BIOTECHNOLOGY PATENTS AND THE ETHICAL DILEMMAS IN GENETIC ENGINEERING

Ms. Nirmala R Harish[1], Assistant Professor, CMR University School of Legal Studies

Vishnu J[2], B.A.LL.B. (Hons), CMR University, School of Legal Studies

ABSTRACT:

Genetic engineering has transformed the field of biotechnology, but it has also created intricate ethical and legal challenges around biological innovation patenting. Patents in this area, including genes, genetically engineered organisms, and new biotechnological processes, were initially designed to provide incentives for research and safeguard inventors' rights. But this trend has come more and more into conflict with moral issues regarding commodification of life, genetic justice, access to life-saving medications, and even the possible environmental implications of genetically altered beings. The more advanced genetic engineering advances, the more bioethicists, policy makers, and the public are challenging the right to own living organisms and the ethics of gene editing, particularly in human, animal, and environmental realms. Legal systems around the globe are now confronted with reconciling the economic needs of innovation with the necessity for strong ethical examination of biotechnology patents. While morality clauses have been implemented in some jurisdictions to screen out immoral inventions, no international consensus on what is an acceptable application of genetic technology exists. This article discusses seminal controversies on the frontier of biotechnology patents and ethics, reviewing pertinent case laws, policy evolution, and stakeholder views in order to make a case for a more subtle, ethically guided paradigm of intellectual property in genetic engineering. Finally, it highlights the need for a responsive legal infrastructure that facilitates scientific advancement while protecting societal values and human dignity.

Keywords: Biotechnology, Patents, Genetic Engineering, Bioethics, Intellectual Property Rights, Genetically Modified Organisms, Morality Clauses, Legal Frameworks, Genetic Justice, Innovation Policy

[1] Assistant Professor, CMR University School of Legal Studies
[2] Student of B.A. LL.B. (Hons), CMR University, School of legal studies

1.INTRODUCTION:

Biotechnology has introduced a new era where we can change, improve, and use living organisms for human benefit. For thousands of years, humans have manipulated biological processes, with ancient agricultural societies selectively breeding plants and animals for desirable traits. However, modern biotechnology, linked closely to genetic engineering, involves the precise alteration of genetic material using advanced laboratory methods. This field gained significant attention in the 1970s with the discovery of recombinant DNA technology. This breakthrough allowed scientists to create new organisms and modify existing ones in ways that were not possible before.

Genetic engineering, a part of biotechnology, refers to the direct manipulation of an organism's DNA to change its characteristics in a specific way. Techniques like gene splicing, CRISPR/Cas9 genome editing, and transgenesis have transformed medical treatments, farming practices, and the production of bio-based industrial goods. Early successes, such as genetically modified insulin and pest-resistant crops, sparked scientific excitement as well as concerns about bio-safety, biodiversity, and bioethics.

These advancements have sparked intense discussions about patenting biological materials and inventions resulting from genetic engineering. The reason for biotechnology patents is to give inventors exclusive rights over their creations. This incentivizes investment in research and development and encourages the economic use of biotechnological innovations. This system aims to reward inventiveness and support technological progress. However, patents can also create monopolies, limit access to essential medicines and technologies, and raise ethical questions about treating life as a commodity.

This paper examines the legal, ethical, and policy issues surrounding biotechnology patents and genetic engineering, focusing on international, Indian, and comparative frameworks, important court rulings, and the ongoing ethical challenges at the intersection of innovation and morality.

2. LEGAL FRAMEWORK OF BIOTECHNOLOGY PATENTS:

2.1 International Treaties and TRIPS Compliance:

The international legal framework for biotechnology patents is strongly shaped by the Trade-

Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS) Agreement, which the World Trade Organization administers. TRIPS requires member countries to allow patents for inventions, whether they are products or processes, in all technology fields, as long as they are new, involve an inventive step, and can be used industrially. Notably, Article 27(3)(b) allows countries to exclude from patentability:

"…plants and animals other than micro-organisms, and essentially biological processes for the production of plants or animals other than non-biological and microbiological processes."

