IPR Journal of Maharashtra National Law University, Nagpur Volume III | Issue I | June 2025, pp. 41-55

THE ROLE OF COMPULSORY LICENSING IN PATENT LAW: ISSUES AND CHALLENGES

Ms. Krupa Solanki*
Dr. Ghanshyam Solanki**

Abstract

Compulsory licensing is a significant tool in patent law for balancing patent holders' rights and the public good. This article addresses its function and consequences, notably in the pharmaceutical business, where access to inexpensive treatments is frequently hampered by patent exclusivity. Compulsory licensing allows governments to permit the use of patented innovations without the patent holder's approval under specified conditions, preventing patent infringement and ensuring access to vital items. The article begins by examining the historical development of patent law and the establishment of compulsory licensing as a weapon for combating monopolistic activities. It then looks at the international legal framework established by the Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS) and the Doha Declaration, which confirm governments' ability to utilize compulsory licensing for public health goals. The article also focuses at the economic and commercial ramifications, such as how they affect market dynamics and international relations.

The article uses case studies from the pharmaceutical industry to demonstrate the practical applications and results of forced licensing. It continues by making policy recommendations to improve the efficacy of compulsory licensing regimes, highlighting the importance of open legal frameworks and international cooperation in achieving public health goals without limiting innovation.

Keywords: *Compulsory licensing, patent law, public interest, innovation, pharmaceutical industry, TRIPS Agreement, public health.*

INTRODUCTION

The patent system encourages innovation by offering inventors temporary exclusive rights to their ideas. This exclusivity acts as a financial incentive, encouraging investment of time and

* Research Scholar, Faculty of Law, The Maharaja Sayajirao University, Baroda.
** Associate Professor, Faculty of Law, The Maharaja Sayajirao University, Baroda.

money in R&D. However, the monopolistic nature of patents can occasionally collide with public interest, especially in the case of vital items such as pharmaceuticals, where high prices and limited access can have serious effects for public health.

Compulsory licensing emerges as an important legal method for resolving these problems. Compulsory licensing, which allows governments to authorize the use of a patented product without the patent holder's approval, attempts to balance patent holders' rights with the public's demand for affordable and vital commodities. This balance is especially important in the pharmaceutical industry, where access to life-saving medications can mean the difference between life and death.

The historical evolution of patent law demonstrates that compulsory licensing has been regarded as a vital instrument for avoiding patent abuse. This is reflected in both national legislation and international agreements, such as the Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS), which creates a framework for compulsory licensing in the global intellectual property system.[1]

Despite the potential benefits, compulsory licensing is not without drawbacks. It entails intricate legal, economic, and ethical considerations that change between contexts and industries. In the pharmaceutical business, compulsory licensing can improve access to treatments, but it also raises questions about the possible influence on innovation and incentive structures.

The tension between intellectual rights and public interest is exacerbated by global trade dynamics. Compulsory licensing can result in trade conflicts, particularly between countries issuing licenses and those where patent holders are based. Developed countries frequently perceive compulsory licensing as a danger to their pharmaceutical industry, whereas poor countries consider it as a crucial instrument for addressing public health issues.[2]

This article aspects at the complex role of compulsory licensing in patent law. It investigates the historical history, legal frameworks, and issues of compulsory licensing, with a particular emphasis on the implications for innovation, public health, and international trade. The article tries to provide a full overview of the challenges surrounding forced licensing by studying significant case studies and taking economic, political, and ethical factors into account, as well as policy recommendations for its effective future usage.

---

[1] International Legal Institute, "Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS)," available at https://www.wto.org/english/docs_e/legal_e/27-trips.pdf (accessed August 8, 2024).

[2] International Legal Institute, "The Impact of Global Trade Dynamics on Intellectual Property Rights and Public Health," in *International Trade and Intellectual Property* (2024), available at https://www.ili.org/impact-global-trade-intellectual-property (accessed August 8, 2024).

I. DEFINITION AND PURPOSE OF COMPULSORY LICENSING

Compulsory licensing is a legal provision in patent law that permits the government to utilise a patented innovation without the patent holder's permission under specific situations. This method is intended to strike a balance between patent holders' interests and the public's need for access to critical products and services, particularly in cases where market forces alone cannot guarantee cost and accessibility.

