

National Working Group on Patent Laws

[Centre for Study of WTO Issues]

D-86/3, Okhla Industrial Area, Phase - 1, New Delhi - 110 020 (India)
Phones: 4052 - 1796, Fax : 4052 - 1795 <wgkeayla@del6.vsnl.net.in>

Date : 16.4.2008

PATRON

JUSTICE V.R. KRISHNA IYER
Former Judge
Supreme Court (India)

CHAIRMAN

Dr. NITYA NAND
Former Director
Central Drug Research Institute

CO-CHAIRMEN

Mr. S.P. SHUKLA

Former Member

Planning Commission (India)

Prof. MUCHKUND DUBEY

Former Foreign Secretary

Govt. of India

Prof. ASHOK PARTHASARTHI

Former Secretary to

the Govt. of India

CONVENOR

Mr. B.K. KEAYLA

Former Commissioner of

Payments, Govt. of India

CONVENOR CORE GROUP

Dr. RAJEEV DHAVAN

Senior Advocate

Supreme Court (India)

CO-CONVENORS

Mr. DINESH ABROL

CSIR Scientific Workers' Assn.

Dr. BISWAJIT DHAR

Indian Institute of Foreign Trade

Prof. B.S. CHIMNI

Jawahar Lal Nehru University

Dr. AMIT SEN GUPTA


Mr V. Ravi,
Controller General of Patents,
Designs and Trade Marks
Boudhik Sampada Bhawan,
S.M. Road, ANTOP Hill,
Mumbai-400037.

Dear Sir,

We have examined the Draft Manual of Patent, Practice and Procedure. Our comments are attached (Annexure-I).

We have in the meanwhile, received a copy of letter dated March 19, 2008 (Annexure-II) addressed to the Prime Minister of India by Justice VR Krishna Iyer, Former Judge, Supreme Court. We have also examined this letter and we fully agree with the suggestions contained in his letter. We fully support the views expressed about the irrelevance of the Manual.

While examining the Manual, we find that the same contains a large number of case laws emanating from foreign countries. Most of these case laws are quite old and are based on the laws of those countries' practiced during that relevant periods. Even our Patents Act of 1911 was based upon philosophy not relevant for our country's interest. The original Patents Act of 1970 was a legislation based upon the national aspirations of our people and the objective of self reliance. There are a few case laws during the period our original Patents Act 1970 was in operation. Keeping these factors in view, it would not be proper to



COMMENTS ON DRAFT MANUAL OF PATENT PRACTICE AND PROCEDURE.

CHAPTER I : INTRODUCTION

Page 11, para 1.2.12

1. The Patents (Amendment) Act of 2002 did not incorporate "provision to protect biodiversity and traditional knowledge" Section (3) in fact, dealt with exclusion from patentability and as such this should be treated as deleted.

CHAPTER III : PATENTABLE SUBJECT MATTER

Page 21, Para 3.1 Introduction

Sub-para 3.1.1

2. Criteria No. (i) provides that the invention "must be novel". This may be expanded by adding "having unrelated features".

Para 3.2 Novelty of Invention

3. Sub para 3.2.1 In the last line, the words "and has unrelated features" be added after the word "domain".
4. Para 3.3.7 : In fifth line after the word "essential", the words "and unrelated" may be added.

CHAPTER IV : INVENTION NOT PATENTABLE :

Page 58, para 4.5.3

5. The last two lines are bit confusing. It should be clearly indicated as to what the scope of comparison will be. Whether the base compound or the new form or both will be compared with another new form. This para is quite important and should be formulated in a clear and expanded manner.

Page 72, para 4.10.1

6. This para indicates that any microorganism discovered from the nature is not patentable. According to section 3 (j) of the amended Patents Act, 1970, microorganism is patentable. Thus there is a need to define as to what kind/form of microorganism would be patentable. There is a need to define the patentability scope of microorganism which can be covered under this section.

We would suggest that only genetically modified microorganism should be patentable. Since this modified microorganism perform various activities, only specific and each activity should be separately covered by the process patent only.

The technology of modifying the microorganism to genetically modified microorganism could also be covered by the process patent.

It is extremely important to deal with this aspect more explicitly and in a detailed manner.

It is unfortunate that this matter has remained unresolved even after an assurance given on the floor of Parliament.

CHAPTER V : APPLICATION FOR PATENT

Page 118, para 5.8.11 Unity of Invention.

7. In sub-para (a), the word “specially” may be substituted by the word “specifically”

Para 5.9 : Sufficiency of disclosure.

8. Sub para 5.9.2 deals with patent application where there is mention of biological material. This para needs to be expanded to provide for the requirement of agreement with the biological material supplier and agreement reached with him about benefit sharing.

CHAPTER VII : OPPOSITION PROCEEDINGS TO GRANT PATENT

Page 178, para 7.1.2 : Proceedings under pre-grant opposition.

