# A CRITICAL ANALYSIS OF INDIA'S LEGISLATIVE FRAMEWORK FOR THE PROTECTION OF TRADITIONAL KNOWLEDGE

**BY- ALPIKA SHRIVASTAVA**

ASSISTANT PROFESSOR OF LAW

JAGANNATH UNIVERSITY, JAIPUR

**YUKTA**

RESEARCH SCHOLAR

JAGANNATH UNIVERSITY, JAIPUR

**ABSTRACT**

This research paper provides a critical analysis of the Indian legislative framework governing the protection of Traditional Knowledge (TK) within the broader ambit of Intellectual Property Rights (IPR). India, a mega-biodiverse country with a rich repository of indigenous wisdom, faces the persistent challenge of biopiracy and the unauthorized commercial exploitation of its heritage. The study evaluates the efficacy of existing legal instruments, primarily the Biological Diversity Act (2002) and the Patents Act (1970), in safeguarding TK from misappropriation.

A central focus of this analysis is the Traditional Knowledge Digital Library (TKDL), a pioneering defensive mechanism designed to prevent the erroneous grant of patents. While the TKDL has successfully thwarted numerous international patent claims on Indian medicinal plants, this paper argues that "defensive protection" alone is insufficient. The research identifies significant lacunae, including the absence of a robust *sui generis* (unique) legislation that grants "positive rights" to indigenous communities, the complexities of Access and Benefit Sharing (ABS), and the struggle to align collective community ownership with the individualistic nature of modern IPR.

Furthermore, the paper examines the judicial interpretation of TK protection and the administrative hurdles faced by the National Biodiversity Authority (NBA). By contrasting India's domestic policies with international standards like the Nagoya Protocol, the study concludes that a holistic legal reform—one that balances commercial innovation with the socio-economic rights of traditional practitioners—is imperative to transition from mere preservation to sustainable empowerment.

**Keywords: Traditional Knowledge (TK); Biopiracy; Intellectual Property Rights (IPR); Traditional Knowledge Digital Library (TKDL)**

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The concept of Traditional Knowledge (TK) serves as the cultural and scientific backbone of many developing nations, particularly India. It encompasses the collective wisdom, innovations, and practices of indigenous and local communities that have been refined and passed down through generations. Unlike the conventional Western model of Intellectual Property Rights (IPR), which is built upon the pillars of individual ownership, industrial application, and a fixed duration of protection, Traditional Knowledge is inherently communal, often oral, and evolves continuously over time. It is not merely a set of instructions for medicinal or agricultural use but a living heritage that is deeply intertwined with the spiritual and social identity of the communities that safeguard it. In the globalized economy of the 21st century, this ancient wisdom has become a highly valuable commodity, leading to a complex clash between traditional lifestyles and modern commercial interests.

India's journey toward formalizing a legal defense for its heritage was accelerated by several high-profile instances of biopiracy that occurred in the late 20th century. The infamous legal battles over the patenting of Neem, Turmeric, and Basmati rice by foreign corporations served as a wake-up call for the Indian government and civil society. In these cases, international entities sought to claim exclusive commercial rights over biological resources and methods that had been part of the Indian public domain for millennia. For example, the attempt to patent the wound-healing properties of turmeric—a practice known to almost every Indian household—exposed the fundamental flaws in global patent systems, which often failed to recognize "prior art" if it was not documented in Western scientific journals. These controversies highlighted a form of "knowledge colonization," where indigenous wisdom was extracted, slightly modified, and then sold back to the world under the protection of modern law, often without any credit or compensation flowing back to the original custodians.

The critical analysis of India's legislative framework must therefore be understood as a response to this systemic vulnerability. To counter these threats, India has developed a unique multi-pronged strategy that attempts to bridge the gap between ancient traditions and modern statutes. This involves a delicate balancing act: protecting the rights of the community while encouraging scientific research and economic growth. The primary legislative pillars—the Biological Diversity Act of 2002 and the Patents Act of 1970—along with the administrative innovation of the Traditional Knowledge Digital Library (TKDL), represent India's effort to create a "defensive shield" against external exploitation.

