ILE COMPETITION AND COMPANY LAW JOURNAL

VOLUME 3 AND ISSUE I OF 2025

APIS – 3920-0028 | ISSN - 2583-8385

Published by

Institute of Legal Education

https://iledu.in

BALANCING INNOVATION AND MARKET ACCESS: THE CONVERGENCE AND CONFLICT OF IP AND COMPETITION LAW

AUTHORS - ADV MONICA MADAAN* & ARRYAN MOHANTY**

* LLM STUDENT OF KR MANGALAM UNIVERSITY, GURUGRAM

** STUDENT OF SYMBIOSIS LAW SCHOOL, NAGPUR

BEST CITATION - ADV MONICA MADAAN & ARRYAN MOHANTY, BALANCING INNOVATION AND MARKET ACCESS: THE CONVERGENCE AND CONFLICT OF IP AND COMPETITION LAW, *ILE COMPETITION AND COMPANY LAW JOURNAL*, 3 (1) OF 2025, PG. 31-46, APIS – 3920-0028 | ISSN - 2583-8385.

Abstract

The intersection of intellectual property (IP) rights and competition law creates a complicated legal environment where the motivation for innovation must be weighed against the potential for market domination. While IP laws provide exclusive rights to creators and inventors, competition law seeks to prevent market behaviours that could negatively impact competition and consumer interests. The Competition Act of 2002 empowers the Competition Commission of India (CCI) to avoid agreements restricting competition and to address the exploitation of dominant market positions. Although IP rights are crucial for technological advancement and creativity, these rights are not unlimited and may be constrained if their application leads to anti-competitive effects. The TRIPS Agreement recognises that specific licensing practices such as exclusive grant-back clauses, coercive package licensing, or conditions that dissuade challenges to patent validity can restrict competition and hinder the spread of technology. National legislation, including the Indian Competition Act, includes measures to regulate such practices. Indian courts have highlighted that the Competition Act and IP laws like the Patents Act function in their respective areas but can also enhance each other when needed. Anti-competitive behaviours like tie-in arrangements, exclusive supply and distribution contracts, refusal to engage in dealings, and resale price maintenance are examined under Section 3 of the Competition Act unless they involve reasonable limitations to safeguard IP rights. However, when IP rights are misused to unfairly restrict competition, such as through discriminatory pricing or denying market access, Section 4 of the Competition Act comes into play. Courts have acknowledged that the misuse of IP-driven market dominance can be addressed under the Competition Act and patent laws via mechanisms such as compulsory licensing. Ultimately, the simultaneous application of IP and competition regulations highlights the necessity of harmonising private innovation incentives with the public interest in a competitive marketplace.

Introduction

The advent of globalisation has profoundly altered global relationships. In advanced and emerging economies, markets have become fundamental elements of economic frameworks. With the swift advancement of technology, there is an increasing threat that original ideas may be replicated, reducing their distinctiveness and competitive edge. This issue has resulted in a pressing demand for more robust protections. Intellectual Property Rights (IPR) provide exclusive authority over intangible assets, which can transform into highly valuable business instruments. These assets, like products or services, can be monetised on various scales, including at the operational, corporate, and international levels. Although

commercialisation can confer a competitive edge, it also requires sharing specific information, which may raise concerns for the rights holders. A nation's economy generally functions through free and regulated markets. This dual framework is embraced to secure a more effective and balanced operation of the national economy. In a free market environment, producers autonomously determine how much to produce and how much capital to invest in innovation. This model fosters creativity and establishes prices based on market dynamics, with little to no government interference. It fundamentally opposes monopolistic behaviour by promoting open competition. However, this model's direct relationship between producers and consumers can sometimes result in exploitation. Manufacturers may focus on profit at the expense of fairness, leveraging competitive pressure. This unchecked approach can create instability and inequality within the economy. Conversely, a regulated market is where government authorities supervise trade and commerce. Regulations are implemented to deter unfair practices and monopolistic control. Legal frameworks assist in monitoring supplier activities and ensuring that vital goods are produced and accessible to the public. This not only protects consumer interests but also fosters national economic growth.[56]

Nonetheless, excess regulation can have adverse effects. Overzealous control may make the market inflexible and limit adaptability. In such environments, innovation may be hindered, making consumers unable to access the goods or services they require. Assessing both systems demonstrates that integrating regulatory measures and free-market principles is vital. Each model possesses its unique strengths and weaknesses. For markets to operate effectively, pricing should remain steady, allowing suppliers to respond to consumer demand efficiently. A well-balanced and open economy, backed by regulatory oversight, is more conducive to maintaining equilibrium between competition law and intellectual property rights. Without regulatory frameworks, the market risks becoming unmanageable and, once destabilised, challenging to restore.

The domains of intellectual property law and competition law are closely connected, and compliance with both is vital to ensuring smooth and equitable market functions. Hence, upholding a legal balance between these two frameworks is essential. While IPR affords exclusive control that can result in market supremacy, competition law aims to curtail such dominance and foster fair access. Intellectual Property (IP) and competition laws might seem to function in distinct areas, yet both aim to foster innovation and enhance consumer welfare. While IP provides exclusive rights to creators, competition law serves as a mechanism to ensure market equilibrium and prevent unfair practices. Historically, the emphasis has leaned towards safeguarding the exclusivity of IP. However, recent trends indicate a shift in perspective, with the growing recognition of the significance of competitive market dynamics, often imposing restrictions on IP rights. The interplay between IP and competition uncovers a multifaceted relationship. IP discourages direct replication, thus constraining competition in one manner, but it simultaneously fosters the development of alternative innovations, which boosts competition. Tensions emerge when IP protections are broadened in ways that obstruct fair competition, particularly when exclusive rights are extended into downstream markets. This frequently results in practices such as refusal to license or supply, harming healthy competition in the marketplace. In such instances, leveraging IP rights may amount to an abuse of dominance and be identified as anti-competitive conduct.[57]

[56] Surabhi Singh & Richa Goel, IPR and Competition Law, iPleaders (20 July 2025, 07:47 AM) https://blog.ipleaders.in/interplay-competition-law-ipr/#Two_mechanisms_of_market_regulation

