International Journal of Multidisciplinary Trends

E-ISSN: 2709-9369
P-ISSN: 2709-9350
www.multisubjectjournal.com
IJMT 2021; 3(2): 73-77
Received: 07-06-2021
Accepted: 09-07-2021

Kriti Singh
Department of Law,
University of Lucknow,
Lucknow, Uttar Pradesh,
India

Corresponding Author:
Kriti Singh
Department of Law,
University of Lucknow,
Lucknow, Uttar Pradesh,
India

Critical analysis of section 3(d) of Indian patent act, 1970

Kriti Singh

Abstract
The basic idea is that section 3(d) of Indian patent act disallows patent protection for mere discovery unless such substance express substantial efficacy in the known substance. This provision is disputed as being violative of TRIPS agreement not only on the ground that the provision does not provide any specific guidelines for incremental innovation but also lake the standard protection to all categories of inventions as provided by TRIP. So the whole research moves around the disadvantage of section 3(d) over Indian patent.

Keywords: patent, discovery, known substance, design

Introduction

The present Patents Act, 1970 came into power in the year 1972, amending and joining the current laws identifying with Patents and Designs act 1911 in India. The Patent (amendment) Act 2005 came into power from first January 2005, which got changes the past patent arrangement of India wherein item patent was stretched out to all subjects of innovation comprising of nourishment, medications, chemicals and smaller scale life forms. In addition, Section 3(d) acquainted in with the said amendment act 2005 and presents pharmaceutical item licenses in India interestingly. The Patent (amendment) Act 2005 characterizes what invention is and makes it clear that any current information or thing can't be patented. In the technical patent setting, "improvement" by and large means innovation that assembles straightforwardly upon an essential patent. In a more extensive sense, a improvement may be thought to be something that adjusts segments of the fundamental's innovation patent as recognized from simply giving a substitute way to deal with accomplishing the same result.

The exceptionally goal of having Section 3(d) as an amendment clause to Indian Patent Act was to keep the "evergreening" of patents. It was tended to at the Federation of Indian Chambers of Commerce and Industry (FICCI) round table on 29th March 2010 that evacuation of segment 3(d) would bring about "evergreening" and postpones in the section of generics, in this manner influencing general wellbeing [1]. This was particularly to keep a beware of patenting of insignificant improvement of current protected developments to augment its imposing business model administration. This segment looked to forestall perpetually disallowing so as to green the patenting of a known substance unless it results in an 'upgrade of the adequacy of that substance'. By making subordinates with included viability patentable, S. 3(d) supports successive advancements of existing items or advances that help get enhanced items to the business sector. It implies that Inventions which are unimportant revelation of another type of a known substance and which does not bring about expanded viability of that substance or the negligible disclosure of any new property or new use for a known substance or of the insignificant utilization of a known procedure, machine or contraption unless such process results in another item or utilizes no less than one new reactant are not patentable. This, at the end of the day implied that India did not bolster developments which were minor adjustments and therefore counteracted undue restraining infrastructure amid the expanded time of patent security by the company/inventor.

The Indian pharmaceutical industry has been a noteworthy maker and supplier of minimal effort nonspecific solutions for the Indian shoppers as well as for some creating countries like it-self, particularly the African countries. The S.3 (d) secures the hobbies of billions of poor, who rely on upon minimal effort nonspecific medications, from silly patent cases by Multinational Pharmaceutical organizations for the sake of development.

[1] https://bricwallblog.wordpress.com/2013/06/07/section-3d-of-the-indian-patents-act-part

Meaning and nature of section 3(d)

S.3 (d) of Indian patent act, 1970 basically talks about that mere improvements are not patentable until and unless resulted in some new substance.

The meaning and nature of the very provision is herein after mentioned:

Section 3(d) the mere discovery of a new form of a known substance which does not result in increased efficacy of that substance or the mere discovery of any new property or new use for a known substance or of the mere use of a known process, machine or apparatus unless such process results in a new product or employs at least one new reactant.