However, despite these pioneering efforts, the framework remains under intense scrutiny. Critics argue that while India has become adept at preventing others from stealing its knowledge, it has yet to create a system that allows indigenous communities to effectively exercise "positive rights" over their own intellectual assets. The tension remains between the need for strict regulation to prevent biopiracy and the need for a flexible system that allows for the sustainable commercialization of traditional products. This introduction sets the stage for an in-depth examination of whether India's current laws are sufficient to protect its biocultural heritage in an era of rapid biotechnological advancement, or if a more radical, community-centric legal reform is required to ensure true bio-justice.

## 2. THE INDIAN LEGISLATIVE FRAMEWORK

India's approach is a multi-layered system involving both proactive documentation and restrictive legislation.

### 2.1 The Biological Diversity Act, 2002 (BDA)

The BDA was enacted to fulfill India's obligations under the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD). Its primary goal is the conservation of biological diversity and the fair sharing of benefits arising from the use of biological resources (Heinrich et al., 2020).

- **National Biodiversity Authority (NBA):** The Act mandates that foreign individuals or entities obtain prior approval from the NBA before accessing biological resources or associated TK for research or commercial use.
- **Benefit Sharing:** Section 21 of the Act empowers the NBA to determine equitable benefit-sharing, ensuring that a portion of the revenue generated from TK returns to the custodian communities.

### 2.2 The Patents Act, 1970 (as amended)

To prevent the patenting of "inventions" that are merely traditional wisdom, the Patents Act includes specific safeguards:

- **Section 3(p):** Explicitly states that an invention which is traditional knowledge or an aggregation of known properties of traditionally known components is **not** patentable.
- **Disclosure Requirements:** Applicants must disclose the source and geographical origin of biological material used in their invention. Failure to do so is grounds for opposition or revocation of the patent.

The **Traditional Knowledge Digital Library (TKDL)** represents one of the most innovative and ambitious administrative responses to the global challenge of biopiracy. Established in 2001 through a collaborative effort between the Council of Scientific and Industrial Research (CSIR) and the Ministry of AYUSH, the TKDL was birthed from necessity. Following the high-profile legal battles over the patents of turmeric, neem, and basmati rice, the Indian government realized that the primary reason for the "theft" of traditional wisdom was a documentation gap. International patent examiners in the United States or Europe had no accessible way to verify if a claim was actually a "novel" invention or merely a centuries-old remedy from the Indian subcontinent.

## 3. THE GENESIS AND STRUCTURE OF THE TKDL

The fundamental problem the TKDL addresses is the "prior art" dilemma. Under international patent law, an invention must be novel and non-obvious. If a practice is already known to the public (prior art), it cannot be patented. However, much of India's Traditional Knowledge (TK) existed in ancient Sanskrit, Arabic, Persian, or Tamil texts, or was passed down through oral traditions. A patent examiner in Washington D.C. or Munich would not have the linguistic skills or the physical access to these ancient manuscripts to disprove a patent application.

To solve this, the TKDL digitized and translated approximately 3.6 million pages of traditional formulations into five international languages: English, French, German, Spanish, and Japanese. By converting these ancient texts

into a modern, searchable format using a specialized classification system—the Traditional Knowledge Resource Classification (TKRC)—India effectively broke the language barrier that previously shielded biopiracy.

## 4. Impact: The Success of Defensive Protection

The impact of the TKDL has been transformative in the realm of "defensive protection." Before its inception, India had to spend millions of dollars and years in litigation to cancel patents after they had already been granted (post-grant opposition). The TKDL shifted this paradigm to "pre-grant opposition."

Currently, the TKDL has signed access agreements with major patent offices worldwide, including the United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO), the European Patent Office (EPO), and the Japan Patent Office (JPO). This allows examiners to search the TKDL database during the patent application process. If they find that a "new" anti-diabetic drug is actually a direct formulation from an ancient Ayurvedic text, the patent is rejected immediately. To date, the TKDL has successfully thwarted or led to the withdrawal of hundreds of patent applications globally, saving the Indian state the enormous legal costs of fighting these battles in foreign courts.

## 5. CRITICAL LIMITATIONS AND PHILOSOPHICAL GAPS

While the TKDL is a landmark achievement, it is not without significant criticism. A critical analysis reveals that the library is a double-edged sword that addresses only a fraction of the problem.

