering innovation-driven economic growth. IPR laws incentivize creativity by granting temporary monopolies, while Competition Law ensures these monopolies don't morph into perpetual market dominance that stifles the very innovation they were meant to encourage.

As Company Secretaries navigate this complex terrain, they must recognize that their role extends beyond mere compliance. We are strategic advisors who must help organizations balance aggressive IP protection with responsible competitive conduct. This balance is particularly crucial as India advances toward its Viksit Bharat@2047 vision; an aspiration that demands both robust innovation and vibrant market competition.

The digital revolution has intensified this challenge. Artificial intelligence, big data analytics, and platform economics have fundamentally altered how businesses create, protect, and monetize intellectual assets. Simultaneously, competition regulators worldwide are scrutinizing these developments with unprecedented vigor, questioning whether traditional IPR frameworks inadvertently create insurmountable barriers to fair competition.

FROM MRTP TO COMPETITION ACT: UNDERSTANDING THE PARADIGM SHIFT

The journey from the Monopolies and Restrictive Trade Practices Act, 1969 to the Competition Act, 2002 reflects India's economic transformation. The MRTP Act, conceived during the license-raj era, viewed market concentration itself as problematic. Its focus was on preventing economic power from accumulating in a few hands—a understandable concern for a newly independent nation, building its industrial base.

The Competition Act, 2002 represents a fundamental philosophical shift. Rather than penalizing success or size, it targets anti-competitive behavior. This modern approach recognizes that dominant positions can emerge through superior efficiency, innovation, or strategy—all desirable outcomes. What matters is how that dominance is exercised.

The Act is built on three core prohibitions:

1. **Anti-competitive Agreements (Section 3)**: This provision targets cartels, bid-rigging, and agreements that appreciably restrict competition. Horizontal agreements between competitors receive particularly stringent scrutiny, while vertical agreements between businesses at different supply chain levels undergo rule-of-reason analysis.

2. **Abuse of Dominance (Section 4)**: Dominance itself is not illegal; while abusing it, is. Practices like predatory pricing, refusal to deal, exclusive arrangements, or tying can violate this provision when undertaken by dominant firms.

3. **Anti-competitive Combinations (Sections 5-6)**: Mergers and acquisitions that substantially lessen competition require Competition Commission approval, ensuring market concentration does not eliminate competitive pressures.

Critically, Section 3(5) acknowledges that IPR protection may necessitate certain restrictions, stating that reasonable conditions imposed to protect rights from IPR laws shall not be considered anti-competitive. However, this protection is not absolute. The emphasis on "reasonable" creates significant interpretative space, and what appears reasonable to a patent holder may look like anti-competitive behavior to regulators or competitors.

THE IPR ECOSYSTEM: MULTIPLE REGIMES, SINGULAR PURPOSE

India's intellectual property framework comprises several statutes, each addressing different forms of creative output:

1. **The Patents Act, 1970** (amended 2005) governs inventions, balancing inventor incentives with public interest. Its compulsory licensing provisions (Sections 83-92) recognize that patents must serve broader societal needs, not just private profit maximization. The 2005 amendments bringing India into TRIPS compliance while maintaining these flexibilities demonstrate thoughtful policy calibration.

2. **The Trade Marks Act, 1999** protects brand identifiers—logos, names, sounds, or even product shapes—that distinguish goods and services in the marketplace. In the digital era, trademark challenges have expanded to include domain names, social media handles, and meta-tags, requiring evolved enforcement strategies.

3. **The Copyright Act, 1957** safeguards original creative expression from literary works to software code. Recent amendments address digital streaming, intermediary liability, and technological protection measures, acknowledging that copyright enforcement must adapt to technological realities without stifling legitimate uses.

4. **The Geographical Indications Act, 1999** protects products with specific geographical origins—Darjeeling tea, Banarasi silk, Kanchipuram sarees. These are not merely heritage preservation measures; they are economic development tools creating value for entire regions and communities.

5. **The Designs Act, 2000** protects the visual appearance of products, increasingly important in sectors where aesthetic differentiation drives consumer preference—consumer electronics, automotive design, fashion, and furniture.

> Generally, IPR ownership includes the right to refuse licensing—a fundamental aspect of property rights. However, this right is not absolute when it intersects with market dominance.

