International Journal of Leading Research Publication
IJLRP

© IJLRP | ISSN (O) - 2582-8010
November 2021 | Vol. 2 Issue. 3
www.ijlrp.com

IPR DISPUTES AND ADR

Rakesh Kumar Seth

Research Scholar, Faculty of Law, Tantia University, Sri Ganganagar

ABSTRACT

The article covers the various methods of ADR available and its correlation with IPR mainly in the dispute section. WIPO covers the centres established for Mediation and states techniques that are required to be followed during the same. There are multiple benefits of ADR if used with respect to autonomy, neutral umpire. However, the limitations and issues attached to it should be ignored regarding limited binding orders, settlement through only formal proceedings. In India, recently the trends of ADR in all the proceedings have seen a hike and a swift shift can be observed in IPR disputes as well.

Keyword: *Autonomy, correlation, limitations, trends, WIPO*

1. INTRODUCTION

The opportunities for cross-border intellectual property (IP) disputes have been enhanced by the rise in international transactions. New forms of IP conflicts can be created by global challenges – for instance, digital environments, climate change issues, healthcare access, the preservation of traditional information and cultural expressions and biodiversity protection. In the meantime, the economic downturn induces interested parties to look for more productive and cost-effective forms of settling such conflicts than through court proceedings – making ADR an ever more appealing alternative.

The IPR typically grants the designer an exclusive right for a certain period of time to use his product. The topic of intellectual property (IP) is the result of the mind or the intellect. Including Patents; trademarks; geographical indications; manufacturing designs; integrated circuit layout designs; plants security and copyright, etc. One can own, be legacy, sell or buy IP. Its intangibility and non-exhaustion are the key features that distinguish it from any other type. IP is the cornerstone of an information economy. It encompasses all sectors of the economy and becomes ever more important to ensure the competitiveness of the enterprise.

In the past, real arbitration and mediation capabilities were not used, as IP owners and lawyers stuck to conventional courts. However, things have changed in recent years and parties are now more likely to settle their differences in this new way. The ADR is improved by efficient domain name resolution mechanisms, such as the Dispute Resolution Policy for a Uniform Domain Name. The trademark owners can now defend their trademarks on the Internet.

ADR applies to impartial agreements allowing parties, with the help of a qualified neutral intermediary of their choosing, to settle their conflicts outside court in a private forum. ADR may only be enforced if both parties consent or are mandated by the competent court to refer their dispute to the proceedings. The advantages include time and economy, versatility, control by parties, neutrality, a single strategy, confidentiality and expertise.

Techniques of ADR6 WIPO's Arbitration and Mediation Center -

"The WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (WIPO Center) was established in 1994 on a not-for-profit basis to facilitate the time and cost-effective resolution of IP and related disputes through ADR. It is recognized as an international and neutral forum especially appropriate for cross-border and cross-cultural disputes and conducts procedures under the WIPO Mediation, Expedited Arbitration, Arbitration and Expert Determination Rules (WIPO Rules). The WIPO Rules contain specific provisions that are particularly suitable for IP and related disputes, such as those concerning confidentiality and technical evidence. However, their scope is not limited to such disputes and they can be and have been, successfully applied in other areas. The WIPO Center makes available, in different languages, model clauses and agreements that parties may use as a basis for submitting their disputes to WIPO. As experience has shown, the effectiveness of ADR depends largely on the quality of the mediator, arbitrator or expert. The WIPO Center maintains a database of over 1,500 qualified neutrals from 70 countries with further candidates added according to case needs, and it assists in the appointment of neutrals in each case.

© IJLRP | ISSN (O) - 2582-8010
November 2021 | Vol. 2 Issue. 3
www.ijlrp.com

The following ways for settling conflicts are given by WIPO.

- Meditation. Mediation. An informal mechanism by which a neutral individual, the mediator, allows the parties to resolve the conflict.
- Adjudicate. A structured process where the arbitrator makes a binding decision on the dispute is brought before the arbitrator.
- In the absence of arbitration, mediation followed.

Benefits of the use of ADR in IP conflict resolution.

