



Article

# Sui Generis Systems and Farmer's Rights: The PPV&FR Act as India's Legislative Response to Agricultural IP Challenges

## Article History:

### Name of Author:

Sourabh Batar<sup>1</sup>, Harbansh Dixit<sup>2</sup>

### Affiliation:

<sup>1</sup>Research Scholar, Teerthanker Mahaveer College of Law and Legal Studies, Teerthanker Mahaveer University, Moradabad (U.P.), India

<sup>2</sup>Professor & Dean, Teerthanker Mahaveer College of Law and Legal Studies, Teerthanker Mahaveer University, Moradabad (U.P.), India.

### Corresponding Author:

Sourabh Batar

### How to cite this article:

Batar S *et. al*, Sui Generis Systems and Farmer's Rights: The PPV&FR Act as India's Legislative Response to Agricultural IP Challenges. *J Int Commer Law Technol*. 2025;6(1):1645-1649.

**Received:** 15-10-2025

**Revised:** 25-11-2025

**Accepted:** 05-12-2025

**Published:** 16-12-2025

©2025 the Author(s). This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>)

**Abstract:** This review delves into the intricate relationship between farmers' rights and intellectual property rights within the Indian agricultural landscape, examining the historical context, legal frameworks, and socio-economic implications of their interplay. It scrutinizes the impact of the Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights agreement on the Indian agricultural sector, particularly concerning the increasing use of IPRs in agriculture and its effects on trade dynamics. The paper navigates the debates surrounding the extension of intellectual property monopolies to agriculture and the potential compromise of farmers' rights in the face of powerful agro-based corporations. The analysis incorporates the perspectives of various stakeholders, including farmers, plant breeders, and the biotechnology industry, to provide a comprehensive understanding of the challenges and opportunities in balancing intellectual property protection with the need to promote agricultural innovation and ensure food security.

**Keywords:** Farmers' Rights, Intellectual Property Rights, Plant Variety Protection, India, Agriculture, TRIPS Agreement.

## INTRODUCTION

Intellectual property rights, encompassing inventions, software, publications, and plant varieties, represent the tangible manifestation of intellectual endeavors, warranting protection and recognition (Sridhar, 2016). The discourse surrounding intellectual property rights in agriculture is multifaceted, particularly in a nation like India, where agriculture forms the bedrock of the economy and the livelihood of a substantial proportion of the population. The Agreement on

Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights has significantly influenced the global intellectual property landscape, leading to the harmonization and reinforcement of intellectual property rights systems across nations. This has led to increased application of IPR in agriculture over the last few decades (Campi & Dueñas, 2015). However, the implementation of these rights in the agricultural sector has sparked considerable debate, particularly concerning its implications for farmers' rights, biodiversity, and food security.

Farmers' rights, in this context, refer to a set of

entitlements aimed at safeguarding the interests of farmers, including the right to save, use, exchange, and sell farm-saved seeds, as well as the right to equitable benefit sharing arising from the use of plant genetic resources. The intersection of intellectual property rights and farmers' rights presents a complex challenge, requiring a delicate balance between incentivizing innovation and protecting the livelihoods and traditional practices of farming communities.

### **Farmers' Rights: An Overview**

The concept of Farmers' Rights gained prominence as a counter-narrative to the expansion of intellectual property rights in agriculture, particularly in the context of the Convention on Biological Diversity and the International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture. Farmers' rights encompass a range of entitlements, including the protection of traditional knowledge, the right to participate in decision-making processes related to plant genetic resources, and the right to benefit from the commercialization of plant varieties developed using farmers' knowledge and resources.

In the Indian context, farmers' rights are enshrined in the Protection of Plant Varieties and Farmers' Rights Act, enacted in 2001 (Musa et al., 2015). This legislation seeks to recognize and protect the contributions of both plant breeders and farmers in the development of new plant varieties. The Act grants farmers the right to save, use, sow, resow, exchange, share, or sell their farm-saved seeds, with the exception of selling seeds under a brand name.

