International Journal of Aquatic Science
ISSN: 2008-8019
Vol 12, Issue 02, 2021

Investigating Cases on Plant Protection and Confidential Information under Intellectual Property Law in India

M.Z.M. Nomani[1], Mohammad Rauf[2], Ghazal Salahuddin[3]

[1]Professor, Faculty of Law, Aligarh Muslim University, Aligarh-202001(U.P./India)
http://orcid.org/ 0000 0003 3886 6590
[2]Assistant Professor, Faculty of Shariah & Law, Maldives National University, Male (Maldives)
[3]Assistant Professor (Guest Faculty), (PhD DST-INSPIRE), Department of Geography, Kirori Mal College, Delhi University, Delhi (India)

Email: [1]zafarnomani@rediffmail.com, [2]mohammadrauf@mnu.edu.my, [3]ghzl10@rediffmail.com

Abstract: ***There is no legislation codifying the ideas of confidential information or trade secrecy, plant variety and intellectual property law in India. It is in contrast to the global trend of codifying common law trade secrecy concepts. In reality and usage, the court interpreted the common law approach to safeguard Plant varieties in patent law. The general patent law provides statutory protection to plant variety protection. It is still up in the air whether patents or plant variety regulations can protect plant components. They are probably covered under the trade secret legislation as well. The regulation of confidential information included in the Competition Act of 2002. The Indian Penal Code, 1860, includes prohibitions on the misappropriation of trade secret, including plant varieties. The Companies Act, 2013 incorporate measures on confidentiality in its principal corporate statute. The Delhi High Court's decision in Emergent Genetics India Pvt. Ltd. v. Shailendra Shivam created new law using trade secret to protect plant varieties. It will have far-reaching implications for the intellectual property paradigm. The Delhi High Court further held in Sungro Seeds Ltd v. S.K. Tripathi that the assertion of common law rights in trade secrets as secret knowledge could not be established. The paper briefly discusses the evolving laws in India regarding the application of trade secret legislation to plant variety management.***

Keywords: Confidential Information, Trade Secrecy, Plant Variety, Common Law, Legal Interpretation, Court Rulings.

1. INTRODUCTION

Confidential information and trade secrecy assurance in India is evolutionary as there is no enactment arranging the plant variety protection under the intellectual property domain. It contradicts the worldwide pattern towards codification of the custom-based law and normative standards of trade secret protection. The court's application and translation to custom-based law deal with secure trade secret had discovered to be conflicting utilization. The legal discourse on trade secret and intellectual property is not just a smart thought yet a

subject of most extreme need. The propellers of plant variety such as *UPOV Convention*, 1962, *Paris Convention*, 1967, and *TRIPS Agreement*, 1995 have ordered states to change plant variety laws. However, this normative arrangement seldom found trade secret into it (Tripp et al., 2007). The Indian *Competition Act*, 2002 separate fuse section on use, misappropriation and guideline of private data. The *Indian Penal Code*, 1860 prohibits misappropriation of trade secret, intellectual property and plant variety in the metaphorical sense. The *Companies Act*, 2013, arranges confidential data and trade secret protection. The agrarian laws advance food security right, trade secret and plant variety obliquely (Nomani, 2019). The Delhi High Court's decision in *Emergent Genetics India Pvt. Ltd.* v. *Shailendra Shivam* developed jurisprudence of trade secret in plant variety. In *Sungro Seeds Ltd* v. *S.K. Tripathi*, the Delhi High Court held that the claim of common law rights in trade secret as confidential information is impossible to establish. The paper takes a legal stance on synergizing plant variety and trade secrecy under intellectual property.

Trade Secret Law

Trade secret as intellectual property can decipher immaterial worth in plant variety; however, shockingly, it is dislodged from the home of intellectual property law. The explanation may be how intellectual property laws are appointed to acquire straightforwardness and honour information the executives though the trade secret covers mystery and classification. The way can check the acknowledgement of trade secret worldwide that most of the working advancements are secured as a trade secret instead of by patent (Bone, 1998). A more profound investigation of trade secret uncovers a vital part in securing advancements and building up rights to utilize innovation. Trade secret ordinarily characterized as 'any equation, example, gadget or accumulation of data utilized in one's business, and which offers human chance to benefit over contenders.' Broadly talking, there are three elements essential to all such meaning of trade secret. A trade secret is a data that is not by and large known to the general population (Pooley, 1997). It gives a monetary advantage by keeping up mystery and classification. Trade secret security reaches out to equation, designs, plans, plans, actual gadgets, cycles, programming and ability and can appropriately applied to seed and plant variety. Trade secret keeps their specials information out of the hands of contenders through Non-Disclosure Agreements (NDA) and Non-Compete Clauses (NCC) through Employment Agreement (Nomani et al., 2020a). Trade secret arrangements depend on business insider facts dependent on their worth and affectability, and likewise, representatives admonished for the break. Non-revelation Agreements (NDAs) is restricting on outsiders while examining any business prospects and adventures. Trade secret goes about as an impetus to foster incremental innovation, not gathering the non-conspicuousness standard of patent law and copyrights (Nomani et al., 2011).