CRITICAL INTERSECTION POINTS: WHERE STRATEGY MEETS COMPLIANCE

Patent Pools: Collaboration's Double Edge

Patent pools can facilitate technological advancement by aggregating complementary patents, reducing transaction costs and avoiding patent thickets. The DVD, MPEG, and Bluetooth technology pools demonstrate how collaboration can accelerate innovation diffusion. However, poorly structured pools become vehicles for price coordination or collective refusal to deal.

From a governance perspective, several safeguards are essential:

- **Essentiality Review:** Pools should include only patents genuinely essential to the technology, not peripherally related patents included for strategic advantage. Regular essentiality reviews ensure the pool remains focused.

- **Independent Licensing:** Pool participation should not preclude independent licensing. Patent holders must retain the ability to license outside the pool, and licensees should have options beyond the pool.

- **Transparent Governance:** Clear rules for royalty setting, dispute resolution, and membership admission/exit reduce opportunities for anti-competitive coordination.

- **Pro-competitive Justification:** Document efficiency gains, transaction cost reductions, and innovation benefits that justify any competitive restraints inherent in the pooling arrangement.

The Competition Commission applies rule-of-reason analysis to patent pools, weighing their pro-competitive benefits against potential anti-competitive harms. Organizations participating in pools must ensure their arrangements withstand this scrutiny.

STANDARD ESSENTIAL PATENTS AND FRAND: THE LICENSING EQUILIBRIUM

When patents become essential to industry standards - telecommunications protocols, Wi-Fi specifications, USB connections—their holders acquire extraordinary market power. The FRAND (Fair, Reasonable, and Non-Discriminatory) commitment theoretically constrains this power, but disputes about what constitutes "fair" and "reasonable" are endemic.

The Ericsson litigation in India established crucial principles. In Telefonaktiebolaget LM Ericsson v. Competition Commission of India[1], the Supreme Court affirmed that SEP holders with dominant positions cannot impose unfair licensing terms. Subsequent Delhi High Court decisions in the Intex and Micromax cases further refined FRAND jurisprudence, emphasizing:

- Royalties should reflect the patent technology's value, not the end product's price.

- Good faith negotiations are essential, not mere formalities before litigation.

- Licensing terms should be genuinely non-discriminatory across similarly situated licensees.

- Injunctions for FRAND-committed SEPs require careful consideration of both parties' interests.

1. *(Civil Appeal No. 6697/2013).*

For governance professionals, several practical implications emerge:

- **Develop Transparent Methodologies**: Before disputes arise, establish clear royalty calculation approaches based on comparable licenses, industry standards, and patent value assessments. Document these methodologies thoroughly.
- **Negotiate in Good Faith**: Maintain detailed records of licensing discussions, offers, counter-offers, and justifications. Good faith is not just about final terms but about the negotiation process itself.
- **Avoid Strategic Litigation**: Filing infringement suits as negotiation tactics can be characterized as attempts to leverage dominance unfairly. Litigation should follow genuine negotiation breakdowns, not precede them.
- **Monitor Global Developments**: FRAND jurisprudence continues evolving across jurisdictions. European, US, and Chinese approaches influence expectations globally, affecting Indian companies' international licensing activities.

REFUSAL TO LICENSE: WHEN RIGHTS MEET RESPONSIBILITIES

Generally, IPR ownership includes the right to refuse licensing—a fundamental aspect of property rights. However, this right is not absolute when it intersects with market dominance. Though Indian law is not explicitly adopted the "essential facilities doctrine," competition analysis considers situations where:

- The IPR is indispensable for competing in a downstream market.
- Refusal eliminates all effective competition.
- No objective justification exists for the refusal beyond eliminating competition.
- Licensing would not eliminate incentives to innovate.

Several red flags warrant careful governance attention:

- **Blanket Refusal Policies**: Categorical refusals to license without case-by-case assessment, especially by dominant firms, invite regulatory scrutiny. Each licensing request merits individual evaluation based on its specific circumstances.
- **Discriminatory Licensing**: Licensing to some competitors while refusing others in similar circumstances requires robust business justifications unrelated to competitive advantage manipulation.
- **Constructive Refusal**: Setting licensing terms so onerous that they effectively constitute refusal—through excessive royalties, unreasonable conditions, or deliberately burdensome procedures.
- **Strategic Patent Accumulation**: Acquiring patents not for use or licensing but to foreclose competitors from entire technological areas.

From a practical standpoint, maintain detailed records of licensing requests received, evaluations conducted, and decisions made with supporting rationales. If refusing to license, document legitimate business justifications—protecting trade secrets, maintaining quality standards, avoiding free-riding on R&D investments, or preserving incentives for continued innovation.