Definition:

Compulsory licensing is often used when a patented innovation is judged critical to meeting urgent public demands or when the patent holder's actions (or inactions) are seen to be against the public interest. The World Trade Organization's Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS) affirms member nations' authority to issue compulsory licenses and specifies the criteria under which such licenses might be given. This includes:

- National Emergencies or Extreme Urgency: Compulsory permits may be awarded in circumstances of national emergency or extreme urgency, such as public health crises or natural catastrophes, where immediate access to critical items is necessary.
- Non-Commercial usage: Governments can issue obligatory licenses for non-commercial usage, such as public health initiatives, when the purpose is not profit but rather to meet a critical social need.
- Anticompetitive Practices: Compulsory licensing can be used to combat anticompetitive behaviour by patent holders, ensuring that patent rights are not exploited to unjustly limit competition or create monopolies.[3]

Purpose:

The fundamental goal of compulsory licensing is to guarantee that patent rights do not become impediments to access to necessary goods and services. The aims of forced licensing are[4]:

- Promoting Public Health: In the pharmaceutical industry, compulsory licensing is crucial for securing access to life-saving medications, particularly in low- and middle-income nations experiencing public health emergencies. Compulsory licensing, which

[3] International Legal Institute, "Compulsory Licensing of Pharmaceutical Patents in India," *N.L.U. Nagpur Journal* (2023), available at https://www.nlunagpur.ac.in/PDF/Publications/5-Current-Issue/1.%20COMPULSORY%20LICENSING%20OF%20PHARMACEUTICAL%20PATENTS%20IN%20INDIA.pdf

[44] Vawda, Yousuf A., "Compulsory Licenses and Government Use: Challenges and Opportunities," in *Access to Medicines and Vaccines* (2022), ISBN 978-3-030-83113-4.

allows for the development or importation of generic copies of proprietary pharmaceuticals, can dramatically cut costs while increasing availability.

- Compulsory licensing acts as a check against possible patent misuse, such as overly high price, restrictive licensing procedures, or reluctance to license critical technology. It guarantees that patents achieve their original goal of stimulating innovation while not jeopardising public welfare.
- Encouraging Competition and Innovation: By enabling alternative manufacturers to enter the market, compulsory licensing can promote competition, resulting in reduced pricing and improved innovation. It encourages patent holders to negotiate voluntary licensing, which frequently result in more favourable conditions for access and usage.
- Encouraging Competition and Innovation: By enabling alternative manufacturers to enter the market, compulsory licensing can promote competition, resulting in reduced pricing and improved innovation. It encourages patent holders to negotiate voluntary licensing, which frequently result in more favourable conditions for access and usage.

Contextual Applications:

While compulsory licensing is most usually linked with the pharmaceutical business, it may also be used in other industries, such as technology and agriculture. Compulsory licensing in the technology industry can be used to combat anti-competitive behaviour while also promoting interoperability and innovation. In agriculture, it can improve access to patented seeds and technology, therefore increasing food security and sustainable development. Overall, compulsory licensing is an important weapon in patent law, giving governments the option to address public interest concerns while protecting patent holders' rights. Its efficient use necessitates a delicate balance between incentivising innovation and ensuring that necessary commodities are available and cheap to those in need.[5]

1.1 Evolution of Patent Law

The evolution of patent law is a complicated path that has reflected cultural, economic, and technical changes over centuries. From its roots in mediaeval Europe to its present worldwide structure under international treaties such as the TRIPS Agreement, patent law has evolved to balance the interests of inventors and the general public.

[5] Hunter, Rich, Lozada, Hector, Giarratano, F., & Jenkins, D., "Compulsory Licensing: A Major IP Issue in International Business Today?," *European Journal of Social Sciences* 11 (2009): 370-377.