UPOV Convention & TRIPS Agreement

The UPOV Convention, 1962, Paris Convention, 1967, and TRIPS Agreement, 1995 are the powerful depiction of global trade secret law. Article 14 of UPOV 1991 as a variety dominatingly got from the underlying variables, or from a variety that is itself overwhelmingly got from the underlying variety, while 'holding the outflow of the fundamental trademark that outcome from the genotypes or blend of genotypes of starting variety. It ought to be unmistakably discernable from the underlying variety except for the distinctions which result from the demonstration of induction; it adjusts trade secret to beginning variety in the declaration of the fundamental qualities that outcome from the

genotype or mix of genotypes of the underlying variety (Dutfield, G., 2012). Article 39.1 of the TRIPS Agreements give that "in the course of guaranteeing viable assurance against uncalled for rivalry as given in Article 10 bis of the Paris Convention,1967 individuals will ensure undisclosed data" of the sort which depicted in passages 2 and 3 of Article 39. Article 10bis of Paris Convention, 1967, is characterised as demonstrating little rivalry "any demonstration of rivalry in opposition to genuine practices in modern and business rehearses". Article 10bis records three specific practices. The TRIPS Agreements, 1995 accommodates accessibility of patent for innovations, regardless of whether they are items or cycles, in all field of innovation, whether items are imported or privately delivered. Although Article 27(3) (b) of TRIPS accommodates a sui generis framework not the same as licensing however in the actual term, it fills the need closely resembling a patent and privatisation of rights over the rural and organic asset. It establishes one of only a handful few regions where India has presented some edge of appreciation in formulating a defensive sui generis framework (Tarasofsky, 1997).

Indian Legal Protection

At global level, the TRIPS Agreement, 1995 sanctioned trade secret arrangements during the Uruguay Round of the GATT, 1947. The TRIPS Agreement, 1995 perceives trade secret under 'undisclosed data,' yet stays quiet on the instrument and modalities (Nomani et al., 2020b). The nature and philosophy vary in state practices and reach from security laws to unreasonable rivalry and break of agreements. From that point forward, there has been a pattern toward the reception of homegrown resolutions explicitly coordinated at the expanded insurance of trade secret (Beckerman-Rodau, 2002). The *Protection of Plant Varieties and Farmer' Right Act,* 2001 stimulate innovative improvement in new plant variety guaranteeing trade secret. It promotes the seed business through homegrown agro-biodiversity by sharing the customary privileges. It also recognises the conserver's ancestral networks through advantage sharing. While accommodating a powerful arrangement of protection, the proposed enactment tries to protect scientists' privileges, including their conventional right to save, use, offer or sell the homestead produce (Nomani et al.,2021). The Protection of Plant Varieties and Farmers Right Authority promotes new plant and privileges variety by registration and documentation. The collection, assemblage and distribution of plant varieties, seeds and 'germ plasm' also undergo compulsory authorising of secured variety (Nomani et al., 2019). The remarkable feature of the law is a double right – one is for the variety, and the other is for the section appointed to it by the raiser. The right is heritable and assignable for 15 years to 18 years per Section 5 of *Seeds Act*, 1966. The procedural subtleties and methods of carrying out this Act given in *Protection of Plant Varieties and Farmer' Right Rules*, 2003 and *Guidelines on Access to Biological Resources and Associated Knowledge and Benefit Sharing Regulation*, 2014 under *Biological Diversity Act*, 2002.

US & Indian Courts' Ruling

The Supreme Court of the United States in *Chakrabarty* v. *Diamond*, *Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks*, expressed that it is conceivable that plant variety and trade secret can be ensured. Nevertheless, three diverse U.S. resolutions may incorporate the Plant Variety statute, the plant patent norms and the general patent regulation (Janis et al., 2002). The Plant Variety Protection Act secures a variety of trade secrets repeated by seed, though the Plant Patent Law ensures trade secret, replicated abiogenetically(Gaffney et al.,2003). Regardless of how they replicated, the plant varieties could be patentable under the General Patent Statute (Maurer et al., 2000). This inquiry was left open to scholarly discussion

opposite administrative insightfulness of states to appreciate whether trade secret law can make pertinent to plant variety assurance (Darr,1981). The Supreme Court had unrealistic reasoning that only time will show whether the current intellectual property rules are adequate. To give both direction and satisfactory protection or whether changes in the law will be needed in future to fuse trade secret law under secret trade space (Nomani, 2020). The judgment in *Emergent Genetics India Pvt. Ltd.* v. *Shailendra Shivam* of High Court of Delhi is opening new boondocks of trade secret law application to plant variety. It synergized plant protection, with trade secret and the *Patent Act*, 1970; *Copyright Act*, 1957; and *Seeds Act*, 1966.