TYING AND BUNDLING: INTEGRATION VERSUS LEVERAGE

Tying occurs when purchasing one product (tying product) is conditioned on buying another (tied product). While some bundling serves legitimate purposes—technical integration, quality assurance, cost efficiencies—it can also extend dominance from one market to another.

The fundamental question: Is bundling driven by customer benefit or strategic market foreclosure?

Several factors determine whether bundling raises concerns:

- **Market Power**: Bundling by firms without significant market power rarely raises issues. Concerns intensify when dominant firms leverage their position.
- **Separate Markets**: If bundled products serve distinct customer needs with independent demand, tying scrutiny increases.
- **Foreclosure Effects**: Does bundling prevent competitors in the tied product market from reaching customers?
- **Efficiency Justifications**: Do legitimate technical or economic reasons justify bundling?

Governance best practices include:

- Offering unbundled alternatives where technically feasible.
- Documenting genuine integration benefits or cost efficiencies.
- Monitoring whether bundling forecloses competition in tied markets.
- Regular review of product integration strategies for continued justification.
- Clear customer communication about bundling rationales.

SHAM LITIGATION AND PATENT EVERGREENING: PROCESS AS WEAPON

In pharmaceuticals particularly, "evergreening" describes extending patent protection through incremental modifications—new formulations, dosages, or combinations—without significant therapeutic advancement. While legitimate innovation deserves protection, trivial modifications designed solely to delay generic competition raise concerns.

Similarly, baseless litigation filed to harass competitors, delay market entry, or increase rivals' costs constitutes process abuse. The "sham litigation" doctrine, recognized internationally, could apply where patent suits serve purely anti-competitive purposes.

Governance safeguards include:

- **Rigorous Internal Standards**: Establish patent application criteria beyond mere patentability, considering genuine innovation value and strategic necessity.
- **Pre-Litigation Assessment**: Before filing infringement suits, conduct thorough merit evaluations considering both legal prospects and business objectives.
- **Avoid Forum Shopping**: Filing multiple suits in different jurisdictions simultaneously can appear strategic harassment rather than legitimate enforcement.
- **Document Legitimate Reasons**: Maintain records showing enforcement actions serve genuine IP protection, not competitor harassment or market delay.
- **Board-Level Oversight**: Major IPR enforcement decisions should receive senior leadership review, ensuring alignment with organizational values and risk tolerance.

THE DIGITAL ECONOMY: NEW CHALLENGES, EVOLVED RESPONSES

Data Assets: The New Competitive Moat

While raw data itself is not intellectual property, databases enjoy copyright protection, algorithms may be patentable, and data-derived insights constitute trade secrets. Large digital platforms accumulate datasets creating competitive advantages potentially insulated by IPR-like protection.

The intersection becomes complex when:

- Unique datasets create insurmountable entry barriers for competitors.
- Data portability requirements conflict with proprietary protection claims.
- Algorithmic pricing enables tacit coordination without explicit agreements.
- Data accumulation through acquisitions raises market concentration concerns.

Governance frameworks must address:

- **Competition Assessment**: Evaluate whether data accumulation strategies raise competitive concerns, particularly if your organization holds dominant positions.
- **Balancing Acts**: Balance proprietary protection with reasonable data-sharing obligations, especially where data access determines competitive viability.
- **Algorithmic Transparency**: Ensure algorithm-driven decisions—pricing, ranking, recommendations—don't facilitate anti-competitive coordination.
- **Regulatory Monitoring**: Track evolving regulatory approaches to data access, interoperability, and portability across jurisdictions.
- **Proactive Measures**: Rather than waiting for mandates, consider voluntary data-sharing initiatives demonstrating good faith while preserving legitimate competitive advantages.

PLATFORM ECONOMICS: NETWORK EFFECTS AND MARKET POWER

Digital platforms exhibit network effects where value increases with user adoption, creating winner-takes-most dynamics. Combined with strong IPR protecting platform technologies, these effects can entrench dominance.

Recent Competition Commission investigations into e-commerce platforms, food delivery aggregators, and app stores demonstrate heightened scrutiny of:

- **Self-Preferencing**: Favoring platform-owned services over third-party offerings in search results, rankings, or features.
- **Exclusivity Arrangements**: Contracts preventing sellers or service providers from multi-homing (operating on competing platforms).
- **MFN Clauses**: Most Favored Nation provisions preventing suppliers from offering better terms elsewhere.
- **Feature Access Restrictions**: Limiting third-party developers' access to platform features or APIs that platform-owned services enjoy.
- **Data Advantages**: Using non-public data from platform users to compete against them.