The benefits of ADR have increasingly been recognized lately because of its quick resolving and other reasons as mentioned below –

- A single process – Court litigation may include multiple cases in various jurisdictions with the possibility of conflicting outcomes in international IP disputes. By way of ADR, a dispute concerning a right secured in a variety of countries can be settled by the parties within a single process to avoid cost and difficulty in multi-law litigation.
- The autonomy of a group- Parties can decide how to settle their dispute. The conventional route of litigation is not needed.
- ADR operates like a neutral umpire. No party may benefit from the benefits of domestic litigation.
- Competence -The most important thing is for parties to choose an arbitrator who is expert in their profession, as part of this conventional form of resolved disputes.
- Confidentiality - Settling conflicts by ADRs is the easiest and safest way to preserve confidentiality. As key actors, privacy and confidentiality Finality and the execution of arbitral awards are of huge importance. Arbitral awards usually do not have to be appealed. They can be introduced without unnecessary delay immediately.

The research activities of licenced innovators are measured on the basis that the rights to 'intellectual success' are indicated. Protection against intellectual property allows the producer the right to use its power over externals that try to use their incentives for all the hard work without its permission. The method of thinking about the formation of rights is overcome by the danger of being unavailable. The owners of licenced inventions ought to be their guardian dogs and to present the courts with an action plan to invade their rights. Indian Courts are making a big leap in advancing the safe innovation mechanism in India, so that, if another contest target is submitted, the open assets can be better and lawfully used by the Courts of India. Patent law and copyright law, which provide integration of science and knowledge of creativity, need special arbitration officials who can appreciate, with no raising in the finger, the multidisciplinary idea of the current event.

The minimal assurance idea given to the owner of secured innovation rights needs systems for prompt and rapid equity implementation. In its assessment of the Indian Legal Executive's presentation in cases associated with licenced innovation rights the Supreme Court of India held that "Without looking at the benefits of the discussion, we believe the issues with trademarks, copyrights and licences should be addressed by lonely

The case of issues with IPR primarily dealt with between meetings on the transient directive with respect to trade names, copyrights and licences, but it goes on for a substantial amount of time, with the consequence that the suit will not be eventually picked. That's not right. In our assessment, all the Courts should carefully agree on the stipulation of Rule 1(2) C.P.C.'s “requirements in relation to the recognition of trademarks, copyrights and licences, and the details on the case in these cases should remain on a daily basis and the final decision should be issued annually within four months of the date of the prosecution's registration."

The Supreme Court of India, stressing its position at Bajaj Auto Ltd. v. TVS Motor Company Ltd., held that "experience shows the long-standing litigation in the nation with the issues of licences, trademarks and copyright and the trial has largely been dealt with by transitory order gatherings. This situation is unacceptable and so, in the previously mentioned scenario, we passed the above-mentioned request to represent the shopping areas. We direct that all courts and councils complete now and reliably the headings in the previously mentioned application."

It is clear that the exploited gathering chooses interchange competition objectives components to move forward with licenced innovation rights in India, because of the unjustifiable postponement in case removal and costly prosecutions that could drag out the assurance agreed to the work in place. Furthermore, this approach

© IJLRP | ISSN (O) - 2582-8010
November 2021 | Vol. 2 Issue. 3
www.ijlrp.com

is needed for the business idea of the exchanges involving the leading part of protected innovation cases.

There are also limits.

1. Disputes can be settled only by formal proceedings.
2. The arbitrator's ruling is only binding on the parties.
3. Since ADR is fully focused on cooperation, it is less acceptable for any party to be non-cooperating.

Trends in WIPO mediation and arbitration

"The WIPO Center – having administered over 80 mediations and 110 arbitrations, the majority of which were filed in the last four years – has observed various trends and developments in IP dispute resolution:

41 per cent of the administered procedures were mediation cases, 49 per cent standard arbitration, and 10 per cent expedited arbitration.

The WIPO clauses and procedures are often found in a combined model. For example, the most frequently used WIPO clause is that providing for "mediation, followed in the absence of a settlement by (expedited) arbitration". It has the advantage of giving parties the opportunity to settle their case in a more informal forum before moving to arbitration.

WIPO standard arbitration tends to be used in more complex cases such as patent disputes, which generally last from 12 to 18 months. WIPO expedited arbitration is primarily used in disputes where a lower amount is at stake, less voluminous and technical evidence is involved and where a quick result is needed, which tends to be the case for trademark and software-related disputes. In general, the expedited arbitration procedure takes up to six months.