Trade Secret & Plant Variety

The judgment in *Emergent Genetics India Pvt. Ltd.* v. *Shailendra Shivam* (Delhi H.C., 2011) inspected trade secret and plant variety result under the definition of fundamental attributes of variety. The Court held that the "plant variety" is generally a strain of a plant or a harvest that is thoroughbred. To meet all requirement of a trade secret for plant variety protection, a yield or plant should create a similar kind of plant each advanced age, ought to be unmistakable in appearance and discernable from others. Every candidate looking for it must fulfil the measures of "curiosity, uniqueness, consistency and security" to give assurance through enrollment. These rights are a consequence of the *UPOV Convention*, 1961 and Article 27 of *TRIPS Agreement*, 1995 (Nomani, 2000). The new methodology embraced by Plaintiff under the trademark of HLL, BRAHMA, was purchased from Bharati Seeds. As BRAHMA turned out to be exceptionally fruitful, HLL began advertising different trade secret of Bharati Seeds, like KRISHNA and LAKSHMI, the two of which are cotton half and halves. The Bharati Seeds explored and delivered cotton mixtures, for example, Brahma and Krishna for HLL, under a selective sourcing understanding. The Court articulated plant variety as a trade secret under *the Seeds Act*, 1966 and *Plant Varieties Act*, 2001 on the ground of innovation and assemblage. The Court discovers, at first sight, the suit guarantees as trade secret protection of the information base for reproducing the plant variety and creating the seeds (Varadarajan, 2011).

Common Law & Confidential Information

However, in *Sungro Seeds Ltd* v. *S.K. Tripathi* (Delhi H.C., 2020), the Delhi High Court held that the claim of common law rights in trade secret as confidential information could not be established under intellectual property. The Delhi High Court restated the requirement of registration for rights to exist in a plant variety law. The Court ruled that the grant of such a privilege is still pending and not established under *Plant Varieties Act*, 2001. It is hard to assert common law rights in secret information or to enforce them. The Court divided intellectual properties into two categories. The one with rights that accrue only upon registration as patents. The other with rights that exist even before registration (such as trademarks) (such as copyrights and trademarks). Plant types were put in the first group after the Court clarified vital clauses of the Act. The Court determined that no rights exist until the plant variety registered under the Act. However, the Court did consider the provision of Section 24(5) of *Plant Varieties Act*, 2001 (which, unlike the Patent Act, offers protection to plant variety applicants during the period between filing and registration). Based on the previous decisions in *Navigators Logistics Ltd.* v *Kashif Qureshi* (Delhi H.C., 2018) and *Claudio De Simone* v. *Actial Farmaceutica SRL* (Delhi H.C., 2018), the Court drew a parallel. The Court also cited its decision in *Modicare Ltd.* v. *Gautam Bali* (Delhi

H.C., 2019), which concluded that restrictive covenants are unenforceable under Section 27 of the *Indian Contract Act*, 1872.

2. CONCLUSION

The *Plant Varieties Act* of 2001 secures the plant variety's novelty, originality, uniformity, and stability. The word "extent variety" in the gene compilation emphasizes that it intended to apply to declared variations of species under the Seeds Act, 1966. The Court said that in the absence of copyright protection, Plaintiff could seek an injunction on the premise that the defendants have unauthorizedly exploited trade secret and sensitive information. The requirements for a cause of action for breach of trust in the common law world were enunciated explicitly in Coco v. A.N. Clark (Engineers) Ltd. The information must have the required level of confidence that imposes a duty of lawful use to the party's advantage (Jorda, 2008). According to the Court, the 'quality of confidence' accentuates that trade secret is a specific principle. Rivals can gain access to trade secret with plenty of effort or unethical measures if the owner of a trade secret or piece of information can show that reasonable efforts made to keep the information private, it remains confidential and is legally protected. On the other hand, when trade secret owners fail to take necessary precautions to secure private information, they risk losing the information's secrecy quality, even if competitors obtain it without permission. The *Plant Varieties Act*, 2001 protects farmers who have the right to use, conserve, use, exchange, share, sell, sow, or re-sow farm products, including seeds protected by the Act. A breeder registered under the Act must declare any propagating material sold to a farmer; otherwise, the farmer entitled to compensation.

Acknowledgment: The principal author would like to acknowledge the Indian Council of Social Science Research, New Delhi, for its funding of Minor Research Projects on *Role of International Biodiversity Law in Developing Legal Framework for Access and Benefit Sharing (ABS) Regime in India* 2019-20.