[57] Akshit Prajapati and Anam Khan, Commercialising Intellectual Property Rights & Significance of Competition Laws, Vol 1 Issue 1, NLUAJIPR, 166-185 (2022) https://nluassam.ac.in/docs/Journals/IPR/vol1-issue-1/9.pdf

ILE COMPETITION AND COMPANY LAW JOURNAL
VOLUME 3 AND ISSUE I OF 2025
APIS – 3920-0028 | ISSN - 2583-8385
Published by
Institute of Legal Education
https://iledu.in

Over time, legal authorities and courts have begun to recognise that IP and competition laws share common goals: advancing innovation and enhancing consumer advantages. Innovations benefit society by delivering new products, technologies, and services that fulfil unmet needs. IP rights motivate this endeavour by providing legal protection and encouraging the dissemination and commercialisation of creative efforts. These protections enable inventors and creators to reap rewards from their contributions while also facilitating technological and cultural progress. Concurrently, competition law ensures that innovation flourishes within an open and equitable marketplace. It seeks to prevent anti-competitive agreements, mergers that limit market options, and the exploitation of dominant market positions. In this respect, both legal systems complement one another, fostering economic efficiency and serving consumer interests. Even when IP rights result in market exclusivity, this does not automatically imply monopolistic control, as choices are often available. Additionally, holding an IP right does not necessarily mean the holder possesses market power. When balanced appropriately, IP and competition laws collaborate to stimulate advancement, provide more options, enhance quality, and reduce consumer costs.[58] IPRs have progressed beyond their traditional role in protecting moral and ethical claims to creative ownership. They are increasingly recognised as strategic assets that help individuals and organisations achieve their commercial goals. Although trademarks and trade secrets have long been associated with branding and market positioning, recent insights from legal and non-legal perspectives indicate that other forms of intellectual property, such as copyrights and industrial designs, also play an essential role in attracting consumers and increasing market appeal.[59]

IPR and Competition: Friend or Foe?

Competition legislation aims to create a fair and efficient marketplace that bolsters the nation's economic growth, promotes healthy competition, and protects consumer interests. Innovation and intellectual assets are crucial to stimulating competition, as intellectual property (IP) is treated as an asset, like physical property. In today's global market, intellectual capital has emerged as a significant factor in driving growth and enhancing competitive interactions across sectors. When exploring the connection between competition law and IP law, two critical perspectives arise: the impact of intellectual property rights (IPRs) on formulating competition law and applying competition law to utilising IPRs post-grant. Innovation and competition are interdependent, forming the foundation of IP and competition law.

While IP laws provide exclusive rights that may appear monopolistic, these rights are designed to reward innovation and creativity for a limited duration. Conversely, competition law aims to prevent market dominance and eliminate unfair practices. Although these two legal frameworks may seem to oppose each other, with IP limiting competition and competition law seeking to enhance it, they are complementary. IP law prevents unauthorised use of creative works, motivating others to innovate and compete instead of simply replicating existing ideas. By safeguarding original creations, IP laws grant fair opportunities to creators, while competition law ensures that such rights are not exploited to hinder market entry or consumer choice.

The role of competition law is to mitigate anti-competitive behaviours and stop companies from abusing their market power in dealings with other enterprises. It also regulates intellectual property use, ensuring exclusive

[58] Raniyal Niyada P & Karun Sanjaya, Intellectual Property as a Market Tool and its Relation with Competition, Vol 2 Issue 1, DPILJIPR, 1-18 (2022) https://www.researchgate.net/publication/357687162_Intellectual_Property_as_a_Market_Tool_and_Its_Relations_with_Competition

[59] Ishan Puranik, Intellectual Property as a Marketing Tool in the Creative Industry, Vol 1 Issue 2, IPRJMNLUN, 116-129 (2023) https://www.nlunagpur.ac.in/PDF/Publications/CI-Dec-2023/9.Ishan%20Puranik.pdf

rights are not misused beyond their intended scope. While IPRs can be strategically employed to boost market presence, competition law sets boundaries to prevent the abuse of such rights. An inflexible understanding of IP regulations can constrain the broader application of competition principles and stifle market-driven innovation. It is, therefore, critical to establish clear distinctions between the protections offered by IP law and the regulatory function of competition law in fostering innovation, particularly in high-tech industries. The exclusive rights bestowed by IP laws are intentionally limited in time to encourage technological development and foster ongoing innovation, both essential for sustained economic growth. Competitive markets flourish through novel ideas and advancements; once the protection period expires, the knowledge becomes publicly accessible, allowing others to build on it and create new solutions. This cycle exemplifies the compelling interplay between intellectual property and competition law. Rather than being purely monopolistic, the IP system is designed to balance innovation incentives with broader commercial goals in a globalised economy.[60]

In a free market economy, products are created with limited government intervention. The pricing and availability of goods are predominantly determined by supply and demand, often affected by monopolistic behaviour from manufacturers. In this framework, producers independently choose the quantity of goods to manufacture, the investments required for innovation, and how to establish their prices. With minimal governmental regulations on supply and pricing, producers can wield considerable influence over market dynamics. Conversely, a regulated market features state oversight, wherein authorities monitor trading and business activities. Unlike the free market, this framework introduces systems to regulate various market forces, making it more difficult for any single entity to monopolise the production and supply of essential goods. While regulation helps mitigate unethical practices by manufacturers and suppliers, it does not completely eradicate them. Furthermore, price controls aim to benefit both consumers and producers. Nevertheless, excessive regulation can stifle economic growth, lessen operational flexibility, limit innovation, and potentially prevent consumers from accessing the products or services they seek. Intellectual property law aspires to find a compromise between granting exclusive rights to creators and addressing the broader public interest. It aims to reconcile competing interests in a just and reasonable way. Intellectual Property Rights (IPRs) offer legal safeguards to individuals and organisations, allowing them to capitalise on their innovations commercially. These rights are legally conferred for a specific duration to prevent perpetual monopolies and ensure a fair distribution of advantages between rights holders and the public.[61]