Explanation: For the purposes of this clause, salts, esters, ethers, polymorphs, metabolites, pure form, particle size, isomers, mixtures of isomers, complexes, combinations and other derivatives of known substance shall be considered to be the same substance, unless they differ significantly in properties with regard to efficacy [2]."

From the way in which this section is worded, it will be evident that all together that the underlined segment of Section 3(d) is pulled in the accompanying conditions must be fulfilled:

- What is claimed must be an insignificant disclosure;
- What is claimed must be another type of a known substance; and
- Such substance claimed does not bring about expanded viability over known substance.

On the off chance that any of the aforementioned three conditions are not met, Section 3(d) can't and ought not to be material. A point by point investigation of the claimed subject-matter appreciation of each of these conditions is set out hereunder:

(1) Mere discovery

In contradistinction to "invention" (characterized in S. 2(1) (j) of amended Indian Patent Act, 1970), the expression "discovery" has not been characterized in any section or any tenets there under of the Indian Patent Act. In this manner, one of the consistent conclusions that can be determined concerning the expression's utilization "discovery" in the Act is that it has been utilized as a part of the sense utilized as a part of regular ordinary English dialect. As per the Webster's Third International Dictionary of the English Language, the expression "discovery" alludes to "the demonstration, procedure or an occasion of picking up learning of or discovering the presence of something beforehand obscure or unrecognized." Therefore "discovery" basically alludes to discovering something that has as of now existed in nature however was beforehand obscure or unrecognized. In like manner, a guaranteed invention would need to identify with a something (be it compound substance, organic grouping and so forth.) which in some structure or other existed in the regular habitat to be viewed as a disclosure.

For example, the paracetamol has antipyretic property. Further discovery of new property of paracetamol as pain relieving cannot be patented [3].

Furthermore, concerning organic inventions, an asserted item, which has been built or designed in a research facility to meet particular issues confronted by existing craftsmanship in the field through the utilization of recombinant DNA innovation (i.e., including substantive human intercession), can, by no stretch of creative energy, be termed an "mere discovery".

(2) New form of a known substance

It will be clear from the perusing of S. 3(d) and the clarification thereto that a complaint under the S. 3(d) can reasonably be raised just as for situations where the patentability of another type of definitely known chemical substances comes being referred to. The clarification to S. 3(d) sets down thoroughly the expression's expansiveness "new form" and sets out different classes of elements that would be thought to be the "same substance". Genuinely, the expression "other derivatives of known substance" showing up in the clarification is excessively expansive in its ambit which incorporate any conceivable subsidiaries of the known substance one can consider. The cases of the new type of referred to substances which ought to be considered as same substance expressed in this clarification are further qualified by the words "unless they contrast altogether in properties as to viability."

For example, new utilization of Aspirin for treatment of the cardio-vascular illness, which was prior utilized for pain relieving object, is not patentable. In any case, another and option process for get ready Aspirin is patentable.

(3) Does not increase efficacy

The new types of known substance ought to in this manner be esteemed unpatentable just inasmuch as they don't demonstrate any "enhanced efficacy" or as it were don't vary altogether in properties as to efficacy. In this view, the way that a reference in respect to the amount of upgrade of viability is relied upon is to be found in the underlined bit of the clarification to S.3 (d) which makes it clear that new type of known substances are permissible just when such new types of the known substances vary altogether in properties as to efficacy. So the model is not any trifling augmentation in efficacy but rather critical change in the viability of the new over the known substance.

If there should arise an occurrence of Biswanath Prasad Radhe Shyam V. Hindustan metal Industries [4].

Court held, it is vital to endure personality a top priority that with a specific end goal to be patentable an improvement on something known before or a mix or diverse matters definitely known, ought to be something more than a simple workshop improvement; and should freely fulfill. The test of invention or an inventive step. To be patentable the improvement or the mix must deliver another result than before. The blend of old known whole numbers may be combined to the point that by their working between connections they create another process or enhanced result.