### **Intellectual Property Rights in Agriculture Plant Variety Protection**

Plant Variety Protection is a specific form of intellectual property right granted to plant breeders for new, distinct, uniform, and stable plant varieties (Mathur & Musyuni, 2018). This protection grants the breeder exclusive rights to produce, sell, and license the variety for a specified period, incentivizing investment in plant breeding and innovation (Zaman, 2020). The implementation of plant variety protection has been a subject of debate in India, with concerns raised regarding its potential impact on farmers' access to seeds and the conservation of agro-biodiversity. IP protection is generally considered indispensable for breeding programs that are not publicly funded (Smulders et al., 2021).

### **Patents and Their Impact on Agriculture**

Patents represent another formidable form of intellectual property right that can be granted for inventions, particularly those related to agricultural biotechnology. The proliferation of patents on genes, genetic engineering techniques, and genetically modified crops has provoked widespread and deeply

entrenched ethical and socio-economic concerns. This is primarily due to their direct impact on equitable access to crucial agricultural technologies and their propensity to foster significant monopolization within the vital seed market, thereby limiting farmer choice and increasing input costs. Furthermore, the contentious extension of patent rights to living organisms and fundamental biological processes has drawn severe criticism, as it risks the wholesale privatization of essential genetic resources and directly threatens the erosion of invaluable traditional farming practices, fundamentally undermining farmers' inherent rights to save, use, exchange, and sell farm-saved seeds.

### **The Indian Context: Legislation and Policy The Protection of Plant Varieties and Farmers' Rights Act, 2001**

India's Protection of Plant Varieties and Farmers' Rights Act represents a pioneering effort to strike a balance between breeders' rights and farmers' rights. The act acknowledges the contributions of both formal breeders and farmers in the development of new plant varieties. The Act includes provisions for the registration of new plant varieties, as well as extant varieties, and grants breeders exclusive rights to produce, sell, and market the protected variety (Rao, 2006). It recognizes the pivotal role farmers play in the conservation of genetic resources and their invaluable contributions to the breeding process. (Kumar, 2012). The Act explicitly grants farmers the right to save, use, sow, resow, exchange, share, or sell their farm-saved seeds, with the exception of selling seeds of protected varieties under a brand name, a provision that is intended to safeguard their traditional practices and livelihoods. The Act also includes provisions for benefit sharing, ensuring that farmers receive a fair share of the commercial benefits arising from the use of their traditional knowledge and genetic resources in the development of new varieties.

### **Other Relevant Legislation**

The Biological Diversity Act, 2002, is another key piece of legislation that impacts farmers' rights and IPR in India. This Act aims to protect India's biodiversity, regulate access to biological resources, and ensure equitable sharing of benefits arising from their use. The Act requires individuals or entities seeking to access biological resources and associated traditional knowledge for commercial purposes to obtain prior informed consent from the National Biodiversity Authority and to negotiate benefit-sharing arrangements with the relevant local communities (Singh, 2017). The Patents Act, 1970, as amended, also plays a role in governing intellectual property rights in agriculture, particularly in the context of biotechnological inventions (Chapman & Sherman, 2018). Other laws and policies, such as the

National Food Security Act, also play a role in shaping the landscape of farmers' rights (2021).

### **Impact of IPR on Farmers in India**

#### **Seed Availability and Affordability**

The implementation of IPR, particularly plant variety protection and patents, can have significant implications for seed availability and affordability for farmers in India. Intellectual Property Rights protection for crop varieties can affect research and food security, because development of new varieties depends on access to existing varieties, biological material, and their genetic information (Prasanna et al., 2021). While proponents argue that IPR incentivize investment in plant breeding and lead to the development of improved varieties, concerns have been raised that they can also lead to increased seed prices and reduced access to seeds for smallholder farmers (Ebert et al., 2023). The imposition of intellectual property rights can foster monopolization within the seed market, consequently limiting farmer choice and substantially increasing input costs, which is especially burdensome for farmers operating on a small scale.

#### **Traditional Knowledge and IPR**

The interface between traditional knowledge and IPR is a critical issue in the Indian context. India acknowledged in principle the case for strict IPR protection, but, this could be done only in phases suited by its own ground reality (Rangarajan et al., 2007). Traditional knowledge, developed and passed down through generations of farmers, often forms the basis for new plant varieties and agricultural innovations. Intellectual Property Rights, if not carefully managed, can lead to the misappropriation of traditional knowledge, where private entities obtain patents or plant variety protection on innovations derived from traditional knowledge without adequately compensating or recognizing the contributions of the knowledge holders.

