

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL FOR LEGAL RESEARCH AND ANALYSIS



Open Access, Refereed Journal Multi Disciplinary
Peer Reviewed

www.ijlra.com

DISCLAIMER

No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored, transmitted, or distributed in any form or by any means, whether electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise, without prior written permission of the Managing Editor of the *International Journal for Legal Research & Analysis (IJLRA)*.

The views, opinions, interpretations, and conclusions expressed in the articles published in this journal are solely those of the respective authors. They do not necessarily reflect the views of the Editorial Board, Editors, Reviewers, Advisors, or the Publisher of IJLRA.

Although every reasonable effort has been made to ensure the accuracy, authenticity, and proper citation of the content published in this journal, neither the Editorial Board nor IJLRA shall be held liable or responsible, in any manner whatsoever, for any loss, damage, or consequence arising from the use, reliance upon, or interpretation of the information contained in this publication.

The content published herein is intended solely for academic and informational purposes and shall not be construed as legal advice or professional opinion.

**Copyright © International Journal for Legal Research & Analysis.
All rights reserved.**

ABOUT US

The *International Journal for Legal Research & Analysis (IJLRA)* (ISSN: 2582-6433) is a peer-reviewed, academic, online journal published on a monthly basis. The journal aims to provide a comprehensive and interactive platform for the publication of original and high-quality legal research.

IJLRA publishes Short Articles, Long Articles, Research Papers, Case Comments, Book Reviews, Essays, and interdisciplinary studies in the field of law and allied disciplines. The journal seeks to promote critical analysis and informed discourse on contemporary legal, social, and policy issues.

The primary objective of IJLRA is to enhance academic engagement and scholarly dialogue among law students, researchers, academicians, legal professionals, and members of the Bar and Bench. The journal endeavours to establish itself as a credible and widely cited academic publication through the publication of original, well-researched, and analytically sound contributions.

IJLRA welcomes submissions from all branches of law, provided the work is original, unpublished, and submitted in accordance with the prescribed submission guidelines. All manuscripts are subject to a rigorous peer-review process to ensure academic quality, originality, and relevance.

Through its publications, the *International Journal for Legal Research & Analysis* aspires to contribute meaningfully to legal scholarship and the development of law as an instrument of justice and social progress.

PUBLICATION ETHICS, COPYRIGHT & AUTHOR RESPONSIBILITY STATEMENT

The *International Journal for Legal Research and Analysis (IJLRA)* is committed to upholding the highest standards of publication ethics and academic integrity. All manuscripts submitted to the journal must be original, unpublished, and free from plagiarism, data fabrication, falsification, or any form of unethical research or publication practice. Authors are solely responsible for the accuracy, originality, legality, and ethical compliance of their work and must ensure that all sources are properly cited and that necessary permissions for any third-party copyrighted material have been duly obtained prior to submission. Copyright in all published articles vests with IJLRA, unless otherwise expressly stated, and authors grant the journal the irrevocable right to publish, reproduce, distribute, and archive their work in print and electronic formats. The views and opinions expressed in the articles are those of the authors alone and do not reflect the views of the Editors, Editorial Board, Reviewers, or Publisher. IJLRA shall not be liable for any loss, damage, claim, or legal consequence arising from the use, reliance upon, or interpretation of the content published. By submitting a manuscript, the author(s) agree to fully indemnify and hold harmless the journal, its Editor-in-Chief, Editors, Editorial Board, Reviewers, Advisors, Publisher, and Management against any claims, liabilities, or legal proceedings arising out of plagiarism, copyright infringement, defamation, breach of confidentiality, or violation of third-party rights. The journal reserves the absolute right to reject, withdraw, retract, or remove any manuscript or published article in case of ethical or legal violations, without incurring any liability.

EFFECTIVENESS OF INDIA'S BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY ACT IN PREVENTING BIOPIRACY: A CRITICAL LEGAL ANALYSIS.

AUTHORED BY - RITAKSHI BRIJWASI

Student, B.B.A.LL.B. (H), 5th year, Amity law School, Noida, UP.

“Envisioned as a shield against the silent plunder of biological wealth, the Biological Diversity Act reflects India's resolve though its strength is tested in the arena of global exploitation and domestic implementation.”

Abstract

With a wide variety of biological resources and similarly rich traditional knowledge systems created over millennia by indigenous and local populations, India is acknowledged as one of the seventeen megadiverse nations in the world. Although this biodiversity is a source of ecological, cultural, and economic wealth, it has also made India more vulnerable to the worldwide issue of biopiracy, which is defined as the unlawful taking and commercial exploitation of biological resources and related traditional knowledge without prior consent or fair benefit-sharing. India passed the Biological Diversity Act, 2002, in response to this issue and to fulfill its responsibilities under the Convention on Biological Diversity, 1992. The Act seeks to protect biodiversity, guarantee sustainable use, and create a system for the just and equitable distribution of advantages resulting from the use of biological resources.

