BIOTECHNOLOGY PATENTS AND GENETIC INNOVATION: A NAVIGATING LEGAL AND ETHICAL BOUNDARIES

Vinothini. V, BA LLB, LLM, VELS University (VISTAS) Pallavaram, Chennai

Sathiyalingam. E, B.SC., BL. LLM, VELS University (VISTAS) Pallavaram, Chennai

ABSTRACT

The biotechnology sector has emerged as one of the most transformative fields of modern science, driving innovations in medicine, agriculture, environmental management, and industrial processes. Among these innovations, genetic technologies ranging from genetically modified organisms (GMOs) to gene-editing tools like CRISPR have opened unprecedented possibilities for enhancing human health, food security, and environmental sustainability. However, these advancements have also created complex challenges for the legal and ethical frameworks surrounding patent rights. Patents, traditionally designed to incentivize innovation by granting inventors exclusive rights, now face the critical task of addressing the unique nature of genetic inventions, where the subject matter is often naturally occurring, highly complex, and ethically sensitive. It examines the international, regional, and national legal frameworks that govern patent protection of genetic material, including agreements under the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO) and the Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS). The paper also evaluates contrasting approaches in jurisdictions such as the European Union and India, highlighting variations in legal interpretations and their impact on innovation, research accessibility, and commercialization of genetic technologies. Beyond legal analysis, this study critically examines the ethical implications of granting patents on genetic inventions. It also explores the role of ethics committees, guidelines from international organizations, and corporate social responsibility in mitigating these concerns while promoting responsible innovation. In addition, the research addresses the impact of genetic patents on scientific research and collaborative innovation.

Keywords: Biotechnology, Genetic Patents, Intellectual Property Rights (IPR), Patent Law, Genetic Innovation, CRISPR Technology, Ethical Considerations.

Introduction:

Biotechnology has emerged as one of the most dynamic and transformative fields of contemporary science, revolutionizing healthcare, agriculture, environmental management, and industrial processes. At the core of these advancements lies genetic innovation, which includes technologies such as genetic modification, gene editing (CRISPR), and synthetic biology. These innovations hold the potential to address critical global challenges, such as curing genetic diseases, improving crop yields, mitigating climate change, and producing sustainable biofuels. The rapid pace of discovery in genetic science, however, has raised complex questions about how these innovations should be legally protected and ethically regulated. Patents, as a form of intellectual property (IP), are designed to incentivize innovation by granting inventors exclusive rights to their creations for a limited period. In biotechnology, they protect investments in high-cost research and provide a framework for commercialization of new technologies.[1] However, the unique nature of genetic inventions often involving naturally occurring genes, organisms, or life processes poses unprecedented challenges for conventional patent law. Determining what constitutes a patentable invention, identifying the true inventor, and balancing private ownership with public welfare are some of the legal issues that have emerged in the biotechnology sector.[2] In addition to legal considerations, ethical concerns play a central role in the governance of genetic patents. Critics argue that patenting genes or genetically modified organisms can lead to the commodification of life, restrict access to essential medicines, and exacerbate social inequities. For instance, monopolistic control over patented genetic therapies may make life-saving treatments unaffordable for large populations, particularly in developing countries. These ethical dilemmas have prompted policymakers, researchers, and international organizations to seek frameworks that balance commercial incentives with societal welfare.

Globally, patent laws vary in their treatment of genetic inventions. Jurisdictions such as the United States, European Union, and India have adopted different approaches to the patentability of genes and biotechnological processes, resulting in a complex legal landscape. International treaties, such as the Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights

[1] Dr. Monica Mahajan, Prof. (Dr.) Shweta Dhand & Ms. Tavinderjeet Kaur, *Intellectual Property Rights and Patents in Biotechnology* (Bhumi Publishing, India, First Edition June 2025) (PDF) https://www.bhumipublishing.com/wp-content/uploads/2025/06/Intellectual-Property-Rights-and-Patents-inBiotechnology.pdf

[2] Biotechnology Patents IP Challenges for Research and Pharma in India, LawCurb (visited Feb. 5, 2026), https://www.lawcurb.in/post/biotechnology-patents-ip-challenges-for-research-and-pharma-in-india.

