INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL FOR LEGAL RESEARCH AND ANALYSIS

Open Access, Refereed Journal Multi Disciplinary
Peer Reviewed

www.ijlra.com

ISSN: 2582-6433

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.

ISSN: 2582-6433

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IJLRA welcomes submissions from all branches of law, provided the work is original, unpublished, and submitted in accordance with the prescribed submission guidelines.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.

ISSN: 2582-6433

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.

ISSN: 2582-6433

EVOLUTION OF INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DISPUTE RESOLUTION UNDER INTERNATIONAL LAW: A CRITICAL STUDY OF INSTITUTIONAL FRAMEWORKS AND ADR MECHANISMS WHILE FOSTERING EQUILIBRIUM BETWEEN PRIVATE RIGHTS AND PUBLIC INTEREST.

AUTHORED BY - ISHAAN MEHANDRU
Student, B.Com.LL.B. (H), 5th year, Amity law School, Noida, UP.

"Justice lies not just in protecting the creator's silhouette, but in balancing the private spark of genius with the public's flame of necessity."

Abstract

Dispute resolution used to be primarily a domestic issue, but the globalisation of intellectual property has made it a challenging worldwide task. By analysing the institutional architecture and the increasing dependence on Alternative conflict settlement procedures, this article critically examines the development of international intellectual property conflict settlement. While organisations like the WTO and WIPO have improved enforcement and harmonisation thanks to the TRIPS Agreement, they also expose structural injustices, procedural restrictions, and a lack of consideration for public interest issues. This essay contends that while alternative dispute resolution procedures improve productivity and adaptability, they run the risk of favouring private business interests at the expense of accountability, transparency, and the general welfare of society. It ends by putting out a normative framework that aims to improve inclusivity, harmonise procedures, and change institutions in order to balance individual rights with the public good.

Keywords: ADR, WIPO, WTO TRIPS, Dispute Resolution, settlement, society, court.

Introduction.

Innovation, creativity, and technological advancement are all governed by intellectual property law, which has grown to be a fundamental component of the global economic order. However, the shortcomings of conventional dispute resolution procedures have been shown by the growth of cross-border transactions. Due to procedural conservatism and territorial jurisdiction,

ISSN: 2582-6433

domestic courts frequently are unable to handle the complexity of international intellectual property conflicts. This has made the creation of international institutional frameworks and ADR procedures necessary. Although speed and consistency are promised by these systems, their development poses important concerns about legitimacy, accessibility, and justice. In order to determine if the current systems actually balance private property interests with public welfare or if they only serve to perpetuate already-existing global disparities, this article takes a critical approach.

Evolution of International IP Dispute Resolution.

The Paris and Berne Conventions, among other documents, shaped the early international intellectual property law, which was more concerned with harmonising substantive rights than resolving disputes. Enforcement continued to be dispersed and dependent on national legal frameworks. A paradigm change occurred when intellectual property was integrated into the framework of international trade. A centralised dispute resolution process within the WTO and legally binding responsibilities were implemented under the TRIPS Agreement. Although this breakthrough greatly improved enforceability, it also made intellectual property a trade concern, making it vulnerable to political and economic forces. This change has been criticised for allegedly favouring industrialised countries, which have more technological and negotiation ability. The policy space available to developing nations has also been reduced by the incorporation of intellectual property into trade law, especially in areas like public health. In an effort to alleviate the inefficiencies of litigation, specialised alternative dispute resolution systems have emerged within WIPO. Concerns about fragmentation and a lack of coherence in international conflict resolution are raised by this parallel system, nevertheless.

Institutional Frameworks for IP Dispute Resolution.

WTO Dispute Settlement Mechanism.

Because of its binding nature and enforcement capabilities, the WTO dispute settlement system is frequently considered one of the most successful international adjudicatory procedures. However, private actors the main parties involved in intellectual property disputes—are intrinsically excluded by its state-centric framework. The system is often criticised for its lengthy deadlines, expensive expenses, and complicated procedures. Developing nations frequently encounter major obstacles when trying to use and make good use of this mechanism. Inequality is made worse by the disparity in financial resources and legal knowledge.

ISSN: 2582-6433

From a normative standpoint, the WTO framework puts enforcement and compliance ahead of fair results. Its handling of intellectual property disputes, especially under TRIPS, has come under fire for failing to adequately address public interest issues like access to medications, which reflects a conflict between economic liberalisation and human rights.

WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Centre.

The ADR procedures offered by WIPO offer a more adaptable and specialised method of resolving intellectual property disputes. The effectiveness of customised processes is demonstrated by the success of domain name dispute settlement. Its voluntary character, however, is a significant drawback. Its usefulness is limited by the need for party consent, especially in conflicts involving power disparities. Furthermore, the confidentiality of procedures compromises transparency and the advancement of jurisprudence even while it is advantageous for safeguarding proprietary information. The wider normative influence of WIPO rulings is constrained by this lack of precedential validity, which further adds to the fragmentation of international IP law.

Other Institutional Mechanisms.