#### **Case Studies of IPR Impact**

The impact of IPR on farmers in India is multifaceted and varies depending on the specific crop, region, and socio-economic context. The implementation of the 'Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights' can create benefits for a developing country's pharmaceutical industry, particularly with strong technological competencies that can be used as a platform for further expansion (Simonetti et al., 2007).

### **Challenges and Issues**

#### **Balancing Farmers' Rights and IPR**

Striking a harmonious balance between safeguarding farmers' rights and upholding intellectual property rights constitutes a formidable challenge in the

Indian agricultural landscape. The central issue revolves around ensuring that IPR incentivize innovation and investment in agriculture without undermining the rights and livelihoods of farmers, particularly smallholder farmers who constitute the backbone of Indian agriculture. The challenge lies in creating an IPR regime that fosters innovation while simultaneously protecting farmers' traditional practices, knowledge, and access to essential agricultural inputs like seeds.

#### **Enforcement and Awareness**

Effective enforcement of IPR and farmers' rights is crucial for ensuring that the intended benefits of the legal framework reach the stakeholders. However, in India, enforcement mechanisms are often weak, and awareness about IPR and farmers' rights is limited, especially among rural communities. This can lead to instances of IPR infringement, misappropriation of traditional knowledge, and exploitation of farmers.

#### **International Agreements and Their Implications**

International agreements, such as the Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights, have a significant impact on the Indian IPR regime and, consequently, on farmers' rights (Payumo et al., 2012). The country was hopeful to capture a significant percentage of the world's generic market in the pharmaceutical sector after the implementation of the agreement (Mahajan, 2011). While these agreements aim to harmonize IPR standards across countries, they can also pose challenges for developing countries like India, which may have different priorities and developmental needs.

### **Conclusion**

The interplay between farmers' rights and intellectual property rights in India is a complex and evolving issue with significant implications for agricultural innovation, food security, and the livelihoods of millions of farmers. The way the government has dealt with the WTO's Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights highlights how India is strategically using it for the benefit of its nation and industry (Basheer, 2018). The need of the hour is a holistic and well-calibrated approach that balances the need to incentivize innovation with the imperative to protect the rights and interests of farmers, especially smallholder farmers.

Moving forward, policymakers, researchers, and civil society organizations must work together to promote awareness about IPR and farmers' rights, strengthen enforcement mechanisms, and ensure that the benefits of agricultural innovation are shared equitably among all stakeholders. Further, there is also evidence that developed-country technology is sufficiently appropriate for developing countries as to offer substantial free-rider gains (Perrin, 1999).

Moreover, in order to promote the establishment of relevant rules and guidelines for the protection of IPR, it is important to analyze the influence of the convergence–divergence debate on IPR and access to resources in India's shrimp aquaculture sector (Ramanna-Pathak, 2015).