(TRIPS) Agreement and guidelines by the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO), attempt to harmonize standards while leaving room for national discretion.[3] Moreover, the impact of patents extends beyond legal and ethical considerations to practical aspects of research and innovation. While patents incentivize investment in biotechnology, overly broad or restrictive patent claims can hinder scientific collaboration, slow down follow-on research, and limit the dissemination of knowledge. Mechanisms such as patent pools, compulsory licensing, and open innovation frameworks have emerged as strategies to reconcile commercial interests with public benefit, ensuring that innovation continues without compromising ethical standards.[4]

Patent

A **patent** is a statutory and exclusive right granted by the State to an inventor or assignee for an invention that is **new**, involves an **inventive step**, and is **capable of industrial application**. This right allows the patent holder to **prevent others from making, using, selling, or importing** the patented invention without authorization for a **limited period**, generally **20 years** from the date of filing, in exchange for full public disclosure of the invention.[5]

Milestones in Biotechnology and Intellectual Property (IP) Law

The evolution of biotechnology has been closely intertwined with the development of intellectual property law, creating a dynamic framework that both encourages innovation and raises complex legal and ethical questions. One of the earliest milestones was the patenting of genetically engineered microorganisms in the landmark **Diamond v. Chakrabarty (1980)** case in the United States, where the Supreme Court recognized that a human-made bacterium could be patented, establishing a precedent for biotechnological inventions.[6] This was followed by

[3] World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO), *Advice on Flexibilities under the TRIPS Agreement*, https://www.wipo.int/ip-development/en/policy_legislative_assistance/advice_trips.html (visited Feb. 5, 2026).
[4] Monesh Mehndiratta, *Compulsory Licensing in IPR (Meaning of Compulsory Licence, Provisions under the Patents Act, 1970 & Copyrights Act, 1957)*, https://blog.ipleaders.in/concept-compulsory-license-patents-act1970/#:~:text=Copyrights%20Act%2C%201957.,Meaning%20of%20compulsory%20licence,impact%20of%20 intellectual%20property%20rights (visited Feb. 5, 2026).
[5] *Patents Law in India: Everything You Must Know!*, R K Dewan (Oct. 31, 2024), https://www.rkdewan.com/blogs/patents-law-in-india-everything-you-mustknow/#:~:text=In%20simple%20terms%2C%20what%20is,public%20disclosure%20of%20the%20invention (visited Feb. 5, 2026).
[6] Diamond v. Chakrabarty, *Law*, EBSCO *Research Starters* (2023), https://www.ebsco.com/researchstarters/law/diamond-v-chakrabarty (visited Feb. 5, 2026)

the patenting of specific genes and DNA sequences, culminating in the controversial **Myriad Genetics case (2013)**, which clarified that naturally occurring genes could not be patented, though complementary DNA (cDNA) remained patentable.[7] In parallel, "international frameworks such as the **Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS) Agreement (1995)** and guidelines from the **World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO)** provided a global standard for patent protection, influencing national legislations and harmonizing IP policies across jurisdictions." In India, the **Patents (Amendment) Act, 2005** marked a significant milestone by allowing product patents for pharmaceuticals and biotechnology, aligning domestic law with TRIPS obligations. Additionally, the development of CRISPR and gene-editing technologies in the 21st century introduced new challenges for patent offices and courts, as they grappled with defining patentable subject matter in rapidly evolving scientific landscapes. Collectively, these milestones reflect the gradual adaptation of IP law to emerging biotechnologies, balancing the need to incentivize innovation with ethical and public interest considerations, and setting the stage for ongoing debates on the patentability of life forms and genetic materials.