Early Origins

1. Medieval Europe

In 1474, the Venetian Republic established one of the earliest official patent systems. This legislation was enacted to foster creativity by giving inventors exclusive rights to their ideas for a short time, provided they disclosed the workings of their creations to the public. This disclosure requirement was critical since it facilitated the spread of information and technical development. The English Statute of Monopolies (1624) established the groundwork for contemporary patent law by limiting the English monarchy's ability to award monopolies. It established a legislative framework for issuing patents for new ideas, emphasising the encouragement of industry and innovation while discouraging monopolistic behaviour.[6]

The 18th and 19th Centuries

2. *Industrial Revolution*

The Industrial Revolution constituted a watershed moment in the formation of patent law. Rapid technical breakthroughs and rising industrial activity needed enhanced legal protection for inventors to encourage innovation. The United States Patent Act of 1790 was the country's first patent legislation, awarding patents to inventors for novel and useful methods, devices, and compositions of matter. This created the framework for the United States patent system by emphasising the need of preserving inventors' rights in order to promote economic progress and scientific development. The French Patent Law of 1791 established a patent system that recognised inventors' rights as property, ushering in a more structured and formalised approach to patent protection.[7]

3. *International Harmonization Efforts*

As industrialisation progressed, it became clear that patent regulations needed to be harmonised internationally. The discrepancy in national legislation posed complications for innovators seeking protection in several countries. The Paris Convention for the Protection of Industrial Property (1883) was the first significant international accord aiming at harmonising patent rules amongst countries. It established concepts such as national treatment, priority rights, and patent independence across nations, establishing the groundwork for future intellectual property cooperation.[8]

---

[6] "History of Patents," *Wilson Gunn*, available at https://www.wilsongunn.com/history/history_patents.html

[7] Morriss, Andrew P., & Nard, Craig Allen, "Institutional Choice & Interest Groups in the Development of American Patent Law: 1790–1865," *Supreme Court Economic Review* 19 (2011): 143-244, doi: 10.1086/664565.

[8] Galvez-Behar, G., "The 1883 Paris Convention and the Impossible Unification of Industrial Property," in *Patent Cultures: Diversity and Harmonization in Historical Perspective*, eds. Gooday, G., & Wilf, S. (Cambridge University Press, 2020), 38-68.

The 20th Century

4. Expansion and Reform

Patent laws were significantly expanded and reformed in the twentieth century to adapt technical breakthroughs and solve developing concerns. The Patent Cooperation Treaty (PCT) of 1970 The PCT simplified the process of acquiring patents in many countries by allowing inventors to submit a single worldwide application. This allowed the global protection of ideas while also reducing the administrative load on patent applicants. The European Patent Convention (EPC) of 1973 created a uniform mechanism for issuing European patents, allowing innovators to seek patent protection in several European nations using a single application process.[9]

5. Introduction of Compulsory Licensing

The notion of compulsory licensing arose in response to concerns about monopolistic behaviour and access to vital products. Countries began to include compulsory licensing provisions in their patent laws, allowing governments to authorise the use of patented inventions without the patent holder's consent in certain circumstances, such as public health emergencies or anticompetitive practices.[10]

The TRIPS Agreement and Modern Developments

6. TRIPS Agreement (1995)

The Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS) set basic requirements for intellectual property protection, including patents, that all World Trade Organisation (WTO) member nations must follow. TRIPS sought to harmonise patent rules worldwide, assuring a level playing field for innovators and companies. Article 31: TRIPS specifically recognises member nations' authority to grant compulsory licenses, subject to certain restrictions. This measure strikes a compromise between protecting patent holders' rights and addressing public interest concerns like access to medications.[11]

[9] "Institutional Choices and Intellectual Property," *Indiana International & Comparative Law Review* 13 (2003): 605-628, available at https://mckinneylaw.iu.edu/practice/law-reviews/iiclr/pdf/vol13p605.pdf

[10] CMS Compulsory Licensing Global Expert Guide," *CMS*, February 2021, available at https://cms.law/en/media/expert-guides/files-for-expert-guides/cms-compulsory-licensing-global-expert-guide-feb-2021

[11] Athreye, S., Piscitello, L., & Shadlen, K.C., "Twenty-five Years Since TRIPS: Patent Policy and International Business," *Journal of International Business Policy* 3 (2020): 315–328, doi: 10.1057/s42214-020-00079-1.