On the other hand, competition law is intended to avert the misuse of market dominance, foster fair competition, and guarantee that consumers can access quality goods and services at fair prices. While IPRs extend a temporary benefit to creators, competition law seeks to ensure that this benefit is not exploited in a way that damages market fairness or consumer welfare. Although competition law and IPRs might seem at odds—since IPRs grant temporary exclusivity while competition law opposes monopolistic practices—they function in concert to promote innovation while preserving market equilibrium. IP rights encourage innovation by providing exclusive commercial advantages for a limited duration, which, in turn, naturally leads to a dominant market position. However, competition law does not oppose holding a dominant position; it intervenes only when that dominance is misapplied to restrict competition

[60] Priyanka Kansara, Alliance between Competition Law and Intellectual Property Law, iPleaders (20 July 2025, 08:51 AM) https://blog.ipleaders.in/alliance-between-competition-law-and-intellectual-property-law/

[61] Aarchie, The Conflict between Intellectual Property Law and Competition Law: Critical and Comparative Analysis, iPleaders (20 July 2025, 09:04 AM) https://blog.ipleaders.in/conflict-intellectual-property-law-competition-law-critical-comparative-analysis/

ILE COMPETITION AND COMPANY LAW JOURNAL
VOLUME 3 AND ISSUE I OF 2025
APIS – 3920-0028 | ISSN - 2583-8385
Published by
Institute of Legal Education
https://iledu.in

unfairly. Over time, influenced by various court decisions and regulatory measures, legal developments have established that IP and competition laws are not contradictory. Instead, they function together. Grasping how countries tackle the interplay between these legal frameworks is essential for enhancing their implementation. A comparative analysis of international approaches reveals the complexity of aligning incentives for innovation with market regulation. India's Competition Act of 2002 embodies this dual perspective. Section 3 forbids agreements that may significantly harm competition within the market.[62] However, Section 3(5) provides an exemption for activities related to IPRs, indicating an acknowledgement of the unique significance of IP protection.[63] Simultaneously, Section 4 addresses the misuse of dominant positions, including the inappropriate use of IPRs, affirming that competition law can intercede when necessary.[64] India's legal framework in this realm is still progressing. Landmark cases like Aamir Khan Productions v. Director-General[65] and Kingfisher v. Competition Commission of India[66] have established the authority of the Competition Commission of India to adjudicate matters involving IPR and market competition. These rulings have set the stage for continuous dialogue regarding the balance between safeguarding innovation and maintaining market fairness.

Among the essential international treaties facilitated by the World Trade Organisation (WTO) is the Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights, often abbreviated as TRIPS. This agreement stipulates standards that member countries must incorporate into their national legislation regarding intellectual property protection. It enumerates seven types of intellectual property rights and stresses the importance of competition policy within this framework. Developing countries participating in the TRIPS agreement are expected to adapt their laws to these principles, especially in fostering fair competition and overseeing intellectual property management. TRIPS has gradually placed the onus on member states to improve their competition regulations concerning intellectual property rights. Two principal tools to prevent the abuse of dominant market positions are compulsory licensing and parallel imports. Compulsory licensing permits a government to allow the use of a patented invention without the patent holder's consent, mainly in scenarios involving public interest, such as public health. Parallel imports entail the lawful importation of genuine products without the approval of the intellectual property owner, promoting wider access and competitive pricing. Through TRIPS, member states are required to comply with fundamental intellectual property standards to ensure uniformity across global legal frameworks. Article 31 of the agreement focuses on compulsory licensing, particularly in emergencies or when necessary to safeguard public health or address anti-competitive practices. This clause enables governments to intervene when intellectual property rights are leveraged to hinder market competition or exploit consumers. Numerous developing countries utilise these strategies to maintain market fairness by limiting exploitative business behaviours and avoiding the accumulation of power among intellectual property holders. Article 40 of the TRIPS agreement explicitly addresses the adverse outcomes of specific licensing arrangements and acknowledges that some practices may hinder technology transfer. It grants member states the authority to take measures against such anti-competitive conduct and to implement suitable legal or policy initiatives to lessen the repercussions of such exploitation.[67]

Conflicts Between Intellectual Property Rights and Competition Law

[62] The Competition Act, 2002, § 3
[63] The Competition Act, 2002, § 3(5)
[64] The Competition Act, 2002, § 4
[65] AIR 2011 (NOC) 143 (BOM.)
[66] (2010) 4 Comp. LJ 557 (Bom)

[67] Merin Joyson and Shibina Eldhose, IPR & Competition Law: An Overview and its Implications, Vol 4 Issue 2, IJLSI, 110-124 (2022) https://ijlsi.com/wp-content/uploads/IPR-Competition-Law.pdf

ILE COMPETITION AND COMPANY LAW JOURNAL
VOLUME 3 AND ISSUE I OF 2025
APIS – 3920-0028 | ISSN - 2583-8385
Published by
Institute of Legal Education
https://iledu.in

Intellectual Property Rights (IPRs) give creators exclusive legal authority over their innovations, often resulting in economic influence. This exclusivity can raise concerns when it intersects with competition laws, particularly since IPRs, while fostering innovation, can also be leveraged to hinder market competition. Many patented products, creative works, and software yield significant profits, highlighting these rights' economic significance. This situation naturally attracts examination from a competition law viewpoint.

Intra-Technology Restrictions

In licensing contracts, a patent holder may incorporate clauses that limit how a licensee can utilise or compete with the licensed technology. These limitations are usually intended to assist the licensor in recovering substantial research and development expenses. However, they can harm smaller companies or those with less negotiating power. Typical restrictions involve confining sales to some geographic regions, forbidding competition with the licensor, mandating long-term commitments, establishing minimum resale prices, or restricting the volume of goods a licensee may produce. Some agreements may also compel licensees to source all inputs from the patent holder, regardless of whether those components are patented, thereby bundling both licensed and unlicensed offerings.

Cartel-Like Behaviour

A significant concern within competition law is the potential misuse of licensing to mask cartel arrangements. These arrangements can include colluding on prices, regulating production levels, or partitioning markets among firms. Competitors can utilise licensing agreements to coordinate anticompetitive practices even if the market isn't directly linked to the licensed technology. This issue becomes particularly problematic when the licensed patent is weak or not critical to the licensee's operations. Moreover, patent pools—where multiple patent owners consolidate their rights and provide joint licenses—can sometimes be employed to standardise products in manners that diminish competition, mainly when these pools impose limitations on pricing, geographic areas, or usage. Vertical distribution agreements can also facilitate cartel activities. For example, licensors may require licensees to uphold fixed resale prices, thereby eliminating price competition at the retail level. Such agreements can only effectively reduce competition if they encompass a substantial portion of the market.