The effectiveness of the Biological Diversity Act, 2002 in combating biopiracy in India is examined critically in this study report. It assesses the institutional structure, enforcement methods, legal framework, and practical implementation issues. The study contends that despite the Act's strong legal basis and adherence to global environmental standards, its efficacy is constrained by lax enforcement, ineffective administrative procedures, and inadequate grassroots implementation.

Introduction

In the global conversation on intellectual property and environmental law, biopiracy has become a major problem. It entails the unapproved use of biological resources and traditional knowledge, frequently through the acquisition of patents or commercial rights in other countries without the proper custodians' agreement. India has often been the target of such exploitation due to its rich biodiversity and long-standing traditional systems like Ayurveda, Siddha, and Unani.

Indian traditional knowledge has been patented overseas, frequently without due acknowledgment or benefit-sharing, as seen by a number of well-known conflicts, such as those involving turmeric, neem, and basmati rice. A thorough statutory process to control access to biological resources and safeguard traditional knowledge was required as a result of these instances, which revealed weaknesses in India's legal system before 2002.

In order to solve these issues, the Biological Diversity Act of 2002 was passed, which established benefit-sharing arrangements, guaranteed conservation, and controlled access to biological resources. Nevertheless, the question of whether the Act has been successful in accomplishing its primary goal of combating biopiracy persists despite its progressive aim.

Legal Framework of the Biological Diversity Act, 2002

In order to implement India's obligations under the 1992 Convention on Biological Diversity, the Biological Diversity Act, 2002 was passed. The three main tenets of the Act are the preservation of biological variety, the sustainable use of its constituent parts, and the just and equal distribution of benefits resulting from the use of biological resources.

The National Biodiversity Authority at the federal level, State Biodiversity Boards at the state level, and Biodiversity Management Committees at the local level comprise the three-tier institutional system established by the Act to operationalize these goals. The highest regulatory agency in charge of authorizing foreign persons, organizations, or businesses to access biological resources is the National Biodiversity Authority. While Biodiversity Management Committees are responsible for recording local biodiversity and assisting grassroots conservation efforts, State Biodiversity Boards control access by Indian entities and guarantee compliance at the state level.

Additionally, before any foreign organization can access biological resources or related traditional knowledge, the Act requires prior clearance from the National Biodiversity Authority. Additionally, it establishes benefit-sharing agreements with nearby communities and controls intellectual property rights resulting from these resources. Together, these clauses seek to stop unapproved exploitation and guarantee that local populations are fairly compensated for the use of their resources and expertise.

Concept of Biopiracy and Its Relevance in India

The misuse of biological resources and traditional knowledge through intellectual property mechanisms like patents is known as biopiracy, although it is not specifically defined under most legal systems, including India. It usually entails the commercial use of such resources without sharing benefits and without permission from the nation or community of origin.

India's vast biodiversity and oral traditions make it susceptible to biopiracy. Multinational firms have made multiple attempts to secure patents on the therapeutic qualities of plants or agricultural products that have long been recognized and utilized in India. A patent for the wound-healing benefits of turmeric was issued in the United States, however it was later revoked after India proved to have earlier traditional knowledge.

These examples show that although traditional knowledge was in the public domain in India, it was initially susceptible to misappropriation due to a lack of systematic documentation and international acknowledgment.

Effectiveness of the Biological Diversity Act, 2002

India's framework for intellectual property and environmental law has advanced significantly with the passage of the Biological Diversity Act. It establishes a regulatory framework to regulate access and use and gives legal recognition to India's sovereign rights over its biological resources. The National Biodiversity Authority, which serves as a gatekeeping organization and ensures that foreign access to biological resources is subject to prior approval and benefit-sharing terms, is one of its most significant contributions.

Additionally, the Act has significantly improved India's standing in global intellectual property issues. India has been able to contest false patents in other countries and make claims over

traditional knowledge by creating a formal legal structure. The preservation of traditional knowledge has been further aided by the establishment of local biodiversity documentation systems.

Nevertheless, the Act's practical efficacy in stopping biopiracy is still quite low. Although it offers a robust legal framework, enforcement is still inadequate. Misappropriation frequently takes place outside of India's borders, especially through foreign patent offices where there is little Indian regulatory oversight. Furthermore, monitoring systems are insufficiently reliable to keep track of every incident of biological resource utilization, even inside India.