Patent eligibility and novelty criteria

Patent eligibility determines whether the subject matter qualifies as an invention under patent law, while novelty assesses whether the invention is truly new in light of prior art. In biotechnology, these criteria become contentious due to the fine distinction between discoveries and inventions, especially when genetic material is involved. Most patent regimes exclude naturally occurring substances in their natural form from patentability, permitting protection only when human intervention results in isolation, modification, or application that demonstrates technical advancement. "Judicial decisions such as *Diamond v. Chakrabarty* established that living organisms modified through human ingenuity may be patentable, whereas later rulings like *Association for Molecular Pathology v. Myriad Genetics* clarified that naturally occurring gene sequences, even if isolated, do not satisfy patent eligibility requirements."[8] Novelty further requires that the invention has not been disclosed to the public prior to filing, posing challenges in biotechnology where research findings are frequently

[7] Association for Molecular Pathology et al. v. Myriad Genetics, Inc., 569 U.S. 576 (2013), https://unctad.org/ippcaselaw/sites/default/files/ippcaselaw/2020-12.
[8] Ashish M. Bakshi, *Gene patents at the Supreme Court: Association for Molecular Pathology v. Myriad Genetics*, *J. Law & Biosci.* 1(2):183–189 (May 2, 2014), https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC5033540/ (visited Feb. 5, 2026).

published in academic journals or shared in collaborative environments, potentially jeopardizing patent claims.

In addition to novelty, the requirement of an inventive step or non-obviousness plays a critical role in evaluating genetic patents. An invention must demonstrate a technical advancement or economic significance that is not obvious to a person skilled in the art. In genetic research, incremental modifications or routine laboratory techniques often blur the line between genuine innovation and obvious experimentation, making patent examination particularly stringent. Patent offices worldwide have struggled to develop consistent standards for assessing inventive step in biotechnology, leading to divergent interpretations across jurisdictions.[9] These inconsistencies not only affect patent grant rates but also influence investment decisions and innovation strategies within the biotechnology sector.

Inventorship and ownership

Inventorship and ownership issues further complicate the patent landscape in genetic innovation. Inventorship refers to the identification of individuals who have made a substantive intellectual contribution to the conception of the invention. In biotechnology research, inventions are often the result of collaborative efforts involving scientists, research institutions, funding agencies, and private corporations. Determining inventorship becomes complex when multiple contributors are involved, particularly where automated processes, bioinformatics tools, or artificial intelligence systems assist in research outcomes. Incorrect attribution of inventorship can render a patent invalid, making accurate determination legally crucial.

Ownership, while related, is distinct from inventorship and is governed largely by contractual arrangements and employment relationships. In many cases, patents arising from genetic research are owned by institutions or corporations rather than individual inventors, especially when the research is conducted under employment contracts or funded by public grants. Disputes frequently arise over ownership rights when collaborations cross institutional or national boundaries, raising questions about benefit sharing, access to research outputs, and commercialization rights. These issues are particularly sensitive in genetic research involving indigenous knowledge or biological resources, where ethical considerations intersect with legal

[9] *Biotechnology Patent Landscape in India: Analyzing Emerging Legal Issues and Challenges*, IIPRD (Aug. 8, 2024), https://www.iiprd.com/biotechnology-patent-landscape-in-india-analyzing-emerging-legal-issues-andchallenges/#:~:text=The%20term%20patent%20is%20given,patent%20law%20in%20India%20are (visited Feb. 5, 2026)

ownership claims. Consequently, patent eligibility, novelty, inventorship, and ownership collectively shape the regulatory framework governing genetic patents, highlighting the need for clear legal standards and ethical safeguards to ensure both innovation and fairness in biotechnology patent regimes.[10]