TRIPS also allows for excluding inventions necessary to protect public order or morality, as well as human, animal, or plant life or health. This flexibility has led to varying national implementations, especially regarding the patenting of life forms.

2.2 Indian Legal Position Under the Patents Act, 1970:

India's approach to biotech patents follows the Patents Act, 1970 (as amended). The Act generally agrees with TRIPS but includes specific national considerations. Indian patent law specifically excludes several categories from patentability:

"an invention which is frivolous or claims anything obviously contrary to well-established natural laws" (Section 3(a)), and

"inventions the primary or intended use or commercial exploitation of which could be contrary to public order or morality or which causes serious prejudice to human, animal or plant life or health or to the environment" (Section 3(b)).

Section 3(j) further excludes "plants and animals in whole or any part thereof other than micro-organisms but including seeds, varieties and species and essentially biological processes for production or propagation of plants and animals." As a result, India allows patents for microorganisms and biotech processes but typically prohibits the patenting of higher life forms and plant varieties, which are regulated under separate laws.

2.3 Comparative Perspectives: US, EU, and Other Jurisdictions:

In the United States, the Supreme Court's ruling in *Diamond v. Chakrabarty* set a precedent for patenting genetically modified microorganisms. The court held that "anything under the sun

that is made by man" could be patentable. Consequently, the United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO) recognizes patents on isolated and purified genes, genetically modified animals, plants, and biotechnological processes, provided other legal criteria are met.

In contrast, the European Patent Convention (EPC) and the EU Biotech Directive (98/44/EC) allow extensive patent protection in biotechnology. However, they explicitly prohibit patents for processes involving cloning humans, altering the genetic identity of humans, uses of human embryos, and other inventions against public order or morality.

Other countries, such as Canada and Australia, have adopted a more cautious approach, excluding higher life forms from patentability based on judicial decisions and moral reasoning. This divergence shows the global lack of consensus on how life and genetic inventions should be subject to proprietary claims.

3. SCOPE OF PATENTABILITY IN BIOTECHNOLOGY:

3.1 Patentability of Genes and Biological Materials:

The patenting of isolated DNA sequences, proteins, and other biological molecules has received different legal treatment. In the U.S., gene patenting was allowed for decades if it involved isolated genes with specific, substantial, and credible utility. However, the Supreme Court's decision in Association for Molecular Pathology v. Myriad Genetics, Inc. ruled that naturally occurring DNA sequences, even when isolated, are products of nature and not patentable. Synthetic DNA constructs, however, are still eligible for patents.

Other jurisdictions have their own rules: the EU allows gene patents if the gene is isolated and has a useful function, requiring a disclosure of its role. In India, natural substances, including genes found in nature, cannot be patented, although their processes and new forms or modifications are eligible.

3.2 Genetically Modified Organisms (GMOs) and Patent Issues:

The patenting of GMOs has also generated debate. In Diamond v. Chakrabarty, the U.S. Supreme Court approved the patenting of a bacterium engineered to break down crude oil. Since then, many genetically modified plants and animals have been patented, including the well-known "Oncomouse."

India takes a more restrictive approach, excluding plants and animals other than microorganisms from patentability, with plant varieties protected under the Protection of Plant Varieties and Farmers' Rights Act, 2001.

3.3 Patents on Biotechnological Processes:

Processes related to biotechnology, such as recombinant DNA techniques, cell culture methods, and diagnostic procedures, can generally be patented if they meet criteria for novelty, inventive step, and industrial applicability. However, if these processes lead to products that are not patentable (such as higher life forms in India), the exclusive rights may be limited.

4. ETHICAL DILEMMAS IN GENETIC ENGINEERING:

4.1 Commodification of Life and Sanctity of Nature:

Arguments in favor of biotechnology patents often clash with concerns about commodifying life. This idea suggests that genes, plants, animals, and even parts of the human body are treated as mere property. Critics argue that patent law was not meant for living things and that providing patents for genetic materials undermines the inherent value of life and risks "playing God."