Refusal to License

Although IP holders have no legal requirement to license their inventions, a refusal to do so in specific situations may be interpreted as anticompetitive. This is particularly true if denying access to the technology hinders the entry of new products into the market or eradicates competition in adjacent markets. A notable instance arises when a dominant firm possesses essential technology and declines to share it with rivals, thereby restricting innovation and consumer choices.

Standard-Essential Patents (SEPs)

Industry standards play a vital role in ensuring product compatibility and benefiting consumers. When a standard includes patented technology, that patent is identified as a "standard-essential patent" (SEP). SEP holders must license their technology on fair, reasonable, and non-discriminatory (FRAND) terms. However, some SEP proprietors misuse their position by demanding exorbitant royalties or refusing to license their patents to competitors under FRAND terms. This behaviour, known as "hold-up," can obstruct the adoption of industry standards, stifle innovation, and lead to inflated prices. In specific instances, SEP holders have pursued legal injunctions against firms willing to license the patents on fair terms. Regulatory bodies have deemed such actions anticompetitive, mainly when they coerce licensees into agreeing to unfavourable conditions.

ILE COMPETITION AND COMPANY LAW JOURNAL
VOLUME 3 AND ISSUE I OF 2025
APIS – 3920-0028 | ISSN - 2583-8385
Published by
Institute of Legal Education
https://iledu.in

Exclusionary Licensing Practices

Certain licensing agreements encompass stipulations that impede licensees from engaging with alternative technologies or conducting transactions with rival licensors. These stipulations may manifest as "tie-in" contracts, wherein the licensee is compelled to acquire supplementary, unrelated products from the licensor, or "tie-out" provisions, which restrict the utilisation of competing technologies. Such limitations can exacerbate the market penetration challenges for nascent entities and may unjustly constrain competitive dynamics. An additional illustration is provided by the "exclusive grant-back" provision, wherein the licensee consents to confer the licensor exclusive rights to any enhancements made to the licensed technology. Such contractual terms may diminish the licensee's impetus to innovate and perpetuate the licensor's dominion over a broader spectrum of technologies, thereby inhibiting competitive advancement.

Pay-for-Delay Agreements

In pharmaceuticals, specific patent settlements entail brand-name drug firms compensating generic manufacturers to postpone the introduction of more affordable alternatives. These "pay-for-delay" agreements curtail competition and sustain elevated drug prices. Judicial bodies have determined that such arrangements may contravene antitrust legislation, as they obstruct market entry not through inventive advancements but through financial inducements.

Patent Thickets

A multitude of overlapping patents safeguard a singular product or process, constituting what is referred to as a "patent thicket." These intricate intellectual property networks can complicate market entry for competitors, necessitating navigation through and licensing of various patents. This milieu may deter innovation and establish artificial barriers to entry, ultimately inflating costs for consumers.

Non-Price Predatory Practices

Entities may exploit intellectual property rights through litigation aimed solely at depleting competitors' resources rather than safeguarding legitimate interests. These "bad faith" lawsuits epitomise a form of non-price predation, as they seek to eradicate rivals or augment their operational expenditures without contributing any market efficiencies. While the bona fide enforcement of intellectual property rights is indispensable, frivolous, or abusive legal manoeuvres can unjustly disadvantage new entrants and distort competitive equilibrium.

Mergers and Acquisitions

Intellectual property is pivotal in corporate mergers and acquisitions, particularly within technology-centric sectors. The valuation of a firm's patents, trademarks, and other intellectual property assets can significantly affect such transactions. Nonetheless, when mergers diminish the number of competitors in a marketplace or excessively centralise intellectual property ownership, competition regulatory bodies may intervene to safeguard the integrity of innovation and consumer choice.[68]

Analysis

The Raghavan Committee emphasised that while all forms of Intellectual Property grant exclusive rights to their holders, these rights should not be used to create monopolies or distort market competition. Intellectual Property Rights (IPRs) are designed to incentivise innovation by granting creators protection and commercial benefits. However, using such rights must be balanced with the need to prevent anti-competitive practices that may arise from their misuse. When IPRs interfere with fair competition and significantly adversely impact the market, the Competition Act, 2002, empowers authorities to step in. Specifically,

[68] Anshika Tyagi, Balancing Intellectual Property Rights and Competition Law, Vol 3 Issue 4, IJIRL, 1-15 (2023) https://ijirl.com/wp-content/uploads/2023/07/BALANCING-INTELLECTUAL-PROPERTY-RIGHTS-AND-COMPETITION-LAW.pdf

ILE COMPETITION AND COMPANY LAW JOURNAL
VOLUME 3 AND ISSUE I OF 2025
APIS – 3920-0028 | ISSN - 2583-8385
Published by
Institute of Legal Education
https://iledu.in

Section 3(5) of the Act acknowledges the legitimacy of using IPRs, but only if such use is reasonable. This section permits rights holders to impose certain conditions when licensing their innovations, but those conditions must not be unfair or overly restrictive.

A relevant case addressed by the Competition Commission of India (CCI) involved a dispute between a film producers' group and multiplex owners. The producers argued that their actions were protected under Section 3(5), as they reasonably enforced their rights. However, the CCI ruled that IPRs do not override competition law entirely. Section 3(5) protection is limited and applies only when rights prevent infringement, not when they hinder market access or fair competition. Moreover, the safeguards under Section 3(5) are counterbalanced by Section 4(2) of the same Act,[69] which prohibits any abuse of dominant market position. While holding a dominant position is not inherently unlawful, exploiting that position through unfair practices such as imposing unreasonable conditions, discriminatory pricing, or restrictive agreements is considered abusive.

Following economic liberalisation and the shift to a free-market system, the approach to competition has evolved. While monopolies themselves are not illegal, abusing monopoly power is. Thus, IP rights must not be exercised in ways that harm consumers or limit market opportunities. In the context of licensing, the conditions imposed by IP holders must be fair and evaluated individually. For instance, the Patent Act discourages practices restricting technology transfer or making innovations unaffordable in the global market. Although disputes involving IPRs are often handled by higher courts such as the High Courts or the Supreme Court, the Raghavan Committee suggested the creation of a specialised authority to address anti-competitive concerns arising from IPR use. Indian legal practice and the Competition Act do not exclude such cases from CCI's jurisdiction.