In an another case,

Roche v. cipla [5], prosecution gives us a sufficient chance to look at the shapes of s.3 (d). This subject was chosen by the Delhi HC. The question initiated in January, 2006 after Cipla declared its goal to offer its bland rendition of Erlotinib under the name Erlocip. For this situation, the

[2] Indian patent (amendment) act, 2005

[3] Wadehra B.L., Intellectual property law, universal publication house (5th ed., 2011)

[4] AIR 1982 SC 1444.

[5] 148 (2008) DLT 598

prior known substance was Gefatinib, Roche then asserted a fundamentally comparable compound, Erlotinib. Roche sued Cipla for patent encroachment in 2008 and looked for an interlocutory order. Cipla counter-guaranteed that the Patent was invalid and ought to be disavowed. Cipla additionally contended the value contrast between the two medications and general society enthusiasm for making life-sparing medications accessible at a reasonable cost.
The Delhi HC passed a request dismissing the supplication to God of F Hoffman-La Roche for an injunction in the wake of leading an investigation of s.3 (d), if Erlotinib somehow fulfills the improved efficacy criteria, for this let us consider two conceivable outcomes:

1. Erlotinib is not a subordinate of Gefatinib: If this is the situation, then s. 3(d) does not make a difference. They both are subsidiaries of 4-quinazolinamine, yet are not by any stretch of the imagination subordinates of one another. Therefore if one and only compound in a specific arrangement having auxiliary comparability and acting by the same component is patentable, then it is peculiar to say this.

2. Erlotinib is a subsidiary of Gefatinib: S. 3(d) states that any "subordinate" of a known pharma substance needs to show expanded efficacy keeping in mind the end goal to be patentable. Presently here, if the sign was an inside and out new one, then notwithstanding expecting that Erlotinib is thought to be a subordinate of Gefatinib, Roche crosses the s.3 (d) obstacles. On the off chance that there is another sign for Erlotinib, then under the clarification to s.3 (d), such new utilize would effectively qualify as "contrasting fundamentally in properties with respect to efficacy". At the end of the day, if another utilization is found for Erlotinib, then Erlotinib qualifies as "new substance" by and large under the Explanation to section 3(d)–to this degree, it can't be interpreted as a "known compound".
To aggregate up, keeping in mind the end goal to be patentable over S.3(d) of the amended Patent Act, 1970, topic of an invention ought not be a mere discovery, it ought not be new type of a known substance and it ought to results in generous increment in efficacy over the applicable prior art.

Controversy with respect to section 3(d)
The debate over Section 3(d) of the Patent Act however will be fragmented without the saying of the Novartis case and the court‟ s interpretation of the section. In this face this was the situation which began it all with Novartis challenging the constitutionality of the section and its similarity with TRIPS after the dismissal of its patent applications over its anticancer drug Glivec by the Patent Office.
The latest case, Novartis AG v Union of India [6] chose by Supreme Court of India in 2013 where the case started in the year 1997 with patent application filed by the petitioner before Chennai patent office identified with drug name GLIVEC which was somewhat an alternate version of their 1993 patent for ANTI Leukemia drug. For this situation the Assistant Controller of Patent and outline, Chennai Patent Office dismisses the application under section 3(d) of the Indian patent act 1970. Therefore the petitioner challenged the lawfulness of section 3(d) before the madras High court
The petitioner in the present appeal mollified on two issues:

- Section 3(d) is illegal as it disregards the provisions of the TRIPS's
- The Indian patent act doesn't characterize the expression "Efficacy" and gives unguided power on the Controller. Thus it is discretionary, arbitrary and unclear

