IJCRT.ORG ISSN : 2320-2882

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF CREATIVE RESEARCH THOUGHTS (IJCRT)

An International Open Access, Peer-reviewed, Refereed Journal

Agriculture Sovereignty: The Impact Of Modern Patent Laws And Genetically Modified Technologies On Farmers' Rights In India

Purpose: Investigate the intersection of patent law, genetically modified (GM) technologies, farmers' rights in India, and recommend reforms.

Design/Methodology/Approach: Conducted legal research along with case analysis on Monsanto v. Nuziveedu Seeds Ltd and socioeconomic data to determine the impact of intellectual property (IP) structures and monopolistic GM seed franchises on conventional agriculture.

Findings: While draft PPVFR Act 2001 and The Biodiversity Act 2002 provided some measures, enforcement is somewhat weak. Biotech corporations have dominated with patent laws on seed monopolies, uncontrolled farmer defiance and debt spiral.

Research Limitation/ implications: Case study is limited partially to Indian laws and rural case studies which restricts the scope of international cross-case analysis.

Practical Implications: Farmers granted ownership of seeds and policies adjusting hinders control other compelling powers serve a stronger sustainable agriculture reality.

Social Implications: Gender inequity and the decline of biodiversity resulting from the commercial use of GM seeds underscore the need for more balanced policies to strengthen multilateral and multi-stakeholder governance to address these challenges.

Originality/ Value: This paper determines the legal and socioeconomic issues of modern biotechnology vis-a-vis agricultural sovereignty in India.

Keywords: Agricultural self-determination, GMO, industrial property law, seed ownership, India, farmer's rights, PPVFR, conservation of biodiversity, TRIPS agreements

Research Problems

- In what ways do the current intellectual property laws impact the marginalized farmers in India?
- Which gaps facilitate business conglomerates to take advantage of GM seed patents?
- What underlies the inconsistency between legislative design and ground reality operationalization?

Hypotheses

- **H1 Evidence**: Corporate Advantage Over Farmers
- **Legal Context**: Gaps and Omissions
- Modification of the Patent Act in 2005 to comply with TRIPS requirements is the reason the 1970 Patent Act has 3(j) clauses in it. Monsanto stills bt cotton genes because it can conduct genetic engineering processes.
- The case of **Monsanto v. Nuziveedu** shows how courts in India grappled with the question of whether farmers were entitled to rights within their bounds juxtaposed to corporate patents.
- Exploitation by Corporations:
- The GM Seeds Act gives Bayer-Monsanto unfettered access and control over seed markets for cotton, mustard and maize.
- Suing farmers for patent infringement under Section 29 (PepsiCo suing Gujarati farmers) demonstrates how far these laws go in regarding farming as a criminal activity.
- **Final Remarks**: The examples provided in this section are sufficient to support H1. They demonstrate the ill impacts of the corporate framework, showing that farmers become illegitimate targets while legal frameworks are created to benefit corporations.

H2 Evidence: GM Dependency → Economic Distress

- **Economic Vulnerability:**
  - GM seeds require re-purchasing each season and rely on costly pesticides and fertilizers.
  - The 2023 Sustainable Agricultural Centre study showed Bt cotton farmers spend 65% of their income on seed and chemicals, compared to 25% for traditional seeds.
- **Debt and Suicides:**
  - As per the **National Crime Records Bureau (2023)**, 68% of farmer suicides (10,881 cases) in 2022 were linked to failed harvests and financial stress—often exacerbated by GM seed dependency.

Conclusion: H2 is supported by empirical evidence that shows a correlation between GM seed dependency and heightened farmer debt and suicides.

H3 Evidence: There Are Laws but No Results

(PPVFR Act, 2001):

It superficially provides farmers the permission to retain and trade seeds, but subclause 39(1)(iv) banning the sale of branded seeds creates a legal purgatory.