## References

1. Anjali, Lukose, L. P., Singh, A. P., Gautam, U., & Tewari, D. B. (2021). MATERNITY BENEFIT (AMENDMENT) ACT, 2017: A Socio-Legal Study with Special Emphasis on its Implications in Private Sector.
2. Basheer, S. (2018). Trumping TRIPS: Indian patent proficiency and the evolution of an evergreening enigma. *Oxford University Commonwealth Law Journal*, 18(1), 16. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14729342.2018.1455479>
3. Campi, M., & Dueñas, M. (2015). Intellectual Property Rights and International Trade of Agricultural Products. *World Development*, 80, 1. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2015.11.014>
4. Chapman, S., & Sherman, B. (2018). Finding a Place for Agriculture in Intellectual Property Law. *Deleted Journal*, 49(7), 759. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40319-018-0753-8>
5. Ebert, A. W., Engels, J., Schafleitner, R., Hintum, T. J. L. van, & Mwila, G. (2023). Critical Review of the Increasing Complexity of Access and Benefit-Sharing Policies of Genetic Resources for Genebank Curators and Plant Breeders–A Public and Private Sector Perspective [Review of Critical Review of the Increasing Complexity of Access and Benefit-Sharing Policies of Genetic Resources for Genebank Curators and Plant Breeders–A Public and Private Sector Perspective]. *Plants*, 12(16), 2992. Multidisciplinary Digital Publishing Institute. <https://doi.org/10.3390/plants12162992>
6. Kumar, N. V. (2012). Protection of Traditional Knowledge: International and National Initiatives and Possible Ways Ahead. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2012724>
7. Mahajan, P. (2011). Advent of Intellectual Property Rights in the Pharmaceutical Industry. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.1840627>
8. Mathur, V. K., & Musyuni, P. (2018). PLANT VARIETY PROTECTION LEGISLATION: OVERVIEW OF AN INDIAN AND AFRICAN PERSPECTIVE. *International Journal of Drug Regulatory Affairs*, 2(1), 12. <https://doi.org/10.22270/ijdra.v2i1.120>
9. Musa, M. K., Gadas, Z. A. A., & Radzi, M. S. N. M. (2015). The Plant Variety Protection Law in Malaysia: Issues on Protection of Farmers' Rights. *Journal of Management Research*, 7(2), 375. <https://doi.org/10.5296/jmr.v7i2.6941>
10. Payumo, J., Grimes, H. D., & Wandschneider, P. R. (2012). Status of national intellectual property rights (IPRs) systems and its impact to agricultural development: a time series cross section data analysis of TRIPS member-countries. *International Journal of Intellectual Property Management*, 5(1), 82. <https://doi.org/10.1504/ijipm.2012.045851>
11. Perrin, R. K. (1999). Intellectual property rights and developing country agriculture. *Agricultural Economics*, 21(3), 221. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1574-0862.1999.tb00596.x>
12. Prasanna, P. A. L., Rao, L. V. S., Prasad, A., Waris, A., Meera, S. N., Bandumula, N., Kumar, S. A., & Symaladevi, D. P. (2021). Impact of Intellectual property rights protection for plant varieties on rice varietal development and biodiversity in India. *Journal of Cereal Research*, 13(1). <https://doi.org/10.25174/2582-2675/2021/106446>
13. Ramanna-Pathak, A. (2015). Intellectual Property Rights Access to Genetic Resources and Indian Shrimp Aquaculture: Evolving Policy Responses to Globalization. *The Journal of World Intellectual Property*, 18, 41. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jwip.12030>
14. Rangarajan, K., Chaturvedi, T., Mishra, B., Kishore, K., & Prakash, S. (2007). Impact of IPR on SMEs. *Foreign Trade Review*, 42(2), 27. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0015732515070202>
15. Rao, S. S. (2006). Indigenous knowledge organization: An Indian scenario. *International Journal of Information Management*, 26(3), 224. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2006.02.003>
16. Simonetti, R., Archambault, É., Côté, G., & Kale, D. (2007). The Dynamics of Pharmaceutical Patenting in India: Evidence from USPTO Data. *Technology Analysis and Strategic Management*, 19(5), 625. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09537320701521382>
17. Singh, K. K. (2017). Intellectual Property Rights in Agricultural Biotechnology and Access to Technology: A Critical Appraisal.

SSRN Electronic Journal.  
[https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/Delivery.cfm/SSRN\\_ID2912935\\_code1546869.pdf?abstractid=2912935&mirid=1](https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/Delivery.cfm/SSRN_ID2912935_code1546869.pdf?abstractid=2912935&mirid=1)

18. Smulders, M. J. M., Wiel, C. C. M. van de, & Lotz, L. A. P. (2021). The Use of Intellectual Property Systems in Plant Breeding for Ensuring Deployment of Good Agricultural Practices. *Agronomy*, 11(6), 1163. <https://doi.org/10.3390/agronomy11061163>
19. Sridhar, K. (2016). Intellectual Property Rights and Scope in Agricultural Biotechnology. *Advances in Plants & Agriculture Research*, 3(4). <https://doi.org/10.15406/apar.2016.03.00106>
20. Zaman, K. (2020). Protection of intellectual property rights for agricultural innovations: evaluating Bangladesh's progression towards the international plant variety protection regime. *Journal of Intellectual Property Law & Practice*, 16(7), 677. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jiplp/jpaa213>