In light of the above dispute the court held that
The WTO's Dispute Settlement gives the exclusive remedy and a comprehensive dispute mechanism for infringement of TRIPS Agreement. The High Court investigated the contention between the international law and domestic law and chose that the domestic law will prevail. Besides, in India, international treaties are not straightforwardly enforceable.
The court additionally dismisses the second dispute that the provision is giving unguided power to the patent controller being arbitrary on the term "efficacy" was indistinct and accordingly the court observed that "efficacy implies the capacity to deliver a desired and intended result. Consequently, the test of efficacy in the connection of section 3(d) would be distinctive, and depending upon the result which intended to produce or desired. At the end of the day, the test of efficacy would rely on the function, utility or the purpose of the product under consideration, Therefore, in the case of medicine that claims to cure a disease, the test of efficacy can only be 'therapeutic efficacy'.
Consequently it is found that the Novartis ‘patent application for the beta-crystalline type of Imatinib Mesylate (polymorph B) did not pass through the test of section 3(d) as it didn't have any enhanced therapeutic efficacy. The Supreme Court in this way maintained the High Court's observation and Indian Patent office and rejected the patent application recorded by the petitioner.
The provision under section 3(d) has been sanction by WHO Public Health, Innovation and Intellectual Property Rights Report, 2006, that nations can adopt enactment and examination rules requiring a level of inventiveness that would keep regularly ever-greening of patents from being granted. The decision of the Novartis' case [7] in Indian patent law speaks to a noteworthy victory for community access to inexpensive drugs in creating nations and impacts the access of medicines to poor people. In the event that Novartis had succeeded the case, patenting on drugs would have likely been endorsed all the more broadly in India, restricting generic companies and obstructing access to sensible prescriptions in the creating scene. Additionally the practice is against focused in its impact as the practice will empower pharmaceutical MNCs to kill rivalry from the nonexclusive producers and charge over the top costs for their patented drugs. This thusly will bring about unfavorable impact to open enthusiasm for creating nations since numerous fundamental medications get to be blocked off to the overall population by virtue of excessively expensive estimating.
In this background, Federation of Indian Chambers of Commerce and Industry (FICCI) composed a Roundtable on March 29th, 2010, at FICCI, New Delhi. The Roundtable's

[6] 2007) 4 MLJ 1153

[7] SUPRA NOTE 5 at p.10

target was to talk about the issue of Section 3(d) and whether it comes in the method for giving of commendable creations qualified of patent award. The Roundtable was gone to by government authorities, attorneys, pharma industry delegates, academicians, NGOs, and so forth.

The overall consensus that arrived are as the following

a) Section 3d has not come in way of grant of pharma patents.

The general supposition on section 3d that it ought to proceed as it is not hampering the pharmaceutical's development industry. The aforementioned report uncovered the measurements that the aggregate number of pharma licenses allowed in 2004-05 were 765 and in 2008-09 it was 2373. Since the execution of the new patent Act subsequent to 2005 an aggregate of 3500 „product patents have been for pharmaceuticals which is a critical figure in light of the aggregate item licenses allowed in India. This demonstrates that that the recording of number of pharma patents has expanded and section 3d has not by any means hindered gift of pharmaceutical patents. It is likewise worth specifying after 2005 that 86 patents have been granted for pharmaceutical items in India which, best case scenario must be said as minor varieties of existing pharmaceutical products and not breakthrough drugs [8].

b) Section 3d has not stifled innovation

The report also revealed that implementation of section 3d has not stifled innovation. The report revealed the measurements that in 2004-05, 1911 patents were granted and in 2008-09, 18230 patents were allowed. In this manner, there has been no patenting in the development movement because of new corrections in the law.

c) Foreign MNCs have been significant recipients

The report additionally highlighted that real recipients of product patent regime after the execution of section 3d have been foreign multinationals. The development regarding applications recorded and grant of patents the foreign applicants have been appreciable. The measurements revealed that in 2004-05, 20% of the patent applications were filed by occupants and 80% by nonresident people. In 2007-08 occupants were allowed 21% of the patents and 79% to non-inhabitants. In 2007-08 alone 12088 patents were allowed to outside candidates adding up to 79% as against 3173 patents granted to occupants adding up to 21%8.In 2008-09, 17% of the applications were recorded by inhabitants and 83% by non-occupants. In the matter of stipends, 40% of the patents were allowed to occupants and 60% to non-inhabitants.