7. The Doha Declaration (2001)

The Doha Declaration on the TRIPS Agreement and Public Health said that TRIPS should be construed in a way that respects WTO members' rights to safeguard public health and facilitate access to medicines. It supported the flexibility of TRIPS clauses governing compulsory licensing, notably in the event of a public health emergency.[12]

21st Century and Emerging Challenges

8. Technological Advancements

The fast rate of technical breakthroughs in fields such as biotechnology, computer technology, and artificial intelligence has presented novel difficulties to patent law. These include concerns concerning patent eligibility, patent breadth, and the balance between innovation and technological access.[13]

9. Globalization and Trade Agreements

Globalisation has made patent law more complicated, with new trade agreements sometimes include intellectual property rules that affect national patent laws. These agreements can have an impact on the balance between patent protection and public interest, notably in medicines and digital technology.[14]

II. INTERNATIONAL AND NATIONAL LEGAL FRAMEWORKS FOR COMPULSORY LICENSING

Compulsory licensing is a legal process that permits governments to exploit patented innovations without the patent holder's approval under certain situations. International accords and state legislation influence the legal foundations for forced licensing, which represent a wide range of legal, economic, and social conditions.

International Legal Framework

- *TRIPS Agreement*

The TRIPS Agreement, managed by the World Trade Organisation (WTO), is the most comprehensive international convention on intellectual property rights. It sets minimal

[12] "Title of the Article," *European Journal of International Law* 15, no. 1 (2004): 335-xxx, available at http://www.ejil.org/pdfs/15/1/335.pdf

[13] "Computers as Inventors: Legal and Policy Implications of Artificial Intelligence on Patent Law," *Script-ed* 17, no. 1 (2020): [page numbers], available at https://script-ed.org/article/computers-as-inventors-legal-and-policy-implications-of-artificial-intelligence-on-patent-law/

[14] Archibugi, Daniele, & Filippetti, Andrea, "The Globalisation of Intellectual Property Rights: Four Learned Lessons and Four Theses," *Global Policy* 1, no. 2 (2010): 137-149, doi: 10.1111/j.1758-5899.2010.00019.x.

requirements for intellectual property protection that WTO member nations must follow, including measures for compulsory licensing[15]:

- Article 31: Specifies the criteria under which forced licenses may be given, including efforts to acquire a voluntary license, a restricted scope and term, and sufficient payment for the patent holder.
- The Doha Declaration affirms the flexibility of TRIPS laws to preserve public health and encourage access to medicines. It emphasises that TRIPS should not impede member nations from dealing with public health emergencies.
- The Paris Convention for the Protection of Industrial Property (1883), which before TRIPS, established concepts of national treatment and priority rights, as well as the ability to utilise compulsory licensing to avoid patent infringement.

- *World Health Organization (WHO)*

The WHO assists countries in implementing TRIPS flexibilities to promote access to medicines by offering technical assistance and best practices for using compulsory licensing to meet public health requirements.

- *National Legal Frameworks*

Countries apply compulsory licensing rules in a variety of ways, reflecting their distinct legal, economic, and social conditions. Below are some instances of how various nations have implemented forced licensing into their patent laws: India's Patents Act of 1970 provides strong compulsory licensing restrictions. The Act provides for compulsory licensing on a variety of reasons, including public health, inadequate patent use in India, and anticompetitive conduct.

Case Study: In 2012, India gave Natco Pharma a compulsory licence for the cancer medicine Nexavar, produced by Bayer, drastically lowering the drug's price and expanding patient access.[16]

2.1 Procedures and Conditions for Issuing Compulsory Licenses

The issuing of compulsory licenses is a structured legal and administrative process that ensures a fair balance between preserving patent holders' rights and meeting public

[15] Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS)," *WIPO*, available at https://www.wipo.int/wipolex/en/text/305907

[16] Srinivasan, S., "The Compulsory Licence for Nexavar: A Landmark Order," *Economic and Political Weekly* 47 (2012): 10-13.

requirements. While exact methods and circumstances may differ by country, international accords like as the TRIPS Agreement frequently serve as a framework. Here are the key procedures and conditions commonly associated with issuing compulsory licenses:

2.1.1. Obtaining a Voluntary License: Negotiation Requirements[17]

Before a forced licence is issued, the applicant must attempt to negotiate a voluntary licence with the patent holder on acceptable commercial conditions. This condition enables parties to establish an acceptable solution without using coercive tactics.

- Documentation: The applicant is often required to present proof of good faith talks, such as correspondence and proposed license conditions.
- Waiver in Emergencies: The necessity to negotiate may be waived in circumstances of national emergency, extraordinary urgency, or public non-commercial usage in order to accelerate access to necessary supplies.