The Competition Commission of India was officially constituted under Section 7 of the Act following a Supreme Court ruling, which also recommended forming a Competition Appellate Tribunal to provide regulatory oversight.[70] CCI has asserted its authority in matters involving both IPR and market dominance. A notable case involved the Swedish company Ericsson, which faced allegations of abusing its dominant position in the mobile technology market. The complaint was lodged by Micromax, an Indian phone manufacturer, who accused Ericsson of demanding excessive royalties based on the price of all the devices rather than the patented components and reporting Micromax to regulatory bodies. Ericsson challenged CCI's jurisdiction, arguing that such issues should be resolved under the Patents Act, particularly through provisions like compulsory licensing. However, the Delhi High Court clarified that both the Patents Act and the Competition Act offer distinct remedies, and the existence of one does not invalidate the other. Therefore, it concluded that CCI was within its rights to investigate and take appropriate action under the Competition Act.[71]

Copyright and competition law

Market analysis is fundamental in most competition law cases; those involving copyright are no different. It is crucial to grasp how authorities define and interpret "market," as describing the market is seldom a standalone task; it only serves as the beginning point for evaluating potential breaches of competition law. Notably, assessing the market value of copyright claims can be exceptionally intricate. This complexity stems from various elements, including the subjective nature of consumer preferences, especially when cultural

[69] The Competition Act, 2002, § 4(2)

[70] The Competition Act, 2002, § 7

[71] Madhav Mandhana, Convergence of Intellectual Property Rights and Competition Law: Emerging Need for the Right Balance in Indian Perspective, Vol 7 Issue 5, JLSR, 183-193 (2021) https://thelawbrigade.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/10/Madhav-Mandhana-JLSR.pdf

sensitivities come into play. Furthermore, the rapid pace of technological evolution, especially in media, complicates evaluating which distribution channels can substitute for one another. Increasingly, copyright-related matters intersect with what are referred to as two-sided markets. For example, the dynamics of the newspaper advertising market are quite different from those of the newspaper readers' market. As a result, authorities frequently examine the competitive effects across several interconnected markets. While the concepts of market dominance and definition are distinct, they are also interlinked. Copyright law confers exclusivity but does not imply dominance in antitrust law. A comprehensive examination of the relevant consumer base, including the presence of alternative providers, is critical to ascertain whether competition is negatively impacted. While safeguarding intellectual property can improve a company's market position, consumers seldom consider copyrighted products essential. Nevertheless, certain items, like academic journals or commonly-used software, can be vital due to network effects and functional necessity. Moreover, when intermediaries integrate copyrighted materials into their offerings, it can significantly affect market access for others. This trend is evident in music publishing, film distribution, and collective rights management industries.

Copyright Misuse and Market Competition

Copyright law constitutes a fundamental component of the framework for intellectual property protection, established to safeguard the entitlements of creators concerning their original literary, artistic, musical, cinematic, and software creations. It impedes unauthorised utilisation, replication, or public performance of these creative works, promoting innovation. Nevertheless, there are circumstances in which copyright protection is exploited, resulting in adverse ramifications for market competition and public accessibility. One manifestation of exploitation is the assertion of comprehensive copyright claims. In these instances, rightsholders endeavour to exert control over works or concepts that do not meet the criteria for protection. This encompasses efforts to assert ownership over general principles or ideas, notwithstanding the legal framework's clear delineation between safeguarding expressions and excluding abstract ideas from copyright protection. Another concern pertains to the strategic application of copyright to control market entry. Larger enterprises may use copyright infringement allegations to prevent competitors from launching analogous products or services. In specific scenarios, digital rights management (DRM) is utilised in restrictive manners that inhibit consumers from transitioning to alternative platforms, further entrenching monopolistic dominance. A concomitant issue is the emergence of copyright trolling. In these situations, entities initiate legal proceedings not to protect legitimate rights but to coerce others—often small enterprises or independent creators—into settling out of court. These trolls may generate substandard or generic content solely to instigate infringement claims, encumbering the legal system and engendering a chilling effect on competition due to apprehension of litigation. Moreover, anti-competitive conduct is intensified when corporations advocate for recurrent extensions of copyright durations. Although copyright protection is designed to be transient, such extensions hinder the transition of works into the public domain. This practice restricts access to culturally significant materials by engendering artificial scarcity, enabling corporations to monopolise resources that would otherwise be freely available, thereby constraining public advantage and market diversity.

Patent and Competition Law

Patent and competition laws play separate yet related roles within a nation's legal and economic system. Patent law encourages innovation by giving inventors exclusive rights to their inventions for a finite duration, enabling them to market their innovations without facing immediate competition. This exclusivity is

essential in pharmaceuticals, technology, and manufacturing, as it promotes research and development. However, excessive exclusivity can lead to monopolistic practices, obstruct market entry, and adversely impact consumer welfare if misapplied. Here, competition law becomes essential in curbing anti-competitive behaviours that may arise from the misuse of patent rights. In India, the Patents Act of 1970 regulates the issuance and enforcement of patents, while the Competition Act of 2002 addresses concerns such as abuse of dominance and restrictive trade practices. Conflicts can arise when patent owners engage in tactics like evergreening—making minor modifications to extend their patent duration, imposing restrictive licensing terms, delaying the entry of generic products, or preventing competitors from entering the market. The Competition Commission of India (CCI) steps in when necessary to mitigate such market competition distortions. The interplay between patent and competition law is particularly pertinent in industries where patents often lead to market monopolies. While patents are vital for financing innovation in sectors like healthcare and technology, unchecked protection can lead to elevated prices and limited access. Courts and regulators in India and worldwide consistently strive to find a middle ground between fostering innovation and preserving competitive markets. Achieving this equilibrium is crucial for preventing exploitation and promoting an environment where innovation can flourish without compromising consumer interests.