Ad hoc processes under UNCITRAL regulations and arbitration under organisations like the ICC offer impartiality and enforceability. The New York Convention guarantees that arbitral awards are recognised in all countries, increasing their usefulness. However, there is criticism of these systems. Concerns about democratic legitimacy are raised by the privatisation of dispute resolution. Decisions that do not effectively reflect public interest considerations may arise from the lack of public monitoring and the low involvement of impacted stakeholders.

Role of ADR in IP Dispute Resolution.

Due to its cost-effectiveness, procedural flexibility, and capacity for expert adjudication, alternative dispute resolution procedures have grown in popularity. While mediation promotes cooperative solutions, arbitration enables parties to choose decision-makers with technical expertise. But this efficiency has to be scrutinised. ADR frequently functions within a context that places a high value on private ordering and contractual autonomy. Broader social interests may be marginalised as a result, especially in conflicts concerning vital technology, medications, or environmental issues. Additionally, ADR procedures' intrinsic secrecy results in a lack of openness. Arbitral awards are rarely published, in contrast to court rulings, which restricts their potential to contribute to the advancement and accountability of the law.

ISSN: 2582-6433

Thus, a move toward privatised justice is reflected in the growing use of ADR, which raises important issues regarding the function of public law principles in IP conflict settlement.

Balancing Private Rights and Public Interest.

One of the most important and persistent issues in modern IP law is the conflict between private intellectual property rights and the public interest. On the one hand, strong IP protection laws are necessary to encourage investment, innovation, and creativity by giving inventors and creators exclusive rights. These rights allow people and businesses to recoup their R&D expenses and generate profits. However, overzealous or rigorous enforcement of these rights may limit access to necessary products and services, especially in fields like technology, healthcare, and education, which would be detrimental to the general welfare.

By introducing mechanisms for parallel imports and mandatory licensing, among other flexibilities, the TRIPS Agreement aims to reconcile these conflicting interests. Under certain circumstances, compulsory licensing enables governments to permit the use of patented inventions without the patent holder's approval, especially during public health emergencies. In actuality, though, the application of these flexibilities has been restricted and frequently disputed. Developing nations are sometimes discouraged from fully utilising these safeguards due to political pressure from rich nations, economic dependence, and fear of trade reprisal.

Conflicts over public health offer a clear example of this disparity. A significant portion of the population in underdeveloped nations may not be able to afford life-saving medications due to excessive drug prices caused by the enforcement of pharmaceutical patents. When patent rights were prioritised over pressing humanitarian needs during global health crises, this problem became very apparent. These circumstances demonstrate how inadequate current dispute resolution procedures are at resolving global injustices and guaranteeing fair access to necessary resources.

An additional level of complication has also been brought about by the growth of investment arbitration. Businesses have challenged state-adopted domestic regulations by using intellectual property rights as protected investments under bilateral investment treaties. For example, legislation pertaining to plain packaging for tobacco products, environmental policies, and public health restrictions have been challenged on the basis that they violate patent or trademark rights. Because governments may be discouraged from enacting welfare-oriented

ISSN: 2582-6433

policies by the prospect of expensive arbitration actions, these disagreements raise grave concerns about the erosion of state sovereignty.

In this regard, it seems that the current international IP dispute resolution process favours private economic interests, frequently at the expense of more general society objectives. The need for a more inclusive and balanced approach is highlighted by the ineffective integration of public interest concerns into adjudicatory and arbitral procedures. A revised framework must make sure that, even though innovation is sufficiently safeguarded, public welfare and fundamental human rights are not sacrificed in the process.

Challenges in the Existing Framework.

A critical analysis reveals several systemic challenges:

1. Inconsistent results due to fragmentation among several institutions.

The World Trade Organization, the World Intellectual Property Organization, and other arbitral organisations are only a few of the places where international IP disputes are resolved. Different jurisdictional mandates, procedural norms, and interpretive strategies apply to each of these bodies. As a result, depending on the forum selected, comparable conflicts may result in different outcomes. The coherence of the global IP framework is weakened by this fragmentation, which compromises consistency and predictability in international IP law and makes it challenging for stakeholders to foresee legal ramifications.

2. Developing nations are disadvantaged by structural disparities.

Due to their limited financial resources, lack of technical expertise, and inferior institutional support, developing nations frequently face considerable disadvantages in international intellectual property conflicts. Many poor countries lack the significant legal ability and economic strength necessary to engage in disputes under frameworks like the TRIPS Agreement. As a result, wealthy nations and multinational firms are in a better position to claim and uphold their intellectual property rights, creating an imbalance that perpetuates already existing worldwide disparities.

3. ADR procedures lack accountability and transparency.

Arbitration and mediation in particular are examples of alternative dispute resolution procedures that are usually carried out in a private setting. Confidentiality restricts public access to judgements and reasoning, but it also helps safeguard important commercial

ISSN: 2582-6433

information. Decision makers are less accountable as a result of this lack of openness, which also hinders the creation of a coherent body of precedents. Because of this, the validity of ADR procedures in cases involving more general public interest may be called into doubt.