4.2 Justice, Equity, and Access to Biotechnology:

Equity issues arise since patents can give corporations monopolistic control over vital goods, like life-saving medicines or agricultural seeds. Developing countries and underprivileged groups may find themselves unable to afford crucial technologies, increasing global inequalities. Instances of "biopiracy," where genetic resources or traditional knowledge are patented without fair compensation to indigenous communities, show the need for legal and ethical protections.

4.3 Human Genetic Modifications (CRISPR and Beyond):

The rise of powerful gene-editing technologies like CRISPR-Cas9 has increased the potential for editing human embryos. This raises concerns about "designer babies," genetic discrimination, and unintended health consequences. Patent disputes can also delay research and access to effective therapies, leading to social and ethical issues.

4.4 Animal Rights and Environmental Ethics:

Genetic engineering in animals raises ethical concerns about animal welfare—not only whether patents should be granted but also whether such inventions should be created. Some inventions, like disease-resistant livestock, may help animal populations or humans, while others could lead to significant animal suffering. Biotechnology also poses environmental risks, including potential ecological damage from GMOs, such as gene flow or unintentional ecosystem effects.

5. MORALITY CLAUSES AND JUDICIAL RESPONSES:

5.1 TRIPS Agreement's Morality Exclusion:

As previously mentioned, TRIPS Article 27(2) and (3) allow countries to refuse patents when necessary to protect public order, morality, humans, animals, plants, or the environment. However, the vague standards provide considerable interpretive leeway.

5.2 EU Biotech Directive and Morality Filter:

The EU Biotech Directive (98/44/EC) includes explicit morality exclusions, stating that patents should not be granted for processes involving human cloning, altering human genetic identity, or using human embryos for industrial or commercial purposes. The European Patent Office (EPO) applies the "ordre public and morality" standard when assessing biotechnological patents.

5.3 Indian Judicial Approach to Bio-Patents:

Indian courts and the Intellectual Property Appellate Board (IPAB) have interpreted Section 3 of the Patents Act strictly, limiting patenting of life forms and genetic materials. While patents for biotechnological processes are allowed, those involving public health, morality, or environmental issues face stringent scrutiny.

5.4 Case Studies:

Diamond v. Chakrabarty, 447 U.S. 303 (1980) (U.S.): Allowed the patenting of a genetically engineered bacterium capable of breaking down oil.

Association for Molecular Pathology v. Myriad Genetics, Inc., 569 U.S. 576 (2013) (U.S.):

Determined that isolated DNA sequences are not patentable, though cDNA may be patented.

Monsanto Technology LLC v. Nuziveedu Seeds Ltd., (2019) 3 SCC 381 (India): The Indian Supreme Court upheld Section 3(j) exclusions for genetically modified seeds, supporting legislation against broad bio-patenting.

6. POLICY CHALLENGES AND GLOBAL DEBATES:

6.1 Balancing Innovation Incentives vs. Public Interest:

Intellectual property systems must encourage innovation while ensuring access and fairness. In biotechnology, the stakes often include essential medicines, food security, and public health—areas where the public's interest is critical.

6.2 Access to Medicines and Compulsory Licensing:

Patent monopolies can make drugs and treatments unaffordable. Indian law's compulsory licensing provisions (Section 84, Patents Act, 1970) allow the government to promote public access to vital medicines by overriding patent rights under specific circumstances**.**

6.3 Global Divide: Developed vs. Developing Countries:

The biotechnology patent debate highlights a significant North-South divide, with developed countries often holding technological and economic edges, while developing nations struggle for access and recognition of their biodiversity and traditional knowledge.

6.4 Public Perception and Social Acceptance:

Global attitudes toward genetically engineered products and the legitimacy of patent claims over living matter vary significantly, reflecting cultural, religious, and social values. Open dialogue is essential for creating responsive policies.

7. TOWARDS AN ETHICALLY GUIDED PATENT SYSTEM:

7.1 Integrating Bioethics into Patent Law:

Policymakers and legal systems are looking for models that include ethical reviews in the patent process, whether through patent office guidelines or dedicated ethical advisory

committees. Interdisciplinary collaboration is vital to address the complexities of biotechnology.