India's legal framework includes two complementary laws, the Patents Act and the Competition Act. The Patents Act encourages innovation by granting exclusive rights, while the Competition Act ensures these rights are not exploited to create monopolies or hinder competition. Concerns such as price manipulation, unfair licensing practices, or supply limitations illustrate how these laws converge. Examining both statutes shows they share a mutual objective: to sustain a balance between fostering innovation and ensuring competitive fairness. The Patents Act outlines a system for inventors to secure exclusive rights over their inventions for 20 years, prohibiting unauthorised manufacturing, usage, or sales. Section 84 of the Act introduces compulsory licensing to ensure patents do not obstruct public access. If vital products, especially life-saving medications, are not adequately available or affordable, the government can permit other manufacturers to produce and sell them. This provision highlights the importance of balancing patent protection with the broader public interest. Conversely, the Competition Act, which the CCI enforces, aims to eradicate anti-competitive conduct such as mergers that could harm market competition, abusive dominance, and restrictive agreements. The Act prohibits agreements that have an appreciable adverse effect on competition (AAEC). For instance, when a patent holder declines to license essential technology or imposes unreasonably high royalty fees, the Competition Act becomes applicable.

The convergence of patent and competition law becomes particularly clear when patent rights are exploited to obtain unfair advantages in the market. Section 4 of the Competition Act deals with practices such as discriminatory terms, unfair pricing, and refusal to engage, which can signify an abuse of a dominant market position. Patent holders with substantial market power might leverage their rights to prevent competitors from accessing critical inputs or technologies. The Competition Commission of India (CCI) has actively pursued investigations into these occurrences to limit monopolistic behaviours and foster a competitive landscape. Additionally, industries heavily reliant on patents are closely examined under the merger control provisions in Sections 5 and 6 of the Competition Act. These sections empower the CCI to evaluate and potentially block combinations like mergers or acquisitions that could harm competition. This examination is especially crucial in high-stakes sectors such as biotechnology, pharmaceuticals, and digital

technology, where consolidation can result in elevated consumer costs and diminished innovation.

A cohesive legal strategy is essential to harmonise patent protection objectives with competition law's goals. The Indian judiciary and regulatory authorities have striven to maintain innovators' rights while promoting market fairness and protecting consumer interests. The evolving legal perspective in India increasingly favours equitable licensing practices, just pricing, and broader accessibility to patented advancements, mirroring global tendencies. It is therefore essential to interpret both the Patents Act and the Competition Act in ways that support their respective aims. Patent rights should not lead to actions that hinder fair competition. India's legal framework must keep evolving in response to new market dynamics by refining its legislative and regulatory strategies to maintain this sensitive balance. Sections 3 and 4 of the Competition Act are crucial in this regard. Section 3 prohibits practices such as price-fixing, exclusive supply agreements, and refusal to engage, all of which can emerge from restrictive licensing by patent holders. For instance, if a pharmaceutical company engages in agreements that prevent generic manufacturers from producing a drug after patent expiration, it would breach this provision. Likewise, Section 4 addresses the abuse of dominance through unfair pricing, predatory actions, or denial of market entry. In the prominent Ericsson case, the firm was accused of charging excessive royalties for its Standard Essential Patents (SEPs), violating fair, reasonable, and non-discriminatory (FRAND) licensing principles. The CCI's role in investigating such allegations highlights the significance of competition enforcement in overseeing patent-related market behaviour.

Trade Marks and Competition Law

Trademark and competition law fulfil different yet complementary functions within a legal framework. Trademark law mainly preserves brand identity by granting businesses exclusive rights over unique identifiers like logos, names, and symbols. These rights assist in distinguishing products and services in the marketplace, enhancing consumer awareness and trust, and protecting the integrity and value of the brand. Such protection encourages companies to invest in quality and innovation, as they know their brand reputation is secured. On the other hand, competition law focuses on maintaining fair market practices by prohibiting monopolistic behaviours, anti-competitive agreements, and the misuse of market power. Its goal is to ensure that competition is based on capability rather than limiting strategies, thus fostering consumer options and preserving open, competitive markets. While trademark law allows for exclusivity, competition law ensures that this exclusivity does not result in an unfair competitive edge or mislead consumers.

The intersection of these two legal areas becomes particularly significant when trademark rights are utilised in ways that obstruct market entry or confuse consumers. For instance, a dominant player in the market might exploit trademark protection to prevent new competitors or engage in misleading branding tactics. In these scenarios, competition law ensures that trademark protections are applied and do not disrupt fair competition. These legal structures collectively encourage a marketplace that promotes brand innovation and fair access for businesses. In today's economic landscape, trademarks are valuable intangible assets embodying a company's goodwill, identity, and reputation. They play a crucial role in assisting consumers in differentiating products, building trust, and fostering brand loyalty. This importance goes beyond simple identification; trademarks affect purchasing decisions and can provide a competitive edge. Companies invest heavily in developing strong brand images, which can also generate revenue through licensing and franchising. However, this advantage is at risk without adequate legal safeguards, particularly against counterfeit goods, trademark violations, or unfair competitive actions.

The Competition Commission of India (CCI) has a vital role to protect these interests and maintain market integrity. Although the Trademark Act, 1999, serves as the primary legislation governing trademark rights, the CCI addresses anti-competitive behaviour such as abuse of dominance, misleading practices, or exclusionary manoeuvres that endanger fair market conditions. By overseeing mergers, examining monopolistic behaviour, and analysing anti-competitive agreements, the CCI ensures that trademark protections do not become mechanisms for market manipulation. This function aligns with its broader goal of fostering fair competition, improving market efficiency, and safeguarding consumer welfare. Consequently, the significance of trademark protection extends beyond the interests of individual enterprises. It serves as a foundational element in sustaining a competitive and transparent marketplace. As the distinctions between brand value and market dominance continue to merge in modern economies, the proactive involvement of competition authorities is crucial to guarantee that the rights granted by trademark law are exercised responsibly and do not hinder the principles of fair trade.[72]