WIPO mediation and arbitration have been used in disputes covering a variety of fields, including patent infringement and licenses, information technology transactions, telecommunications, distribution agreements for pharmaceutical products, copyright issues, research and development agreements, knowledge transfer, trademark coexistence agreements, art marketing agreements, joint venture agreements, engineering disputes, life sciences, sports, entertainment, domain name disputes and cases arising out of agreements in settlement of prior multi-jurisdictional IP litigation. Parties have also used the Center's services in non-IP-related disputes, such as general contractual matters, insurance, construction and employment (at an IP law firm).

2. WHY ADR SHOULD BE AVOIDED IN IPR DISPUTES?

The ADR for IP disputes also simply cannot be used: ADR relies on the approval of the conflict parties (whether before the dispute occurs or as in an arbitration clause of the transaction contract or after the dispute arises, as in a formal agreement on the arbitration of an established dispute). In other cases, there might still be reasons why one party or the other would not wish to agree to settle IP disagreements through arbitration and some sort of ADR, even in the sense of a current partnership or prospective transaction. The following are some of the reasons:

Concern About the Need for Emergency Injunctive Relief

An IP rightsholder may consider that full protection and vindication of the rights depends and that such relief is obtaining more probable from a public court than from an arbitrators' tribunal, on the availability of an immediate injunctive relief (e.g., a temporary restraining order or a form of injunction that prevents the use or disclosure of an IP). This perception indicates an exception to the trend that arbitration and ADR are probably more likely than public court trials to bring about speedier IP proceedings. In accordance with special provisions in national arbitration law approving such relief, an arbitral tribunal may, of course, also have the option of granting injunctive relief in the form of an interim or provisional order approved by the procedural rules under which the arbitration is subject or by a public tribunal before the Arbitral Tribunal. In relation to this later prospect of legal salvation, however, a limited minority of courts in the U.S. refuse to offer such provisional relief on the basis of the violation of Federal Arbitration Act and the New York Convention, including the issuance of judgements before an arbitral tribunal. This question should be expected and answered in every conflict arbitration clause, although it is a distinct minority position, in which one or more of the parties agree that injunctive recourse is important.

The Strategic Need for Precedent or Publicity

Sometimes an IP holder or a suspected infringer may wish to see its rights fully and publicly protected. A holder of IP rights, for instance, who is about to enter into a series of negotiations on adversarial licences may feel that the advantages of preferring a favourable public judicial reclamation of his rights (and the potential to outweigh the chance of no vexation, or of adverse judgments).

© IJLRP | ISSN (O) - 2582-8010
November 2021 | Vol. 2 Issue. 3
www.ijlrp.com

3. CONCLUSION

Even before the new act 'The Arbitration and Conciliation Act 1996' emerged in India, the ADR was in existence. The Old Arbitration Act of 1940 included ADR. Section 89 of the Civil Procedure code of 1908 has since been introduced and updated to allow conflicts to be resolved outside the court, with the consent of the parties. The current law of 1996 reflects the provisions of the Model UNCITRAL.

In India, it is not well settled the arbitrability of the arguments of substantive IP rules. The use of arbitration was not expected when the Arbitration and Conciliation Act of 1996 was passed to settle IP disputes. In respect of the execution of arbitration awards which involve the findings of IP validity or violation, the ArBitration and Conciliation Act 1996 and various IP Acts are silent. Article 103 of the Patents Act, which applies when a government wants to use a patented invention, contains a provision enabling the court to refer any matter to arbitration (including issues concerning patent validity). However, Indian courts' rulings on the objective arbitrability of substantive IP law have not been reported. As a viable choice in IP disputes, Arbitration and Conciliation Act 1996 does not have a proper structure/encouragement for arbitration. However, the major issue is of the delay - The IP owner shall have the exclusive right for a limited time to commercially exploit the product. A dispute settlement mechanism is therefore required which settles the IP conflicts promptly. As it is quicker, arbitration is deemed viable. Arbitration was enforced in India both to reduce the burden on the courts and to settle trade disputes more promptly. But arbitration did not fulfil its function in practicality, because it takes longer than expected.

REFRENCE

1. https://www.wipo.int/wipo_magazine/en/2009/03/article_0008.html#:~:text=ADR%20refers%20to%20neutral%20mechanisms,neutral%20intermediary%20of%20their%20choice.
2. Shree Vardhman Rice and Gen Mills v. Amar Singh Chawalwala, FAO (O) No. 138 of 1996 & C.M.No. 842 of 2001
3. https://www.wipo.int/wipo_magazine/en/2009/03/article_0008.html#:~:text=ADR%20refers%20to%20neutral%20mechanisms,neutral%20intermediary%20of%20their%20choice.