The ethical and social implications of genetic

Where patents have generated intense moral debate, particularly regarding the patenting of life forms and its impact on access to healthcare and social equity. At the core of this debate lies the question of whether living organisms, genetic sequences, or biological processes should be treated as private property.[11] Critics argue that patenting genes amounts to the commodification of life, undermining human dignity and violating ethical principles that regard life as a shared heritage of humanity. This concern was prominently reflected in the controversy surrounding the patenting of the BRCA1 and BRCA2 genes by Myriad Genetics, which enabled the company to exercise exclusive control over breast cancer diagnostic tests.[12] Ethical objections centered on the idea that naturally occurring human genes, even when isolated, should not be subject to monopolization, as they are discoveries rather than inventions. The U.S. Supreme Court's decision in *Association for Molecular Pathology v. Myriad Genetics* echoed this moral reasoning by rejecting patents on naturally occurring DNA, recognizing the broader social consequences of restricting access to genetic information.[13] Beyond moral philosophy, genetic patents raise serious concerns regarding access to healthcare and equity, particularly in the context of life-saving medicines and diagnostic technologies. Patent protection often results in high pricing of patented drugs and therapies, limiting affordability for economically disadvantaged populations. For instance, patented antiretroviral drugs for HIV/AIDS were initially priced beyond the reach of many developing countries, contributing to significant disparities in global healthcare access. Although patent rights incentivize pharmaceutical innovation, excessive monopoly control can delay the availability of affordable generic alternatives, thereby conflicting with the fundamental right to health.[14] This tension has

[10] https://www.ijnrd.org/papers/IJNRD2411235.pdf.
[11] Donald J. Willison & Stuart M. MacLeod, *Patenting of Genetic Material: Are the Benefits to Society Being Realized?*, 167 CMAJ 259 (2002), https://www.cmaj.ca/content/167/3/259 (visited Feb. 5, 2026) (examining societal and ethical implications of patenting genetic material).
[12] L. Cartwright-Smith et al., *Patenting Genes: What Does Association for Molecular…* (PubMed Central, 2014), https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC3982540/ (visited Feb. 5, 2026)
[13] https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC5033540/.
[14] *Why Are Patents Important To Drug Development?*, Simson Pharma (Sept. 9, 2024), https://www.simsonpharma.com/blog-details/why-are-patents-important-to-drug-development#:~:text=5.,generic%20production%20in%20specific%20regions (visited Feb. 5, 2026)

prompted governments to invoke mechanisms such as compulsory licensing, as seen in India's issuance of a compulsory license for the cancer drug Nexavar, to ensure public access while maintaining respect for patent systems.

Equity issues are further intensified when genetic patents intersect with indigenous knowledge and biological resources. In several instances, corporations have patented genetic materials derived from plants or traditional practices without adequate benefit-sharing with indigenous communities, a phenomenon often described as biopiracy. Such practices raise ethical concerns about exploitation and injustice, particularly when communities that have preserved biological knowledge for generations are excluded from the economic benefits of commercialization. International instruments like the Convention on Biological Diversity seek to address these inequities, yet enforcement remains inconsistent. Collectively, these ethical and social challenges highlight the need for a balanced patent regime that respects moral values and promotes equitable access to healthcare. While patents play a vital role in encouraging biotechnological innovation, their application must be guided by ethical principles that prioritize human welfare, social justice, and global health equity. A patent system that integrates ethical safeguards can ensure that genetic innovation serves not only commercial interests but also the broader goals of societal well-being and fairness.

Role of Patents in Promoting or Restricting Research

Patents is dual role in scientific and technological research by both encouraging innovation and, at times, restricting the free flow of knowledge. Their primary objective is to incentivize research and development by granting inventors exclusive rights over their inventions for a limited period. In research-intensive fields such as biotechnology and pharmaceuticals, patents are particularly significant because they provide legal certainty and economic motivation for investing in high-risk and high-cost research activities. Without patent protection, innovators may be reluctant to invest substantial resources, as competitors could freely copy and commercialize their discoveries.[15]

From a promotional perspective, patents stimulate research by ensuring a return on investment. In pharmaceutical research, for example, the development of a new drug requires