Critical Analysis of Implementation Challenges

The Biological Diversity Act has serious implementation issues despite having a robust legislative basis. Weak enforcement capability is one of the main problems. Regulatory organizations like State Biodiversity Boards and the National Biodiversity Authority frequently struggle with a lack of funding, a shortage of personnel, and a poor monitoring infrastructure. Violations are therefore not successfully identified or dealt with.

Administrative inefficiency is another significant issue. Approvals for access to biological resources are sometimes difficult and time-consuming to obtain, which can hinder innovative and genuine research while failing to effectively curb illicit exploitation. There is a disconnect between the practical implementation of the law and its intent due to this procedural complexity.

Biodiversity Management Committees at the local level are frequently underdeveloped and lack adequate awareness or training. As a result, traditional knowledge and biodiversity resources are not fully documented, undermining one of the most important safeguards against biopiracy.

Additionally, local and indigenous groups are not well-informed about their rights under the Act. These groups are frequently unable to exercise their rights or request remuneration for the use of their traditional knowledge if they do not have sufficient awareness of benefit-sharing regulations.

Enforcement is still very difficult on a global scale. Biopiracy frequently happens through patent applications filed in other jurisdictions, even if India controls access locally. In these situations, enforcement gaps are caused by disparities in intellectual property rules and a failure to acknowledge conventional knowledge databases.

Judicial and Policy Developments

The goals of biodiversity protection have typically been upheld by Indian courts, especially when it comes to acknowledging the significance of traditional knowledge and environmental preservation. However, regulatory initiatives rather than judicial involvement have been the driving force behind the majority of anti-biopiracy laws' enforcement.

By recording traditional medical knowledge and making it accessible to worldwide patent examiners, the Traditional Knowledge Digital Library has been a major policy breakthrough that has helped prevent unjust patent grants. This has worked well in a number of instances where Indian prior art evidence was used to invalidate patents.

However, the Biological Diversity Act's court enforcement is still restricted, and more vigorous litigation and interpretation are required to bolster its implementation.

Conclusion

India's historic legislative attempt to prevent biopiracy of its biological resources and traditional knowledge is the Biological Diversity Act, 2002. It complies with international environmental and biodiversity accords and creates a thorough institutional framework. Without a question, the Act has improved India's legal standing in international conflicts and established procedures for controlling benefit-sharing and access.

In actuality, though, its efficacy in stopping biopiracy is still limited. Its influence is greatly diminished by weak enforcement, ineffective administration, a lack of grassroots implementation, and restrictions on international jurisdiction. Although the Act offers a solid foundation, it needs to be significantly strengthened in terms of institutional capacity, awareness-raising, and international cooperation in order to fully accomplish its goals.

In conclusion, the Biological Diversity Act should be seen as a developing legal framework

that necessitates ongoing revision and efficient execution in order to protect India's rich biological legacy rather than as a comprehensive answer to biopiracy.

References

1. The Biological Diversity Act, 2002 (Act No. 18 of 2003).
2. Convention on Biological Diversity, 1992.
3. Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change, Government of India, *National Biodiversity Authority Guidelines and Notifications*.
4. National Biodiversity Authority, *Guidelines on Access to Biological Resources and Associated Knowledge and Benefit Sharing Regulations*, 2014.
5. Madhav Gadgil and Ramachandra Guha, *This Fissured Land: An Ecological History of India* (Oxford University Press, 1992).
6. K. C. Bansal, P. K. Joshi & R. K. Khetarpal, "Biopiracy and Intellectual Property Rights: The Indian Experience," 12 *Current Science* 1465 (2005).
7. Carlos M. Correa, *Trade Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights: A Commentary on the TRIPS Agreement* (Oxford University Press, 2007).
8. World Trade Organization, *Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS)*, 1994.
9. United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), *Human Development Report* (various editions).
10. *University of Mississippi Medical Center v. United States Patent and Trademark Office* (Turmeric Patent Case), USPTO (1997).
11. European Patent Office, *Revocation of Neem Patent (EPO Case No. T 0416/01)* (2000).
12. Vandana Shiva, *Biopiracy: The Plunder of Nature and Knowledge* (South End Press, 1997).
13. National Innovation Foundation, India, *Documentation of Traditional Knowledge Systems*.
14. Traditional Knowledge Digital Library (TKDL), Government of India, official database records and reports.
15. S. K. Verma & Raman Mittal, *Intellectual Property Rights: A Global Vision* (Indian Law Institute, 2004).
16. P. Narayanan, *Intellectual Property Law* (Eastern Law House, latest ed.).
17. B. K. Sharma, "Protection of Traditional Knowledge in India: A Legal Perspective," 45 *Journal of the Indian Law Institute* 1 (2003).
18. National Biodiversity Authority, Annual Reports (various years).