Global Perspective

The relationship between intellectual property (IP) and competition law has been recognised on a global scale for a long time. In 1948, the Havana Charter for the International Trade Organisation acknowledged the importance of controlling anti-competitive behaviours and promoted cooperation among nations to tackle these issues. Between the 1960s and the 1980s, there was significant focus on the connection between intellectual property rights (IPRs), the transfer of technology, and competition within the marketplace. This led to the United Nations General Assembly adopting a resolution in 1980 that established fair principles and guidelines for managing restrictive business practices, especially concerning intellectual property. The Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS) created a framework for competition protections. It highlights that the establishment of competition policies concerning IPRs is mainly within the domain of individual member states. Nonetheless, these national policies must conform to the main goals of TRIPS, especially regarding the safeguarding and sharing technological advancements. Member nations can act against the misuse of IPRs if such measures do not conflict with TRIPS regulations. Valid responses to patent misuse cases include remedial options such as compulsory licensing. National authorities can also impose penalties or issue injunctions to combat anti-competitive behaviour. Moreover, member states can determine what constitutes abusive IPR activities within their legal frameworks, providing them significant discretion in crafting and enforcing competition policies related to IP. In addition, international guidelines concerning intellectual property licensing highlight three fundamental principles. Firstly, IP is regarded as any other form of property when analysed under competition law. Secondly, the presence of IPRs does not necessarily indicate market dominance. Lastly, licensing agreements are generally perceived as beneficial to competition, allowing businesses to combine complementary resources and improve productivity.[73]

Convergence between Antitrust Law and Intellectual Property in the United States

The basis of intellectual property law in the United States is rooted in the Constitution, which seeks to promote advancements in science and the arts. This goal has influenced both legislative measures and judicial interpretations, leading to a broad approach to Intellectual Property Rights (IPRs). Historically,

[72] Khushi Rajvanshi and Archana Agarwal, IPR v/s Competition Law: A Critical Study of their Convergence and Conflict in the Indian Legal Landscape, Vol 5 Issue 3, IJALR, 1-13 (2025) https://ijalr.in/wp-content/uploads/2025/04/khushi-rp.pdf

[73] Gitanjali Shankar and Nitika Gupta, Intellectual Property and Competition Law: Divergence, Convergence and Independence, Vol 4 Issue 1, NUJSLR, 115-132 (2011) https://nujslawreview.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/12/gitanjali.pdf

U.S. courts have adopted an expansive view, acknowledging protections for innovations such as genetically modified organisms, software, and business methods. Simultaneously, a strong set of antitrust laws is in place to preserve competitive markets and improve consumer welfare. These laws primarily stem from the Sherman Act of 1890 and the Clayton Act of 1914. The Sherman Act forbids agreements or conspiracies that unreasonably restrict trade, including practices like price fixing and market division. While certain behaviours are deemed inherently unlawful, others are evaluated based on the "rule of reason," which assesses their effects on market competition. The Act also targets monopolistic behaviour, prohibiting any attempts to monopolise trade. Such actions are evaluated based on intent and anti-competitive conduct, such as selling below cost or unjustly refusing to engage with specific businesses.

In this framework, a noticeable conflict often emerges between the exclusive nature of IPRs, which confer temporary monopolies, and the antitrust principles that oppose market dominance. However, contemporary interpretations increasingly view these two legal areas as complementary rather than opposing. A pivotal advancement in this perspective has been incorporating innovation-driven economics, highlighting the significance of competition through technological progress rather than solely focusing on lower prices. This viewpoint, influenced by economist Joseph Schumpeter's theories, argues that the most significant competition arises from groundbreaking innovations, new products, methods, and market structures that challenge and may supersede established market leaders. Such dynamic competition is deemed crucial for economic development and long-term consumer benefits. Reflecting this shifting mindset, U.S. antitrust agencies have adjusted their focus to promote compatibility between competition policy and intellectual property. This is evident in the joint guidelines published by the Department of Justice and the Federal Trade Commission, which acknowledge the vital role of IPRs in fostering innovation while warning against their misuse to suppress competition. Judicial rulings have also contributed to this equilibrium. For instance, in a prominent case involving a technology firm's refusal to supply patented components to independent repair services, the Supreme Court determined that using a legal advantage like a patent to dominate another market could breach antitrust laws.[74] This ruling established that merely owning an IPR is insufficient justification for denying access or imposing unreasonable constraints; there must also be evidence of exclusionary conduct. In another significant case, a group of railway companies used their control over a key transportation hub to hinder competition. The Supreme Court found that such coordinated actions limited trade and represented an unlawful attempt to monopolise an essential service, ordering the consortium to provide access to other service providers. These cases illustrate that while intellectual property rights grant exclusivity, they should not be exercised in a way that undermines fair competition. U.S. legal doctrine continues to evolve to ensure that innovation is rewarded without compromising consumer welfare and market accessibility.

Indian Perspective: Insights for Developing Countries Sustained economic growth heavily depends on two fundamental components: intense competition and ongoing innovation. However, reconciling these goals can be difficult, particularly since Intellectual Property (IP) laws inherently provide exclusivity to creators and innovators. At the same time, competition policies aim to eliminate obstacles that impede free market operations. This apparent contradiction poses a considerable regulatory challenge for emerging economies. Although developed regions like the United States and the European Union have found a workable balance through established legal

[74] Jain, Arahant and Jindel, Shubha, Paradoxical Relationship: Intellectual Property Rights and the Competition Policy (March 1, 2014). Available at SSRN: https://ssrn.com/abstract=2407642 or http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2407642

frameworks, numerous developing nations struggle to achieve this equilibrium. These countries are increasingly aware that nurturing innovation is vital for economic transformation. Yet, they must ensure that intellectual property is not utilised in a way that limits market access or undermines fair competition. India's economic shift following the 1991 reforms ushered in a heightened focus on liberalisation, globalisation, and privatisation. Legislative advancements, including revisions to the Monopolies and Restrictive Trade Practices (MRTP) Act and the introduction of the Competition Act, signified India's dedication to contemporary economic governance. The creation of the Competition Commission of India (CCI) illustrated an effort to establish a market environment that fosters fair competition, safeguards consumer interests, and facilitates open commerce. At the same time, India aligned its intellectual property laws with international standards as outlined in the TRIPS Agreement. This dual focus on competition and innovation became crucial for maintaining economic resilience and encouraging equitable growth. However, addressing the intrinsic tension between Intellectual Property Rights (IPR) and competition law requires a more structured policy framework to define the boundaries and interrelations of both systems. Indian judicial bodies have similarly addressed the concept of refusal to deal within the framework of competition law. In a pivotal case, the judiciary recognised the intrinsic monopoly conferred by copyright laws but clarified that this monopoly does not extend to actions that inhibit market competition. The refusal to license or engage in commerce may be considered anti-competitive if it restricts market dynamics or engenders inequitable barriers. The Supreme Court has reiterated this perspective, particularly when right-holders imposed restrictions that transcended the mere protection of their intellectual property and encroached upon market manipulation. Thus, the equilibrium resides in ensuring that intellectual property rights fulfil their fundamental purpose of promoting innovation without facilitating their exploitation as instruments for market exclusion.[75]