9. Sub para (viii) provides for rejecting representation against granting of patent or allowing grant of patent. The decision of the Controller should have logical conclusion of allowing appeal to either party against the decision of the Controller.

Page 185 para 7.2.2, sub para (i)

10. In the names of persons having interest in the subject matter of the patent, the name of the person/organization which unsuccessfully contested the pre-grant opposition may also be incorporated.

CHAPTER IX : PROVISION OF SECRECY OF CERTAIN INVENTIONS.

Para 9.3 Prohibition to apply Patent for invention outside India.

Page 215 sub para 9.3.3

11. In addition to the invention relevant for defence purpose and atomic energy, the invention relating to biodiversity material of India should also be incorporated for taking permission..

Page 226, para 10.12 Term of Patent

Para 10.12.1

12. Reference to patent term which had not expired on 20th May, 2003 under Patents (Amendment) Act 2002, should be clarified as "process patent" instead of "patent" which may not be mistaken as 'product patent'.

CHAPTER XIV : SURRENDER AND REVOCATION OF PATENTS

Page 252, para 14.2.5 Revocation of patent for non-working

13. Even if the patented product is not worked by the patent holder and the first compulsory licence holder, it is logical that additional compulsory licences should be issued to other interested enterprises. A notification could be issued inviting other enterprises to work the patent. A sub para to this effect could be added to para 14.2.5.

There have been instances in the past when supplies of critical material/ component were blocked at the instance of the concerned foreign government for important concerns. The instances of blocking of critical materials are after

i) the reasonable requirement of the public with respect to the patented invention has not been satisfied;

ii) the patented invention is not available to the public at a reasonably affordable price;

iii) the patented invention has not worked in the territory of India.

The Patent holder which may be belonging to a foreign country will not entertain any ground reasoning about the three conditions mentioned above. There is a misplaced requirement to be posed by the applicant to the patent holder. He will not accept the contention that he was abusing his patent right. In fact, these grounds ought to be submitted to the Controller and not the patent holder. It is no doubt that this is the requirement of Section 84 (6) of the Patent

Act, it may be relevant to provide that the applicant should submit the relevant grounds to the Controller and then the Controller should refer these grounds to the patent holder. Controller can wait for six months to decide the case i.e. the time stipulated for response by the patent holder in the relevant section of the Patents Act 1970.

Page 293, para 18.2.7 : Revocation of Patent for non-working (S.85)

15 Sub para (1) provides that if the compulsory licence holder has not worked the patent for two years, patent can be revoked on application either by the Central Government or any other person interested after expiry of two years. In case the first compulsory licence holder has not worked the patent, it will be logical to notifying the failure and invite other enterprises to file applications for grant of compulsory licences. Thus, the public interest of working the patent will get satisfied better.

Page 295 para 18.2.11

16. The circumstances for extreme urgency could also be due to environmental causes viz. pollution of air, pollution of water or pollution of soil. It would be desirable to incorporate these important circumstances for notification by the Government the circumstances of extreme urgency and grant of compulsory licences immediately under Section 92 (3).

Para 18.3, Section 92 (A)

17. provides for “compulsory licences for export of patented pharmaceutical products in certain exceptional circumstances”

Para 18.3.3 provides that the provision in Section 92(A) has been introduced to address the public health problems of the countries having insufficient or no manufacturing capacity in the pharmaceutical sector.

new, specific demands. Fleet managers will have to develop technology to

Under the above circumstances, it would be relevant to point out that Article 31(b) of the TRIPS Agreement provides for granting of compulsory licences for commercial activity on commercial terms and conditions. If this provision is implemented, it would facilitate the domestic enterprise to produce patented product predominantly for the domestic market and also will have possibility to meet the export demand, even when the export orders are small.

Another aspect could also be considered that the enterprise which supplies the patented product meeting the export order under compulsory licence should be automatically granted compulsory licence for meeting the domestic demand also.

Another aspect could also be considered that the enterprise which supplies the patented product meeting the export order under compulsory licence should be automatically granted compulsory licence for meeting the domestic demand also.

also.

V. R. Krishna Iyer
(Former Judge, Supreme Court)

Fax and Phone: 0484-2370088
"SATGAMAYA"
M. G. ROAD, ERINAKULAM,
KOCHI - 682 011
Email: satgamaya@dataone.in
Website: www.vrkrishnaiyer.org