4. Human rights and public interest considerations are not fully integrated.

The protection and enforcement of private proprietary rights are frequently given priority in international IP dispute resolution systems, sometimes at the expense of public interest considerations. Decision-making processes do not sufficiently incorporate issues like public health, education, technology distribution, and access to necessary medications. Strict IP enforcement and fundamental human rights are at odds as a result, underscoring the need for a more balanced strategy that takes socioeconomic factors into account.

5. Excessive dependence on private dispute settlement procedures.

IP conflicts are increasingly being settled through private processes like mediation and arbitration. Although these approaches are effective and adaptable, an over-reliance on them results in the privatisation of justice. This inhibits judicial monitoring and diminishes the function of public courts. As a result, judgements may put business interests ahead of more general social considerations, casting doubt on justice, legitimacy, and the preservation of the general welfare in intellectual property conflicts. The credibility and efficacy of international IP dispute resolution are compromised by these issues.

Recommendations for Reform.

1. Institutional uniformity in procedural standards.

There is currently inconsistency and unpredictability because different forums adhere to different rules and processes. Uniformity, fewer disputes, and a more cohesive international dispute resolution system would result from harmonising procedural rules among organisations such as the World Trade Organization and the World Intellectual Property Organization.

2. Trade and intellectual property systems are institutionally integrated.

International commerce law and intellectual property law frequently function within separate but parallel frameworks. Increased cooperation between IP specific organisations and trade regimes, such as WTO processes, would assist align goals, prevent conflicting decisions, and guarantee that IP enforcement does not jeopardise more general economic and social agendas.

ISSN: 2582-6433

3. Requirements for openness in ADR processes.

The majority of ADR procedures are private, which restricts public monitoring and accountability. Mandatory transparency would increase legitimacy, enable the creation of legal precedents, and guarantee that decisions are subject to more extensive review, particularly in situations involving the public interest.

4. Increased involvement of poorer nations via capacity-building.

Developing countries frequently lack the means and know-how to handle complicated intellectual property issues. By giving them financial support, legal training, and technical assistance, they would be able to engage more actively and lessen inequity in international dispute resolution procedures.

5. Integrating private conflict resolution systems with public law principles.

Private commercial interests are the main focus of ADR systems. Particularly in delicate sectors like healthcare and technology access, incorporating public law concepts like justice, accountability, and preservation of public welfare would guarantee that dispute resolution decisions also take societal implications into account.

Conclusion.

Both notable advancements and enduring difficulties can be seen in the development of international intellectual property dispute settlement. Cross-border dispute resolution is now more efficient, specialised, and enforceable thanks to the growth of institutional frameworks like the World Trade Organization and the World Intellectual Property Organization as well as the growing use of Alternative Dispute Resolution procedures. However, these developments have also raised new issues, such as the fragmentation of legal systems, the opaqueness of private dispute settlement, and structural disparities that disproportionately impact developing nations.

These difficulties show that the current system needs to be critically reevaluated. It is crucial to go beyond a strictly enforcement-driven strategy and make sure that dispute resolution procedures also take into account more general public interest issues including socioeconomic equity, access to medications, and technological advancement. The current structure runs the risk of putting private economic interests ahead of essential society demands in the absence of such a change. Therefore, striking a careful balance between advancing public welfare and

ISSN: 2582-6433

safeguarding innovation is essential to the future of international IP dispute settlement. More open, inclusive, and responsible procedures that incorporate both private and public law issues can accomplish this. In addition to enhancing the system's legitimacy, a revised strategy will guarantee that intellectual property is a vehicle for just and sustainable global growth.

References.

1. Peter Drahos, *A Philosophy of Intellectual Property* (Dartmouth Publishing, 1996).
2. Carlos M. Correa, *Trade Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights: A Commentary on the TRIPS Agreement* (Oxford University Press, 2007).
3. Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS), 1994, Marrakesh Agreement Establishing the World Trade Organization, Annex 1C.
4. Frederick M. Abbott, "The WTO Medicines Decision: World Pharmaceutical Trade and the Protection of Public Health," 99 *American Journal of International Law* 317 (2005).
5. United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), *Using TRIPS Flexibilities for Public Health Protection* (2010).
6. Paris Convention for the Protection of Industrial Property, 1883.
7. Berne Convention for the Protection of Literary and Artistic Works, 1886.
8. World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO), *WIPO Arbitration Rules*.
9. Understanding on Rules and Procedures Governing the Settlement of Disputes (DSU), World Trade Organization (WTO).
10. United Nations Commission on International Trade Law (UNCITRAL), *UNCITRAL Arbitration Rules*.
11. Henning Grosse Ruse-Khan, "The Protection of Intellectual Property in International Investment Law," in *Research Handbook on Intellectual Property and Investment Law* (Edward Elgar Publishing, 2020).
12. *Philip Morris Brands Sàrl v. Oriental Republic of Uruguay*, ICSID Case No. ARB/10/7, Award (2016).