For governance professionals overseeing platform operations:

- Develop transparent, non-discriminatory policies for platform access and ranking.
- Implement information barriers between platform operations and competing services.
- Document legitimate justifications for feature access restrictions or exclusivity terms.
- Monitor market share thresholds triggering enhanced regulatory obligations.
- Regularly review platform governance for alignment with competitive fairness principles.

ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE: INNOVATION MEETS REGULATORY UNCERTAINTY

AI raises profound questions at the IPR-competition interface:

- **Ownership**: Who owns AI-generated inventions—programmers, users, AI systems themselves? Indian Patent Office guidance indicates AI cannot be listed as inventors, requiring human involvement documentation.
- **Patentability**: What aspects of AI systems are patentable—algorithms, training methods, specific applications? Patent offices globally are developing nuanced approaches.
- **Competition Concerns**: Do algorithmic pricing systems facilitate coordination without explicit agreements? How do machine learning algorithms' emergent behaviors affect competition analysis?
- **Data Training**: Does training AI on copyrighted material constitute infringement or fair use? This question remains largely unresolved.

Emerging governance practices include:

- Establishing clear internal policies on AI-generated IP ownership.
- Documenting human involvement in AI-assisted invention processes.
- Auditing pricing algorithms for potential coordination effects.
- Monitoring AI training data sources for copyright compliance.
- Engaging with regulatory consultations on AI policy development.

STRATEGIC IMPERATIVES: A GOVERNANCE FRAMEWORK

Based on evolving best practices, several strategic imperatives emerge for governance professionals:

- **Integrated Compliance Programs**: Develop compliance frameworks addressing IPR and competition law holistically rather than in silos. Quarterly audits examining IP strategies through competition lenses identify vulnerabilities proactively.
- **Cross-Functional Governance**: Establish committees bringing together legal, technical, commercial, and strategic expertise to evaluate IP decisions comprehensively. Competition issues span domains requiring diverse perspectives.
- **Documentation Excellence**: In investigations, contemporaneous documentation determines outcomes. Maintain detailed records of licensing decisions, refusal justifications, pricing methodologies, and enforcement rationales demonstrating legitimate purposes.
- **Continuous Education**: The IPR-competition interface evolves rapidly. Regular training for board members, executives, and relevant employees ensures organizational awareness and reduces inadvertent violations.
- **Proactive Regulatory Engagement**: Where novel technologies or business models raise questions, consider seeking informal Competition Commission guidance or participating in industry consultations.
- **Global Awareness**: Cross-border operations require monitoring international developments. EU's Digital Markets Act, US enforcement priorities, and Chinese regulatory actions influence global practices and expectations.
- **Process Integration**: Build competition compliance checkpoints into IP workflows—patent filing decisions, licensing negotiations, enforcement actions, and portfolio acquisitions should trigger competition assessments.
- **Ethical Culture**: Beyond legal compliance, cultivate organizational values emphasizing innovation incentives and competitive fairness as complementary rather than contradictory goals.

ERICSSON CASE: DEFINING FRAND IN PRACTICE

The Ericsson litigation demonstrated that holding standard-essential patents doesn't grant carte blanche in licensing terms. The Competition Commission found Ericsson prima facie abused dominance by basing royalties on handset prices rather than patent value—a significant concern when small technology components generate royalties on expensive end products.

Though the Supreme Court ultimately set aside CCI directions on jurisdictional grounds, it affirmed that FRAND commitments create enforceable competition law obligations. The Delhi High Court's subsequent FRAND jurisprudence emphasized good faith negotiations and proportionate royalties.

Key takeaways for SEP holders:

- Develop royalty methodologies grounded in patent value, not licensee product value.
- Engage in genuine negotiations with documented offers and counter-offers.
- Avoid litigation threats as negotiation tactics.
- Maintain non-discriminatory licensing across similarly situated implementers.
- Recognize that standard-setting participation creates ongoing compliance obligations.