[15] Riccardo Cappelli, Marco Corsino, Keld Laursen & Salvatore Torrisi, *Technological Competition and Patent Strategy: Protecting Innovation, Preempting Rivals and Defending the Freedom to Operate*, 52 *Res. Pol'y* 104785 (2023), https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0048733323000690 (visited Feb. 5, 2026)

extensive clinical trials, regulatory approvals, and financial commitment. Patent protection enables companies to recover these costs by granting temporary market exclusivity. Additionally, patents encourage disclosure of scientific knowledge, as inventors must publicly disclose their inventions in patent documents. This disclosure contributes to the growth of scientific knowledge and allows other researchers to build upon existing inventions once the patent expires or through licensed access. Licensing agreements allow patented technologies to be shared legally, fostering innovation through partnerships. Universities often rely on patenting and technology transfer offices to commercialize research outputs, translating academic discoveries into practical applications. Thus, patents can act as catalysts for applied research and technological diffusion. In biotechnology, restrictive patent claims over fundamental research tools or genetic sequences can create what is known as the "patent thicket," where researchers must navigate multiple overlapping patents to conduct further research.[16] This can increase transaction costs, delay experimentation, and discourage smaller research institutions or startups that lack financial resources. For instance, exclusive control over patented genetic tests or research methodologies may limit independent verification and follow-on innovation.

Furthermore, fear of patent infringement litigation can deter researchers from pursuing certain lines of inquiry, particularly in commercial research environments. In developing countries, restrictive patent regimes may limit access to essential research materials, slowing scientific progress and widening global innovation disparities. Although research exemptions exist in some jurisdictions, their scope is often unclear, leading to uncertainty among researchers.

Licensing Models, Patent Pools, and Open Innovation

Licensing models, patent pools, and open innovation mechanisms have emerged as effective tools to balance patent protection with the need for broader access to technology and collaborative research. Licensing allows patent holders to authorize others to use their inventions under agreed terms, thereby promoting dissemination of technology while retaining ownership rights. Licensing can be exclusive, where rights are granted to a single licensee, or non-exclusive, enabling multiple entities to access the patented technology. In biotechnology

[16] *Patent Licensing*, in Patent Licensing — an Overview, ScienceDirect Topics, https://www.sciencedirect.com/topics/materials-science/patent-licensing (visited Feb. 5, 2026)

and pharmaceuticals, licensing facilitates the commercialization of inventions developed in academic or public research institutions by transferring them to industry players capable of large-scale production and distribution.[17]

Patent pools represent a collaborative arrangement where multiple patent holders agree to license their patents collectively to third parties. This model is particularly useful in fields characterized by overlapping patents, such as genetic technologies and biopharmaceuticals. By reducing transaction costs and minimizing the risk of infringement litigation, patent pools streamline access to essential technologies and encourage follow-on innovation. For example, patent pools have been effectively used in the healthcare sector to improve access to diagnostic tools and medicines, especially during public health emergencies. These pools often operate under standardized licensing terms, ensuring transparency and fairness while preserving incentives for innovation. Unlike traditional closed innovation models, open innovation encourages firms and research institutions to share knowledge, data, and even patented technologies to accelerate scientific progress. In the biotechnology sector, open innovation initiatives have played a significant role in advancing research on neglected diseases and global health challenges. Mechanisms such as open-source biology platforms and voluntary licensing programs exemplify how innovation can thrive without exclusive control over intellectual property.