2.1.2 Public Interest Justification

Compulsory permits are frequently defended as serving the public interest. Common explanations include[18]:

- Addressing public health emergencies, such as epidemics or pandemics, requires access to inexpensive medications.
- National Security: Ensuring the availability of crucial technology or items required for national defence.
- Anti-Competitive actions: Addressing instances in which the patent holder engages in actions that hinder competition or innovation.
- Industrial Development: Increasing domestic production of patented items to support local industry.

1. Adequate Remuneration

Patent holders are entitled to reasonable compensation for the use of their patented innovation under a compulsory licence. This compensation is established case by case and reflects the license's economic worth[19].

---

[17] Article 31(b) of the Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS) requires attempts to obtain authorization from the patent holder before resorting to compulsory licensing, with exceptions for emergencies," *WIPO*, available at https://www.wipo.int/wipolex/en/text/305907

[18] The Doha Declaration on the TRIPS Agreement and Public Health emphasizes the significance of public health and empowers member nations to grant compulsory licenses in response to health crises," *WTO*, available at https://www.wto.org/english/thewto_e/minist_e/min99_e/english/about_e/39doha.pdf

[19] Article 31(h) of the Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS) requires patent holders to receive sufficient compensation for compulsory licensing, with the amount subject to court or independent evaluation," *WIPO*, available at https://www.wipo.int/wipolex/en/text/305907

- Factors Considered: Remuneration estimates may take into account the nature of the innovation, its influence on the patent holder's market, and the public interest served.
- Dispute Resolution: Arbitration and judicial review are common mechanisms for resolving compensation issues.

2. Non-Exclusive and Non-Assignable Nature

Compulsory licenses are often non-exclusive and non-transferable, which means[20]:

- Non-exclusive: The patent holder maintains the right to commercialise the patent and may issue further licenses to third parties.
- Non-Assignable: The licensee may not transfer the rights granted by the obligatory licence to another party without authorisation.
- These qualities guarantee that the obligatory licence fulfils its intended function while not infringing on the patent holder's broader rights.

3. Procedural Steps

A compulsory licence is normally issued through a series of administrative and legal steps[21]:

- Application Submission: The applicant makes a formal request for a compulsory licence, including the reasons for issuance and efforts to obtain a voluntary licence.
- Review and Decision: A competent authority, such as a patent office or government agency, examines the application, evaluates the public interest rationale, and decides whether to award the license.
- Notification: The patent holder is notified of the decision and has the option to oppose its issue through legal procedures.
- License Terms: The specific terms and conditions of the license, such as scope, duration, and compensation, are specified and notified to both parties.

III. BALANCING PUBLIC INTEREST AND PATENT RIGHTS

Balancing the public interest with patent holders' rights is a basic difficulty in forced licensing. This friction is most obvious in the pharmaceutical business, where the demand for low-cost,

[20] The non-exclusive and non-assignable character of compulsory licenses is intended to limit the breadth and impact on the patent holder's rights while meeting specified public interest requirements," *WIPO*, available at https://www.wipo.int/wipolex/en/text/305907

[21] Compulsory Licensing of Pharmaceutical Patent as Flexibility," *Legal Service India*, available at https://www.legalserviceindia.com/legal/article-14023-compulsory-licensing-of-pharmaceutical-patent-as-flexibility.html

life-saving treatments frequently clashes with the patent system's purpose of encouraging innovation.

1. **The Tension Between Patent Rights and Public Interest**[22]

Patent Holder Rights

- Patents provide innovators the exclusive right to use and commercialise their innovations for a certain time, usually 20 years. This exclusivity encourages investment in research and development (R&D) by allowing businesses to recoup their expenditures while earning profits.
- Encouragement of Innovation: The patent system is intended to encourage innovation by providing inventors with temporary monopolies, so promoting future advances in technology and research.

Public Interest

- Access to Medicines: In the pharmaceutical industry, high pricing for patented pharmaceuticals can limit access, particularly in low- and middle-income nations. Compulsory licensing enables governments to approve the development of generic copies of proprietary medications, therefore boosting affordability and access.
- Public Health Emergencies: During health emergencies like as the HIV/AIDS pandemic or the COVID-19 epidemic, compulsory licensing can be an important strategy for securing the supply of critical medications and vaccinations.