**1. The Documentation Paradox** The most glaring criticism is that the TKDL only protects what is *documented*. India's traditional knowledge is a vast, living ecosystem. A significant portion of this knowledge—particularly tribal medicine, agricultural techniques, and local folklore—is oral. By prioritizing documented texts like those of Ayurveda or Unani, the TKDL inadvertently creates a hierarchy of knowledge. Oral traditions that remain undocumented are left in a legal vacuum, arguably more vulnerable than before because the existence of a "digital library" might lead examiners to assume that if it isn't in the database, it doesn't exist as prior art.

**2. Defensive vs. Positive Protection** The TKDL is strictly a defensive tool; it acts as a "shield" but not a "sword." It prevents others from patenting Indian knowledge, but it does not grant the original communities any proprietary rights or commercial benefits. For example, if a community has preserved a specific herbal remedy for a thousand years, the TKDL ensures a multinational corporation cannot patent it. However, it does not provide a legal mechanism for that community to monetize their knowledge or claim royalties if a company uses that knowledge without a patent. This lacks the "Positive Protection" required to turn TK into an engine for local economic development.

**3. The Risk of Disclosure** There is an ongoing ethical debate regarding the digitization of sacred or secret knowledge. By translating these formulations into international languages and giving access to foreign patent offices, India has essentially "shared" its secrets with the world. While the access is restricted to patent examiners, the concern remains that making this data digital increases the risk of it being leaked or used for "bioprospecting"—where companies use the database as a map to find resources they can then slightly modify to bypass patent restrictions.

In conclusion, the Traditional Knowledge Digital Library is a masterpiece of administrative foresight that has successfully repositioned India in the global IPR landscape. It has effectively stopped the "low-hanging fruit" of

biopiracy by providing patent offices with the tools to respect Indian prior art. However, as a critical analysis suggests, the TKDL is a partial solution. For the framework to be truly robust, the digital library must be coupled with *sui generis* legislation that recognizes oral traditions and grants communities the positive rights to manage and profit from their intellectual heritage. The TKDL has secured the past; now, India must legislate for the future of its living traditions.

## 6. CRITICAL CHALLENGES AND LACUNAE

Despite these advancements, the Indian framework faces several "critical" hurdles:

1. **Defensive vs. Positive Protection:** Current laws focus on *preventing* others from patenting TK (defensive). They do not effectively grant *positive rights* to communities to commercially exploit their own knowledge or sue for infringement (Mackey & Liang, 2012).
2. **Access and Benefit Sharing (ABS) Complexity:** Implementing ABS is often stalled by a long gap between bioprospecting and commercialization, making it difficult to trace and reward the original knowledge-holders.
3. **The "Sui Generis" Need:** Many scholars argue that standard IPR (Patents, Copyright) is a poor fit for TK. There is a growing call for a ***sui generis*** (unique) law that recognizes communal ownership and perpetual protection rather than the time-limited protection of patents (Cheng et al., 2026).

## 7. CONCLUSION

The critical analysis of India's legislative framework for the protection of Traditional Knowledge (TK) reveals a landscape defined by pioneering innovation, yet hindered by persistent structural gaps. India has undeniably emerged as a global leader in "defensive protection," primarily through the establishment of the Traditional Knowledge Digital Library (TKDL) and the strategic amendments to the Patents Act (1970). These tools have effectively shifted the burden of proof onto international patent applicants, successfully curbing the most blatant forms of biopiracy. Furthermore, the Biological Diversity Act (2002) provides a necessary regulatory layer by mandating prior informed consent and envisioning a system of Access and Benefit Sharing (ABS). Together, these measures represent a significant departure from the passive stance of the past, creating a formidable barrier against the unauthorized misappropriation of India's biocultural heritage.

However, a truly "critical" evaluation suggests that defensive success does not necessarily equate to holistic protection. The current framework remains deeply rooted in the Western individualistic paradigm of Intellectual Property Rights, which struggles to accommodate the communal, oral, and fluid nature of indigenous wisdom. While we have become proficient at preventing others from claiming ownership of our past, we have yet to empower local communities to exercise "positive rights" over their present. The custodial communities—the actual practitioners of Ayurveda, Unani, and tribal medicine—often remain on the periphery of the legal process, rarely seeing the tangible socio-economic benefits promised by ABS mechanisms. The administrative complexity of the National Biodiversity Authority (NBA) and the state boards frequently creates a bottleneck that discourages ethical research while failing to provide a clear pathway for communities to commercialize their own innovations.