The Doctrine of Essential Facilities and Market Control

The term "essential facility" pertains to the infrastructure or services vital for other enterprises to compete effectively in a market. When such facilities are monopolistically controlled, access must be granted on equitable and non-discriminatory conditions. The essential facilities doctrine has been utilised when prohibiting access, which could result in unfair market control or extend monopolistic dominance across different sectors. The fundamental principle behind this doctrine is that monopolists should not exploit their exclusive control over essential inputs to obstruct competition. If there are similar alternatives to the facility available in the market, this doctrine generally becomes inapplicable, as competitive forces can govern behaviour without the need for regulatory intervention.

Balancing Monopoly and Abuse of Dominance

The conferment of exclusive rights under intellectual property (IP) regimes, including patents and copyrights, confers a transient monopoly upon rightsholders. Nevertheless, these rights are not without limitations. When exclusivity is employed to inhibit competition instead of fostering innovation, competition law intervenes. For example, the refusal to license intellectual property may be deemed anti-competitive if it obstructs market entry or completely eradicates competition. Indian jurisprudence has acknowledged this delicate equilibrium. In prominent rulings, judicial authorities have recognised the elevated legal status of original creative works while asserting that the commercial exploitation of such rights

[75] Aakriti Sinha, Interface Between IP Laws and Competition Policy: Safeguard Against Anti-Competitive Activities of IP Owners, Vol 4 Issue 3, JCLJ, 621-632 (2024) https://www.juscorpus.com/wp-content/uploads/2024/05/68.-Aakriti-Sinha.pdf

ILE COMPETITION AND COMPANY LAW JOURNAL
VOLUME 3 AND ISSUE I OF 2025
APIS – 3920-0028 | ISSN - 2583-8385
Published by
Institute of Legal Education
https://iledu.in

is not exempt from antitrust examination. Consequently, the Competition Commission of India (CCI) has actively scrutinised practices within the entertainment industry, identifying cartelization, abuse of dominance, and inequitable licensing practices.

Technological Tying and Refusal to Deal

Technological tying represents a category of anti-competitive conduct wherein a company amalgamates its principal product with complementary goods in a manner that constrains consumer options or hampers market entry. A paradigmatic instance involves an organisation incorporating software to operate solely with its proprietary systems, thereby effectively excluding competitors. This concern garnered international prominence in the Microsoft litigation, where the corporation faced allegations of bundling its Internet Explorer browser with the Windows operating system to suppress competition. Investigations conducted by the European Commission concluded that Microsoft had exploited its dominant position to undermine competing technologies. Although Microsoft defended its actions by invoking its intellectual property rights, judicial authorities determined that, under specific circumstances, refusal to license or permit access could constitute an abuse of dominance. Mandatory licensing in such contexts was perceived not as a deterrent to innovation but as a mechanism to equalise competitive conditions, notably when it augmented incentives for rival firms to innovate. The courts underscored that possessing IP rights does not inherently validate anti-competitive practices, and each case necessitates an assessment of the broader implications for consumer choice and market innovation.

Conclusion

The interplay between intellectual property (IP) and competition law is intricate and varied, influencing the mechanisms of innovation, market behaviour, and regulatory frameworks. This essay has explored the essential theories, historical development, recent changes, and real-world consequences of their relationship. It has offered a comprehensive examination of the intersections between these legal fields, emphasising the importance of IP rights in fostering innovation and the goals of competition law in promoting open and accessible markets. Intellectual property law provides creators and inventors exclusive rights to their intangible creations, such as patents, trademarks, copyrights, and trade secrets. These rights encourage innovation by offering financial and legal motivations to invest in research and development. Consequently, new ideas and technological advancements are available to the public. However, while these protections can promote innovation, they can also result in monopolistic behaviours that diminish market competition and limit access to vital goods and information. Conversely, competition law focuses on maintaining fair and competitive markets that serve the interests of consumers. It is intended to avert monopolisation, collusion, and exploitation of market power, which can threaten consumer welfare and economic efficiency. By fostering competition, this legal structure stimulates innovation, enhances efficiency, and broadens consumer options. However, tensions can arise when competition law is applied in contexts involving influential holders of intellectual property, leading to potential conflicts between promoting innovation and ensuring equitable market practices. This conflict becomes especially evident in industries marked by swift technological advancements and high levels of creativity, where firms heavily depend on IP rights to secure returns on their research and development investments. Simultaneously, an excessive concentration of such rights can result in market domination, hindering consumer access and suppressing competition. The global character of contemporary markets adds to the challenges at the intersection of IP and competition law. Variations in legal systems and enforcement approaches across different countries can create further difficulties

for companies operating on an international scale, complicating the equilibrium between innovation and competition.

The relationship between intellectual property and competition law is still a dynamic and expanding topic of legal research and policy-making. While intellectual property rights are essential for stimulating creativity and innovation, competition law prevents market abuses and ensures fair competition. Striking the correct balance between these two frameworks is critical for driving innovation, protecting consumer interests, and improving overall societal welfare. As global economies become more interconnected and technology continues to transform industries, policymakers, regulators, corporations, and the general public must better comprehend how these forces interact. It is feasible to construct legal systems that protect intellectual property while also keeping markets open, fair, and conducive to ongoing innovation and inclusive growth via continued research, conversation, and collaboration.[76]

[76] Tripti Jaiswal & Dr. Kavita Sharma, Intellectual Property and Competition Law: Understanding the Interplay, Vol 12 Issue 4, IJCRT, 863-871 (2024) https://ijcrt.org/papers/IJCRT2404097.pdf