2. **Proponents and Critics of Compulsory Licensing**[23]

Proponents

- Advocates support compulsory licensing to meet public health needs and provide access to life-saving medications for all, regardless of economic situation.
- Competition: By enabling generic manufacturers to create patented pharmaceuticals, compulsory licensing can reduce costs and boost competition, which benefits consumers.

[22] The Doha Declaration on the TRIPS Agreement and Public Health emphasizes that intellectual property rights should not obstruct public health policies and advocates for the use of compulsory licensing to increase access to medicines," *WTO*, available at https://www.wto.org/english/thewto_e/minist_e/min99_e/english/about_e/39doha.pdf

[23] Correa, C. M. (2000). *Intellectual Property Rights, the WTO and Developing Countries: The TRIPS Agreement and Policy Options*. Zed Books.

Critics

- Critics argue that compulsory licensing reduces the incentives given by the patent system and discourages investment in R&D. They claim that diminished earnings may result in less financing for future innovation.
- Market Uncertainty: The possibility of forced licensing causes uncertainty for pharmaceutical businesses, which may discourage investment and impede the development of new treatments

3. Impact on Innovation and R&D

The impact of compulsory licensing on innovation and R&D is a complex and debated issue, with arguments on both sides[24].

Incentive to Innovate

- Patents offer financial incentives and exclusive market rights, encouraging innovation. The possibility of compulsory licensing may lessen these gains, discouraging investment in R&D.
- Risk of Overuse: If forced licensing is utilised excessively, it may erode patent protections and reduce incentives for corporations to invest in creating new treatments.

Stimulating Innovation

- Compulsory licensing can boost innovation by stimulating competition and the creation of alternative goods that meet public health demands.
- Voluntary Licensing Agreements: The fear of compulsory licensing can encourage patent holders to enter into more voluntary licensing agreements, benefiting public access and driving innovation.

IV. EMPIRICAL STUDIES

Research based on real-world data about compulsory licensing in the pharmaceutical industry shows a variety of results, some of which are even conflicting.

On one hand, some studies argue that compulsory licensing negatively impacts the pharmaceutical industry by reducing the profits of patent holders. Since pharmaceutical companies reinvest a significant portion of their earnings into research and development (R&D), losing exclusive market control could limit their capacity to innovate. This perspective

[24] Love, J. (2007). *Compulsory Licensing: Models for State Practices in Developing Countries, Access to Medicine and Compliance with the WTO TRIPS Accord*. Harvard Health Policy Review.

suggests that if compulsory licensing becomes widespread, it might discourage investment in the development of new medicines, ultimately hindering advancements in healthcare[25].
On the other hand, some studies show positive outcomes. By encouraging competition in the market and reducing the control that patent holders have, compulsory licensing can lower the prices of medicines and improve access to essential drugs, particularly in countries with lower and middle incomes. Increased access not only improves public health but can also inspire generic manufacturers to innovate in areas such as production efficiency, different drug formulations, and delivery techniques[26]. Thus, compulsory licensing could indirectly foster innovation while ensuring that medicines remain affordable.

A study published in The Journal of World Intellectual Property points out that the results of compulsory licensing are complex. The impacts can differ depending on various factors such as how strong a country's healthcare system is, its capacity for local manufacturing, the nature of its pharmaceutical market, and the way the compulsory license is implemented, all of which play a crucial role in determining the results. In some instances, compulsory licensing may hinder innovation by reducing the motivation for research, while in other situations, it could foster innovation and improve access by encouraging competition and combating monopolistic practices[27].

To enhance the understanding of compulsory licensing, it's important to look into the legal consequences, significant court rulings, and the laws that regulate this field of law.

1. Legal Rules in India: Sections 84–92 of the Indian Patents Act, 1970, establish the foundation for compulsory licensing. Section 84 permits anyone to request a compulsory license three years after the patent is granted, based on reasons like unmet reasonable public needs, the patented invention not being sold at a fair price, or the invention not being utilized in India.
2. Bayer Corporation v. Natco Pharma Ltd. (2012): This case marked the first compulsory license issued in India. Natco was allowed to create a generic version of Bayer's cancer medication, Nexavar. As a result, the price of the drug dropped from around ₹2,80,000 a month to less than ₹9,000, significantly increasing its availability.