3. REFERENCES

[1] Beckerman-Rodau, A. (2002). The choice between patent protection and trade secret protection: a legal and business decision. *Journal of the Patent and Trademark Office Society*, 84(5), 371-409
[2] Bone, R.G. 1998. A new look at trade secret law: doctrine in search of justification. *California Law Review*, 86(2), 243-270.
[3] Darr, F. P. (1981). Expanding patent coverage: policy implications of Diamond v. Chakrabarty. *Ohio State Law Journal*, 42, 1061.
[4] Delhi, H.C. (2011). *Emergent Genetics India Pvt. Ltd.* v. *Shailendra Shivam,* I.A. Nos. 388, 1267 and 1268/2004 in CS (OS) 50/2004; Decided On: 02.08.2011
[5] Delhi, H.C. (2018). *Navigators Logistics Ltd.* v *Kashif Qureshi,* CS(COMM) 735/2016, CCP(O) Nos.45/2016 & 46/2016, IAs No.7964/2016; Date of decision: 17th September, 2018
[6] Delhi, H.C. (2020). *Claudio De Simone* v. *Actial Farmaceutica SRL,* IA No.15741/2019 (u/O XXXIX R-1&2 CPC); Date of decision: 17th March, 2020
[7] Delhi, H.C. (2020). *Modicare Ltd.* v. *Gautam Bali,* CS(COMM) 763/2016& IAs No.9555/2016 & 11189/2016; Date of decision: 23rd September, 2019.

[8] Delhi, H.C. (2020). *Sungro Seeds Ltd* v. *S.K. Tripathi,* IA No.9632/2013 (u/O XXVI R-9 CPC), IA No.9633/20I3; Date of decision: 15th May, 2020
[9] Dutfield, G. (2012). Turning plant varieties into intellectual property: the UPOV Convention. In *The future control of food* (pp. 49-69). London: Routledge.
[10] Gaffney, G.S. and Ellison, M.E. (2003). A primer on Florida trade secret law: Unlocking the secrets to trade secret litigation. *University Of Miami Business Law Review*, 11(1), 2-41.
[11] Janis, M.D. & Kesan, J.P. (2002). US plant variety protection: Sound and fury...?. *39 Houston Law Review,* 39,727-752
[12] Jorda, K.F.2008. Patent and trade secret complementariness: An unsuspected synergy. *Washburn Law Journal*, 48, 1-32.
[13] Maurer, S.D. & Zugelder, M.T., (2000). Trade secret management in high technology: a legal review and research agenda. *The Journal of High Technology Management Research*, 11(2), 155-174.
[14] Nomani, M. Z. M. & Rahman, F. (2011). Intellection of trade secret and innovation laws in India. *Journal of Intellectual Property Right*, 16(4), 341-350.
[15] Nomani, M.Z.M. and Rauf, M. 2019. Legal policy for bio prospecting of natural resources in India. *Indian Journal of Environmental Protection*, 39(11), 1009-1015.
[16] Nomani, M.Z.M., & Hussain, Z. (2020)b. Innovation technology in health care management in the context of Indian environmental planning and sustainable development. *International Journal on Emerging Technologies*, 11(2), 560-564
[17] Nomani, M.Z.M., Rahman, F., Ahmed, Z., Faiyaz, T., Khan, S.A., & Jasim, A.H. (2020)a. Prevention of transnational environmental crime under convention on protection of environment through criminal law: Agenda and implementation. *International Journal of Advanced Science and Technology,* 29(5s), 606-612.
[18] Nomani, Z.M. (2000). The human right to environment in India: legal precepts and judicial doctrines in critical perspective. *Asia Pacific Journal of Environmental Law,* 5(2), 113-134.
[19] Nomani, Z.M. (2019). The Access and Benefit-Sharing Regime: an Environmental Justice Perspective. *Environmental Policy and Law*, 49(4/5), 259-263.
[20] Nomani, Z.M. (2020). Case Comment: Divya Pharmacy v. Union of India, *Biotechnology Law Report*, 39(2), 122-128; https://doi.org/10.1089/blr.2020.29161.zmn
[21] Nomani, M.Z.M., & Parveen, R. (2021). Legal connotations of biological resources and its ripple effect on conservation researches in India & Abroad, *International Journal of Conservation Science*, 12(2), 571-576.
[22] Pooley, J. (1997). The Top Ten Issues in Trade Secret Law. *Temple Law Review*, 70, 1181-1190.
[23] Tarasofsky, R.G. (1997). The relationship between the TRIPS Agreement and the Convention on Biological Diversity: towards a pragmatic approach. *Review of European Comparative & International Environmental Law*, 6, 148.
[24] Tripp, R., Louwaars, N. and Eaton, D. (2007). Plant variety protection in developing countries. A report from the field. *Food Policy*, 32(3)354-371.
[25] Varadarajan, D. (2011). A trade secret approach to protecting traditional knowledge. *Yale Journal of International Law,* 36,371.