Critical analysis

In Section 3(d) which particularly denies the protection of patents where there is mere discovery of known substances unless such substance express generous efficacy in the known substance. So this provision explicitly bars such substances having incremental advancements or trifiling developments.

The provision is in opposition to the TRIPS agreement not just on the ground that the provision does not give any particular rules or guidelines for incremental development additionally lake the standard assurance to all classes of innovations as gave by TRIPS. The Novartis' case pointed out that the TRIPS agreement gives WTO individuals the alternative of giving patent rights more generous than the basic criteria mandated by TRIPS however does not permit individuals to go the other way by actualizing stricter necessities for acquiring a patent. In spite of the fact that the court characterizes the term efficacy as therapeutic efficacy.

The court likewise neglects to give the method of reasoning with reference to why topic needs enhanced efficacy. Thus, in light of the previously stated that any sort of incremental development won't get patent in India.

Under the law in the U.S., innovators may record a few distinct sorts of patent applications which cover new improvements to their inventions or to cover diverse parts of their developments. These sorts of patent applications incorporate "continuation", "divisional", "continuation to a limited extent", and "reissue".

In, 35 U.S. Code § 101 - Inventions patentable, "Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefore, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title " Here the term improvement alludes to utility model patent additionally where the threshold point is very low when contrasted with the Indian act of patent. In United States of America the change can be patentable.

Something else is, with a specific end goal to completely comprehend the corrected Section 3(d), one need to first address the issue of what precisely the expression "efficacy" implies. This term is not characterized anyplace expect from court interpreted in it in Novatis case that is, Efficacy means the ability to produce a desired or intended result. Henceforth, the test of efficacy in section 3(d) would be distinctive depending upon the result the product under consideration is desired or intended to produce. At the end of the day, the test of efficacy would rely on the capacity, utility or the purpose of the product under consideration. This gives the controller arbitrary power and hence it is analogous and vague in nature.

Conclusion

Notwithstanding the compatibility of section 3(d) with TRIPs agreement, it has also been comprehended that the words lack clarification of the relevant section is inadequate. The act does not specifically define the scope and meaning of enhanced efficacy nor is there any guidelines and rules stated in that effect. Therefore to clarify the meaning of the term “enhanced efficacy” it is vital to adjust the wordings of section 3(d). However, the significant provisions under TRIPS clearly indicate that member nations are free to give significant flexibilities to frame in their national patent laws as according to their social and economic needs. Article 27.1 of the TRIPS agreement does not provide any definition for the term invention, inventive steps and industrial application and therefore the member countries are given adaptability to build up the criteria of patentability. In the absence of a precise definition of patentability, there is nothing to prevent the Section 3(d) from using an “efficacy” requirement, i.e. a higher level of inventiveness which determine patentability of new forms of known substances. Accordingly, in order to acquire patent protection in India, the substance has to go pass the test of novelty, inventive steps, non-obviousness and industrial application which is set forth in TRIPS agreement and also

[8] SUPRA NOTE 1 at p.5

fulfill the requirement of additional improved efficacy incorporated under section 3(d). It is concluded that Section 3(d) does not violate the TRIPS mandate and maybe it anticipates frivolous patenting without disregarding profitable incremental advancements in pharmaceuticals and is very well compliance with TRIPS agreement.