Patent Pools and Licensing Strategies

Patent pools and licensing strategies are important mechanisms for managing intellectual property rights while promoting innovation and access to technology. A patent pool is an agreement in which two or more patent holders collectively license their patents to third parties under standardized terms. This approach is particularly effective in sectors such as biotechnology, pharmaceuticals, and telecommunications, where multiple overlapping patents exist. Patent pools reduce transaction costs, prevent patent infringement disputes, and facilitate easier access to essential technologies.[18] Licensing strategies enable patent owners to grant permission to others to use patented inventions in exchange for royalties or other

[17] Sruthy Rajendran, *Public Funded Research, Patents and Pharmaceuticals*, in NLUA Journal of Intellectual Property Rights, Vol. 2, Issue 1, at 38–52 (National Law University & Judicial Academy, Assam, 2024), https://nluassam.ac.in/docs/Journals/IPR/vol2-issue-1/3.pdf (visited Feb. 5, 2026)

[18] *Patent Pools*, *Lexology* , https://www.lexology.com/library/detail.aspx?g=a9b6abd5-ef49-4e7c-9841eec3b0e0676e#:~:text=In%20a%20patent%20pool%2C%20multiple,access%20to%20the%20pooled%20patent s (visited Feb. 5, 2026)

considerations. Licensing may be exclusive or non-exclusive, depending on commercial objectives and public interest considerations. Strategic licensing encourages technology transfer, supports collaborative research, and enables commercialization of innovations developed by academic or public research institutions. Together, patent pools and licensing strategies help balance patent protection with innovation, ensuring wider dissemination of technology while preserving incentives for inventors and patent holders.

Strategies to Balance Legal Protection, Ethics, and Public Interest

Balancing legal protection, ethical considerations, and public interest is essential in the regulation of patents, particularly in sensitive fields such as biotechnology and genetic innovation. One effective strategy is the incorporation of **public interest safeguards** within patent laws, such as compulsory licensing provisions, which allow governments to authorize the use of patented inventions during public health emergencies or when essential technologies are inaccessible. This ensures that patent rights do not override fundamental societal needs. Another important strategy is the adoption of **ethical review mechanisms** in patent examination processes. Patent offices can integrate ethical guidelines to prevent the grant of patents that may lead to the commodification of life forms or violate moral standards. Transparent patent eligibility criteria, especially for genetic inventions, help maintain consistency and public trust in the patent system.

Flexible licensing models, including non-exclusive and voluntary licensing, also play a crucial role in promoting equitable access while preserving inventors' rights. Such models enable wider dissemination of patented technologies, particularly in healthcare and agriculture, without undermining innovation incentives. Additionally, encouraging **open innovation and patent pools** fosters collaboration, reduces monopolistic control, and accelerates research outcomes. Finally, **international cooperation and harmonization** of patent laws through frameworks like TRIPS and WIPO guidelines can help align national interests with global ethical standards.[19] By integrating legal clarity, ethical responsibility, and public welfare considerations, patent systems can support innovation while ensuring social justice and equitable access to technological advancements.

[19] World Trade Organization (WTO), *Overview of the TRIPS Agreement*, https://www.wto.org/english/tratop_e/trips_e/intel2_e.htm (visited Feb. 5, 2026)

Conclusion

The intersection of biotechnology, genetic innovation, and patent law represents one of the most complex and evolving areas of modern intellectual property governance. While patents play a crucial role in incentivizing research, attracting investment, and promoting technological advancement, their application in the realm of genetic inventions raises significant legal, ethical, and social concerns. The patenting of genetic material challenges traditional notions of inventorship, ownership, and novelty, particularly when inventions are closely linked to naturally occurring life forms. This study has highlighted that an overly rigid or commercially driven patent regime can restrict research, limit access to healthcare, and exacerbate social inequities, especially in developing countries. Ethical concerns such as the commodification of life, unequal access to life-saving technologies, and exploitation of biological resources underscore the need for a cautious and balanced approach. At the same time, completely weakening patent protection could discourage innovation and undermine the progress of biotechnology. Therefore, a balanced patent framework that integrates legal protection with ethical responsibility and public interest is essential. Mechanisms such as compulsory licensing, flexible licensing models, patent pools, and open innovation initiatives provide viable solutions to reconcile private rights with societal needs. Furthermore, harmonization of international patent standards and inclusion of ethical considerations in patent policy can enhance fairness and transparency.