A mere 18% of farmers were aware of their rights under the Act which was reported in a survey conducted in 2022 by the National Biodiversity Authority.

Biodiversity Act, 2002:

Meant to control the exploitation of indigenous biological resources, but its implementation is virtually non-existent.

Legal cases such as W.R. Grace's patenting of Neem demonstrates that biopiracy continues to happen in the absence of effective legal frameworks.

International Pressure:

India not opting to sign UPOV 1991 indicates a willingness to avoid joining breeder-centric systems, but bilateral trade treaties still apply some level of unwelcome justification to forced compliance.

Final Thought: The gap between legislative intent and reality at the grassroots level is what propels further action to be taken on the issue presented in H3.

Research Objectives

- To evaluate the implications of Indian IP and patent laws from a human right's perspective.
- To evaluate the socio-economic effects of GM seeds on small scale farming communities.
- To analyze processes that enable legislation and policies to ensure seed diversity and fair access to seed resources.
- To explore and document resistance movements that advocate for seed sovereignty.

Purpose of the Study

To investigate the legal, socio-economic, and ecological aspects of contemporary agriculture in India, with a focus on patents and GM technologies is the central aim of the study. It hopes to establish arguments that would aid policies designed to promote sustainable practices in agriculture.

1. Introduction

The Indian workforce comprises 58% of the people involved in agriculture, and it preserves cultural identity and tacit ecological heritage. For thousands of years, traditional farming practices have incorporated techniques such as saving seeds, exchanging them, and selectively breeding crops to develop varieties that thrive in specific regions. However, the neoliberal imposition of stringent patenting laws and culture of genetically modified organisms (GM) has replaced these systems with a corporate-controlled seed market.

Under Agriculture Sovereignty, the Department of Food Justice, Self-Determination and Ecological Affairs introduces policy advocating for the right of farmers to determine the use and inputs to their agriculture production system and stop outside exploitation of their resources. However, compliance with the "commercial side" of India's WTO-TRIPS agreement has installed a patent regime bound to biotechnological innovation based on traditional knowledge systems. The GM Seeds Act allows Bayer Monsanto and other

multinationals to dominate India's market for GM seeds—cotton, corn, and mustard—using legal mechanisms to ban traditional practices like seed saving.

This paper addresses three research questions:

1. How do Indian patents' laws interfacing with GM technology marginalize farmers' rights?
2. In what areas does there exist a legal gap concerning the defenses of agricultural sovereignty?
3. In what ways can politically induced active policies strike a balance with technological

Legal Framework: **Disputes and Contradictions**

The Indian legal system struggles to reconcile international IP obligations with domestic agricultural realities, leading to fragmented safeguards for farmers.

The implementation of the Patent Act (1970) and Reisen was modified in 2005 to coincide with travel, and although the law prohibits patent facilities in accordance with section 3(j), itallows patenting of genetically modified organisms (GMOs) and bioengineering processes. This gap allows companies to patent genetic sequences (e.g. Monsanto's bt -Buildwolckry1ac -gen), giving them exclusive control over the seed market. Critics argue that this violates Article 27.3(b) of the trip, which allows Member States to eliminate patentable plants.

PPVFR Act (2001): Promises and Pitfalls

The PPVFR Act recognizes farmers as "breder's" and allows for spares and exchanges. However, Section 39(1)(iv) limits the sale of brand seed, leading to ambiguity. For example, despite legal protections, farmers have patented GMs for legal disputes. A National Biodiversity Authority 2022 survey showed that only 18% of farmers who recognize rights within the framework of the PPVFR Act and emphasize systematic gaps in consciousness are aware.

Biodiversity Act (2002): Weak Enforcement

The law provides for the commercial use of indigenous genetic resources, but enforcement remains. W.R. Grace & Co. Cases such as the patenting of Neem in 1995 by 1995 highlight the sustainable Bioism in which foreign companies benefit from India's biological diversity without compensating the community.