References

1. Elizabeth Verkey, law of patents, Eastern Book Company (ISBN 8170128706) 2005, 95-159.
2. The author has discussed about the section 3(d) and gives the basic idea that how some inventions not patentable special reference are to patents over improvements in contrast with the TRIPS agreement that how it is contrary to TRIPS agreement.
3. Janice M. Mueller, Patent law, Aspen Publishers 191-233 (3rded.,2009, ISBN 978-0-7355-7831-9)
4. This mainly concentrated on the US patent law and all the concepts discussed in this book are from the US point of view. In this book, the Position of U.S patents over improvements is discussed and the jurisprudence developed in the US.
5. Gopalakrishnan NS, Agitha TG. Principles of intellectual property, Eastern book company (1st ed., 2009, ISBN 978-81-7012-157-2)
6. This book helps us to have an over view of Indian perspective of Patent law. This book gives the basic idea regarding 'section 3(d)' further author gave an in depth analysis of various Indian case laws. The author has further explained the evolution of patent jurisprudence in India from 70s to modern period.
7. Novatis V. Union of India 2007) 4 MLJ 1153. In this face this was the situation which began it all with Novartis challenging the constitutionality of the section and its similarity with TRIPS after the dismissal of its patent applications over its anticancer drug Glivec by the Patent Office.
8. Roche vs cipla 148 (2008) DLT 598. The dispute commenced in January, 2006 after Cipla announced its intention to sell its generic version of Erlotinib under the name Erlocip. In this case, the earlier known substance was Gefatinib, Roche then claimed a structurally similar compound, Erlotinib. Roche sued Cipla for patent infringement in 2008 and sought an interlocutory injunction.
9. Bishwanath Prasad Radhey Shyam v. Hindustan Metal Industries AIR 1982 SC 1444. This is one of the rarest concluded cases in India in the inventive concept jurisprudence. In this case the Hindustan metal industries having a patent on holding utensils, of which the bishwanath challenged the invalidity of patent it is both not novel and no inventive concept in that invention. Primarily this case was judged by Allahabad High Court after that the Supreme Court of India decided the case and held that patent to an invention does not lie for mere workshop improvement. Finally this case the patent held invalid as it lacks both novelty and inventive step.
10. Dr. Dhanalakshmi Iyer, Analysis of Section 3(d) of Indian Patent Act, IP frontline (9 /04/2012), available at -file:///C:/Documents and Settings/hcl/Desktop/3D PATENT/Analysis of Section 3(d) of Indian Patent Act _ IPFrontline.htm, visited on 17/09/2015.
11. This magazine talks about the implications of section 3(d) and their non-complience with the TRIPS agreement and also various case laws in this respect. Further on, the article also deals with the benefits that section 3 (d) offers by preventing "ever greening".
12. Swarup kumar, Section 3(d) Of The Indian Patents Act, 1970 (As Amended), Intellectual Property Watch, 01/06/2007, available at - ile:///C:/Documents and Settings/hcl/Desktop/3D PATENT/Scope, Implications Of Section 3(d) Of The Indian Patents Act, 1970 (As Amended).htm
13. Swarup Kumar is a registered patent agent and an advocate practicing intellectual property rights law, especially patent law, in India. This piece of writing deals only with the relevant portion of section 3(d) which relates to patentability of a "new form" of known substance.
14. Section 3(D), Indian Patent Act, 1970
15. Novatis V. Union of India 2007) 4 MLJ 1153
16. Roche vs cipla 148 (2008) DLT 598
17. Bishwanath Prasad Radhey Shyam v. Hindustan Metal Industries AIR 1982 SC 1444.
18. file:///C:/Documents and Settings/hcl/Desktop/3D PATENT/Section 3(d) of Indian Patents Act 1970 significance and interpretation - Lexology.htm
19. https://bricwallblog.wordpress.com/2013/06/07/section-3d-of-the-indian-patents-act-part
20. http://novartisboycott.org/patent-act-of-india-faces-challenge/ (27 Feb 2012)
21. file:///C:/Documents and Settings/hcl/Desktop/3D PATENT/Is Section 3 (d) of Patents Act good for innovation - No _ Business Line.htm
22. file:///C:/Documents and Settings/hcl/Desktop/3D PATENT/Section 3 (d) of the Indian Patent Act - General Knowledge Today.htm