7.2 Possible Reforms in Indian and International Patent Frameworks:

Reforms could involve clearer legal exclusions, mechanisms for sharing benefits, and better protections for public health and traditional knowledge. At the international level, aligning standards for bioethics in patent law is still evolving**.**

7.3 Role of Interdisciplinary Committees:

Bringing together experts from law, science, and ethics is crucial for assessing the societal impact of bio-patenting. Creating institutional structures to facilitate such discussions is recommended for future policy.

8. CONCLUSION:

Biotechnology patents offer essential incentives for scientific progress, but they also raise intricate legal and ethical dilemmas, particularly concerning fundamental issues of life, nature, and health. A consistent legal framework that respects ethical principles and public interests is necessary for sustainable innovation in genetic engineering.

REFERENCES:

1. See Robert Bud, The Uses of Life: A History of Biotechnology 123 (1984).
2. Lori B. Andrews et al., Genetics: Ethics, Law and Policy 22 (4th ed. 2015).
3. Joe Millum, "Benefit Sharing in Bioprospecting," 24 Bioethics 117, 117–27 (2010).
4. Madhavi Sunder, "The Story of Diamond v. Chakrabarty: Technological Change and the Subject Matter Boundaries of Patent Law," in Intellectual Property Stories 85 (Rochelle Dreyfuss & Jane C. Ginsburg eds., 2006).
5. Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights arts. 27, 28, Apr. 15, 1994, Marrakesh Agreement Establishing the World Trade Organization, Annex 1C, 1869 U.N.T.S. 299.
6. The Patents Act, No. 39 of 1970, §§ 3(a)-(b), 3(j), India Code (2025).
7. Diamond v. Chakrabarty, 447 U.S. 303 (1980).
8. USPTO, Manual of Patent Examining Procedure § 2105 (9th ed. 2021).
9. Directive 98/44/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council, 1998 O.J. (L 213).
10. Harvard College v. Canada (Commissioner of Patents), 4 S.C.R. 45 (Can. Sup. Ct.).
11. Ariad Pharm., Inc. v. Eli Lilly & Co., 598 F.3d 1336, 1341 (Fed. Cir. 2010).
12. Ass'n for Molecular Pathology v. Myriad Genetics, Inc., 569 U.S. 576 (2013).
13. Id.; see also Directive 98/44/EC, supra note 14.
14. The Patents Act, supra note 10.
15. Mouse Patent, U.S. Patent No. 4,736,866 (filed June 22, 1984).
16. Monsanto Tech. LLC v. Nuziveedu Seeds Ltd., (2019) 3 SCC 381 (India).
17. David Koepsell, Who Owns You?: The Corporate Gold Rush to Patent Your Genes 45–

65 (2015).

18. Millum, supra note 4.

19. Graham Dutfield, Intellectual Property, Biogenetic Resources and Traditional Knowledge (2004).

20. Jennifer A. Doudna & Samuel H. Sternberg, A Crack in Creation: Gene Editing and the Unthinkable Power to Control Evolution 128 (2017).

21. Mathews J.H. et al., "Genetically Modified Crops: Global Socio-Economic and Environmental Impacts," 37 Sustainability 38 (2011).

22. EPO, Guidelines for Examination in the EPO, Pt. G-II, § 5.4 (2022).

23. Monsanto Tech. LLC v. Nuziveedu Seeds Ltd., supra note 21.

24. Sunder, supra note 5.

25. The Patents Act, supra note 10, § 84; Shamnad Basheer, "India's Patent Law and Policy," in Patent Law in Global Perspective (Ruth L. Okediji and Margo A. Bagley eds., 2014).

26. Nuffield Council on Bioethics, Public Dialogue on Genome Editing (2018).

27. Timmermans K. et al., "Changing the Essentials: Patent Protection and Medicines in the Developing World," 27 New England J. Med. 500 (2004).

28. Indian Kanoonhttps://indiankanoon.orgIndian Kanoon

29. iPleaders Blog https://blog.ipleaders.iniPleaders

30. Law Bhoomi https://lawbhoomi.comLawBhoomi