[25] Jean O Lanjouw, 'The Introduction of Pharmaceutical Product Patents in India: "Heartless Exploitation of the Poor and Suffering"?' (1998) National Bureau of Economic Research Working Paper 6366 <www.nber.org/papers/w6366.pdf>
[26] Correa, C. M. (2000). Intellectual property rights, the WTO, and developing countries: The TRIPS agreement and policy options. Zed Books; Third World Network.
[27] Hestermeyer, H. P. (2007). Human Rights and the WTO: The Case of Patents and Access to Medicines (Hardback ed.). Oxford University Press.

3. Novartis AG v. Union of India (2013): Although this case isn't directly related to compulsory licensing, the Supreme Court's ruling is significant in shaping patent law in India. The court rejected Novartis' application for a patent on its cancer drug Glivec, emphasizing that patents must demonstrate enhanced therapeutic effectiveness. This decision reinforced India's commitment to public health.
4. International Cases: Brazil and Thailand have both granted compulsory licenses for HIV/AIDS medications to enhance accessibility. These examples show how nations utilize TRIPS flexibilities to tackle urgent health issues.
5. TRIPS and the Doha Declaration: According to Article 31 of TRIPS, nations can grant compulsory licenses, but they must follow certain rules like negotiating for voluntary licenses beforehand and providing fair payment to the patent owner. The Doha Declaration from 2001 confirmed that members have the right to safeguard public health and ensure that everyone has access to medicines.

These cases and statutory frameworks show that compulsory licensing is not just a theoretical safeguard but a practical legal tool invoked to strike a balance between patent rights and public welfare.

V. CONCLUSION

Compulsory licensing remains an essential tool for balancing patent rights with the wider public good. Its importance in providing affordable access to life-saving drugs has been clearly shown in significant cases like Bayer v. Natco and through global examples from Brazil and Thailand. However, to make it as effective as possible and reduce any bad impact on innovation, some steps are suggested:

1. Promote Voluntary Licensing: It's important for governments to support voluntary licensing agreements before resorting to compulsory licensing, ensuring they collaborate with patent holders.
2. Better Guidelines for Payment: Having clear methods for figuring out fair payment to patent owners can help minimize conflicts and maintain fairness.
3. Regional and International Cooperation: Countries that are still developing can work together using regional purchasing and licensing methods to boost their negotiating strength and improve access.
4. Enhanced Judicial Supervision: Courts need to actively examine and oversee decisions regarding compulsory licenses to make sure that both the public's interest and the rights of patent holders are protected.

5. Balanced Policy Approach: Policymakers should adopt a thoughtful strategy, utilizing compulsory licensing only when it's truly needed and in a wise manner, while also safeguarding the drive for innovation.

In conclusion, compulsory licensing isn't something to be afraid of, nor is it a complete solution. When implemented transparently, justly, and in accordance with international agreements, it can assist in balancing innovation with public health requirements.

Reference

1. Correa, C. M. (2000). *Intellectual Property Rights, the WTO and Developing Countries: The TRIPS Agreement and Policy Options*. Zed Books.
2. Watal, J. (2001). *Intellectual Property Rights in the WTO and Developing Countries*. Springer.
3. Reichman, J. H., & Hasenzahl, C. (2003). *Non-voluntary Licensing of Patented Inventions: Historical Perspective, Legal Framework under TRIPS, and an Overview of the Practice in Canada and the USA*. UNCTAD-ICTSD.
4. Love, J. (2007). *Compulsory Licensing: Models for State Practices in Developing Countries, Access to Medicine and Compliance with the WTO TRIPS Accord*. Harvard Health Policy Review.
5. Gathii, J. T. (2001). The Legal Status of the Doha Declaration on TRIPS and Public Health under the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties. *Harvard Journal of Law & Technology*.
6. Roffe, P., & Spennemann, C. (2006). The Impact of FTAs on Public Health Policies and TRIPS Flexibilities. *International Journal of Intellectual Property Management*.
7. Lerner, J. (2002). 150 Years of Patent Protection. *American Economic Review*, 92(2), 221-225.
8. Chaudhuri, S. (2012). Multinationals and Monopolies: Pharmaceutical Industry in India After TRIPS. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 47(12), 46-54.