Moreover, the reliance on documentation through the TKDL creates a dangerous "documentation trap." By prioritizing written texts, the law risks devaluing the vast ocean of oral traditions that sustain the livelihoods of India's tribal and rural populations. Without a sui generis (unique) legislation specifically tailored to the nuances

of traditional knowledge—one that recognizes perpetual community ownership and provides for moral rights—the protection remains incomplete.

In conclusion, India's journey toward safeguarding its Traditional Knowledge is at a pivotal crossroads. To move beyond mere preservation and toward true bio-justice, the legal framework must evolve from a reactive stance to a proactive one. This requires simplifying ABS procedures, recognizing the legal standing of oral traditions, and ensuring that the indigenous people are not just subjects of protection, but active stakeholders in the innovation economy. The goal for the future should be a harmonized system where ancient wisdom and modern law coexist, ensuring that the "gold mine" of Indian heritage is not just locked away from thieves, but is utilized sustainably for the prosperity of the communities that have guarded it for millennia.

## REFERENCES

### Statutes & Legislations

- The Biological Diversity Act, 2002 (Act 18 of 2003).
- The Patents Act, 1970 (Act 39 of 1970).
- The Patents (Amendment) Act, 2005 (Act 15 of 2005).
- The Biological Diversity Rules, 2004.

### Books

- V.K. Ahuja, *Intellectual Property Rights in India* (LexisNexis, New Delhi, 3rd edn., 2017).
- P. Narayanan, *Intellectual Property Law* (Eastern Law House, Kolkata, 3rd edn., 2013).
- Elizabeth Varkey, *Traditional Knowledge: The Law and Practice* (Eastern Book Company, Lucknow, 1st edn., 2015).

### Journal Articles

- S. Sharma, "Traditional Knowledge Digital Library: 'A Silver Bullet' in the War against Biopiracy?" 17(2) *The John Marshall Review of Intellectual Property Law* 214-230 (2017).
- T.K. Mackey & B.A. Liang, "Integrating Biodiversity Management and Indigenous Biopiracy Protection to Promote Environmental Justice and Global Health", 102(6) *American Journal of Public Health* 1091-1095 (2012).
- S.K. Verma, "Legal Protection of Traditional Knowledge in India", 46(4) *Journal of the Indian Law Institute* 496-515 (2004).
- S. Cheng, S.R. Benson, & M.G. Ocepek, "Legal protections for traditional cultural expressions: An exploratory review of literature", 31(1) *Information Research* (2026).

### International Documents

- Convention on Biological Diversity, 1992.
- Nagoya Protocol on Access to Genetic Resources and the Fair and Equitable Sharing of Benefits Arising from their Utilization to the Convention on Biological Diversity, 2010.

**Websites/Online Reports**


- Council of Scientific and Industrial Research, "Traditional Knowledge Digital Library (TKDL)", *available at*: https://www.tkdl.res.in (last visited on April 29, 2026).
- National Biodiversity Authority, "Annual Report 2024-25", *available at*: http://nbaindia.org (last visited on April 28, 2026).

 Cheng, S., Benson, S. R., & Ocepek, M. G. (2026). Legal protections for traditional cultural expressions: An exploratory review of literature. *Information Research*, *31*(1). https://publicera.kb.se/ir/article/view/44767

 Heinrich, M., Scotti, F., Andrade-Cetto, A., et al. (2020). Access and Benefit Sharing Under the Nagoya Protocol—Quo Vadis? Six Latin American Case Studies Assessing Opportunities and Risk. *Frontiers in Pharmacology*, *11*. https://doi.org/10.3389/fphar.2020.00765

 Mackey, T. K., & Liang, B. A. (2012). Integrating Biodiversity Management and Indigenous Biopiracy Protection to Promote Environmental Justice and Global Health. *American Journal of Public Health*, *102*(6), 1091–1095. https://doi.org/10.2105/ajph.2011.300408

 Sharma, S. (2017). Traditional Knowledge Digital Library: "A Silver Bullet" in the War against Biopiracy? *The John Marshall Review of Intellectual Property Law*, *17*(2). https://repository.law.uic.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1429&context=ripl