THE COMPANY SECRETARY AS STRATEGIC LEADER

Modern governance demands Company Secretaries transcend traditional compliance roles, embracing strategic leadership in harmonizing IPR and competition objectives:

- **Strategic Advisor**: Counsel leadership on how IP strategies impact competitive positioning and regulatory exposure. Participate in board discussions about patent portfolios, licensing models, and enforcement priorities.
- **Risk Manager**: Develop comprehensive frameworks identifying potential competition law violations in IP activities. Create risk matrices evaluating scenarios from CCI investigations to private litigation.
- **Policy Architect**: Design organizational policies embedding competition compliance into IP management—patent filing, trademark protection, copyright enforcement, trade secret handling, and licensing practices.
- **Culture Champion**: Foster awareness that balancing innovation incentives with competitive fairness serves long-term interests. Develop training programs and communication channels for raising concerns.
- **External Interface**: Build constructive relationships with regulatory authorities, industry associations, and professional bodies. Represent organizational interests in policy consultations while maintaining ethical standards.

CONTRIBUTING TO VIKSIT BHARAT: THE NATIONAL DIMENSION

- India's path to developed nation status by 2047 depends critically on fostering innovation while maintaining competitive markets. Governance professionals contribute through:
- **Promoting Indigenous Innovation**: Support R&D investments while ensuring innovations reach markets competitively. Champion technology transfer to MSMEs and support innovation ecosystems.
- **Leveraging Cultural Capital**: India's 400+ registered GI products represent enormous economic potential. Governance of GI associations must balance collective rights protection with preventing exclusionary practices.
- **Supporting Inclusive Growth**: Ensure large organizations' IP strategies don't foreclose MSME participation. Voluntary technology sharing and fair supply chain dealings benefit entire ecosystems.
- **Enhancing Global Competitiveness**: As Indian companies globalize, managing IP portfolios across jurisdictions while navigating diverse competition regimes becomes essential for international success.

CONCLUSION

The intersection of IPR and Competition Law represents governance's most intellectually demanding and strategically consequential domain. Success requires technical expertise, business acumen, ethical judgment, and wisdom to balance competing interests.

As India advances toward Viksit Bharat, governance professionals have unprecedented opportunities to shape how organizations innovate, compete, and contribute to national prosperity. This requires moving beyond reactive compliance to proactive strategy formulation, embedding competitive fairness into organizational DNA while vigorously protecting legitimate intellectual property rights.

The apparent tension between IPR and Competition Law is actually creative tension—when managed thoughtfully, it drives both innovation and competition, ultimately benefiting businesses, consumers, and society. Leading thoughtfully in this space transcends professional obligation; it becomes meaningful contribution to nation building.

Company Secretaries who master this convergence will not merely protect organizations from legal risks but position them as responsible corporate citizens committed to fair competition, sustainable innovation, and inclusive growth. The future belongs to organizations that innovate boldly while competing fairly—and to governance professionals who lead this transformation with vision, integrity, and unwavering commitment to both innovation and fairness.

REFERENCES:

I. Primary Legislative Framework:

i. The Competition Act, 2002 - https://www.cci.gov.in/images/legalframeworkact/en/the-competition-act-20021687847012.pdf

ii. The Patents Act, 1970 (as amended 2005) - https://ipindia.gov.in/writereaddata/Portal/ev/sections-index.html

iii. The Trade Marks Act, 1999 - https://ipindia.gov.in/trade-marks-act.htm

iv. The Copyright Act, 1957 - https://copyright.gov.in/documents/copyrightrules1957.pdf

II. Leading Case Law:

v. Bayer Corporation v. Natco Pharma Ltd., Order No. 45/2013, IPAB (2013)

vi. DLF Limited v. Competition Commission of India, Civil Appeal No. 7759/2013, Supreme Court (2019) - https://main.sci.gov.in/supremecourt/ 2013/7759/7759_2013_Judgement_02-Sep-2019.pdf

vii. In Re: Google Inc., Suo Motu Case No. 07/2012, CCI (2018) - https://www.cci.gov.in/antitrust/orders

viii. In Re: Shamsher Kataria v. Honda Siel Cars India Ltd., Case No. 03/2011, CCI (2014)

ix. Telefonaktiebolaget LM Ericsson (Publ) v. Competition Commission of India, Civil Appeal No. 6697/2013, Supreme Court (2016) - https://main.sci.gov.in/supremecourt/2013/6697/6697_2013_Judgement_13-May-2016.pdf

x. Telefonaktiebolaget LM Ericsson v. Intex Technologies, CS (OS) 1045/2014, Delhi HC (2015)

III. Institutional Resources:

xi. Competition Commission of India - https://www.cci.gov.in/

xii. Indian Patent Office - https://ipindia.gov.in/

xiii. Supreme Court of India Judgments - https://main.sci.gov.in/judgments

xiv. Journal of Intellectual Property Rights (JIPR) - NISCAIR Publications

❐