MARCH 19, 2008

Respected Prime Minister,

**COMMENTS ON DRAFT MANUAL - 2008 OF PATENT PRACTICE &
PROCEDURE PUBLISHED BY PATENT OFFICE**

1. The Patent office has put on the website 368 pages of Draft Manual of Patent Practice & Procedure for implementing the Patents Act, 2005.
2. The principal Act of 1970 has been drastically revised to comply with TRIPS Agreement and Paris Convention. Thus the new law of 2005 has been in operation for just a little over 2 years. The Patent office practice under the new law is still to evolve. In any case the practice has to be within the framework of statute law and all questions concerning patentability, publication and examination of patent application, the procedure governing the grant of patents etc. are all solely within the purview of and regulated by the provisions contained in the Act and Rules.
3. The Powers of the Controller are also set out in section 73(3) and (4) and sections 77 to 81 of the Act, and those specifically referred to in respect of certain proceedings under the Act. Neither the Controller nor the Central Government has any authority or sanction of law to publish a Manual of the kind put on the website.
4. **Irrelevance of the Manual** The document itself declares that "The Manual does not constitute rule making and hence do not have the force and effect of law. Statements made in the Manual are not in themselves an authority for any action by an officer of the Patent Office." It also says that "While the manual may be regarded as a hand book, it does not impose any particular line of action and may not be quoted to that end." The Patent office thus recognizes the absence of any legality for the document and disowns any authoritative nature to the contents of the document.
5. The Manual seems to be the off shoot of MOU between India and USA on Bilateral co-operation on IP, when viewed in the light of the following statement in the press release issued by the US Patent Office: "Among the activities designed to strengthen the work of both offices, the USPTO will help train Indian patent and trademark examiners, develop education material for the examiners and produce a manual on patent practice for use by Indian examiners and the public...." Ironically, USPTO itself came for criticism by US Supreme Court for granting frivolous patents.
6. Containing as it does, interpretation of various provisions of the law by the Patent Office (which is within the domain of Courts), the official manual (despite disclaimer about authenticity) will provide a fertile ground for litigation and controversy in the interpretation of the legal aspects (vis-à-vis the Act/Rules and the Manual), tending to tilt the balance in favour of the mighty MNCs, who have the resource to litigate.
7. For example, Section 3(d) [under Chapter IV of Inventions not Patentable] and some of the examples cited as being eligible for patents (as in Para 4.5.3 of Manual) would cause immense damage to the legislative intent. Sec.3(d) has been

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

51

52

53

54

55

56

57

58

59

60

61

62

63

64

65

66

67

68

69

70

71

72

73

74

75

76

77

78

79

80

81

82

83

84

85

86

87

88

89

90

91

92

93

94

95

96

97

98

99

100

101

102

103

104

105

106

107

108

109

110

111

112

113

114

115

116

117

118

119

120

121

122

123

124

125

126

127

128

129

130

131

132

133

134

135

136

137

138

139

140

141

142

143

144

145

146

147

148

149

150

151

152

153

154

155

156

157

158

159

160

161

162

163

164

165

166

167

168

169

170

171

172

173

174

175

176

177

178

179

180

181

182

183

184

185

186

187

188

189

190

191

192

193

194

195

196

197

198

199

200

201

202

203

204

205

206

207

208

209

210

211

212

213

214

215

216

217

218

219

220

221

222

223

224

225

226

227

228

229

230

231

232

233

234

235

236

237

238

239

240

241

242

243

244

245

246

247

248

249

250

251

252

253

254

255

256

257

258

259

260

261

262

263

264

265

266

267

268

269

270

271

272

273

274

275

276

277

278

279

280

281

282

283

284

285

286

287

288

289

290

291

292

293

294

295

296

297

298

299

300

301

302

303

304

305

306

307

308

309

310

311

312

313

314

315

316

317

318

319

320

321

322

323

324

325

326

327

328

329

330

331

332

333

334

335

336

337

338

339

340

341

342

343

344

345

346

347

348

349

350

351

352

353

354

355

356

357

358

359

360

361

362

363

364

365

366

367

368

369

370

371

372

373

374

375

376

377

378

379

380

381

382

383

384

385

386

387

388

389

390

391

392

393

394

395

396

397

398

399

400

401

402

403

404

405

406

407

408

409

410

411

412

413

414

415

416

417

418

419

420

421

422

423

424

425

426

427

428

429

430

431

432

433

434

435

436

437

438

439

440

441

442

443

444

445

446

447

448

449

450

451

452

453

454

455

456

457

458

459

460

461

462

463

464

465

466

467

468

469

470

471

472

473

474

475

476

477

478

479

480

481

482

483

484

485

486

487

488

489

490

491

492

493

494

495

496

497

498

499

500

501

502

503

504

505

506

507

508

509

510

511

512

513

514

515

516

517

518

519

520

521

522

523

524

525

52

Hindustan Metal Industries [AIR 1982 SC 1444], 'obviousness' has to be strictly and objectively judged." SC has held that "in order to be patentable an improvement on something known before....should be something more than a mere workshop improvement; and must independently satisfy the test of invention or an inventive step'. If what is stated in paragraph 4.5.3, of the Manual is applied, it will lead to absurdity and help patent seekers to bypass the law easily. More importantly, such a proposition will be in total disregard of the law laid down by the Supreme Court in the aforesaid case. The principle of law as approved by SC is applicable at all times, as it is fundamental to the Patents law.

9. In my opinion the present 2008 draft manual should therefore be wholly scrapped.

For your convenience I have enclosed an eight page explanatory note.