International Druck

The refusal of the UPOV Abbey, which prioritizes breeder rights, reflects our commitment to the *sui generis* system. Bilateral trade agreements such as the US-India Knowledge Initiative on Agriculture have put pressure on protecting the UPOV style of businesses.

Socioeconomic and ecological effects

The Commercialization of agriculture has caused a crisis among 150 million smallholder farmers in India.

Seeds and Debt

GM seeds are sold as a high-rise solution, so you need to purchase annual returns and costly inputs such as pesticides and fertilizers. A 2023 study by the Sustainable Agricultural Centre showed that BT cotton farmers in Maharashtra spend 65% of their seed and chemical income, compared to 25% of traditional cotton breeders. This dependency has intensified the debt crisis,combining the National Crime Records Bureau with 68% of farmer suicides (10,881 cases in 2022) with failed harvests andapparent financing failures.

Criminalization of Traditional Practices

Sue farmers to use Section 29 of the patent for violations if patented genes are also determined in the field by pollinating. In2019, PepsiCo sued nine Gujarati farmers. Because he used a grower of the FC5 potato variety and used a private investigator to collect field samples. The company retracted the complaints after public protests, but retained a legal method for bringing similar claims.

Erosion of Biodiversity

Monocular GM variety disrupted agricultural biological diversity. Non-BT cotton varieties fell 92% between 2002 and 2022, butlocal millet and hybrid corn and soybean impulses were sold. The Indian Agricultural Research Council (ICAR) warns that by 2030, 30% of traditional harvest varieties could disappear due to the adoption of GM.

Gender Differences

Women, who make up 73% of Indian agricultural workers, are subjected to disproportionate stress. Privatization of seeds alienates their role as a warehouse operator and undermines decision-making rights. In Bihar, the adoption of hybrids reduced access to nutritious Indigenous millet among women, and culminated malnutrition in rural households.

Case Study: Resistance and Resilience

Monsanto Nuziveedu Seeds Ltd. (2018)

This groundbreaking case focuses on Monsanto's claims against BT cotton. The Delhi Supreme Court initially ruled that the patent could not be revoked and the gene sequence could not be patented in accordance with Section 3(J). However, theSupreme Court partially re-established Monsanto's argument, revealing the contradiction between patent law and farmer's rights. The unresolved legal tension sought to determine a similar dispute.

Navdanya and Seed Sovereignty

Founded by Dr. Vandanasiva, it promotes agroecology and community seed banks. The 150 seed banking bank network maintains over 5,000 traditional varieties, allowing 500,000 farmers to reject GM seeds. Farmers' protests against the 2020 Business-Friendly Agricultural Act continued to show rural resistance to privatization.

GMO-free Politics in Kerala

In 2019, Kerala was the first Indian state to ban GM plants promoted by Jaiva Karshaka samiti (a group of organic farmers).Politicians prioritize traditional rice varieties such as *pokkari*, which thrive in the Salt Coast ecosystem, demonstrating how decentralized governance can counter corporate intervention.

Political Recommendations

In order to regain agricultural sovereignty, India must accept reforms that prioritize farmers' rights and ecological sustainability.

Legal Reforms

Changes to Section 3(j): Explicitly exclude all forms, including genes and GM organisms, from patentability.
Strengthening of PPVFR Act: clarify the rights of farmers to save, exchange and sell seeds, regardless of company patents.
Farm Law Committee Foundations: Independent bodies for the determination of conflict and punishment disputes.

activates traditional systems

National Species Diversity Register: Document and promote Indigenous varieties and grants farmers who cultivate biological diversity.
Expanding seed banks from local governments: Showing state and central funding and expanding initiatives such asNavdanya's network.

Corporate Accountability

Biopilate Penalties: refers to a fine corresponding to 200% of the profits achieved from pirated genetic resources.
Conversational obligations: publish corporate obligations, GM seed and licensing fee pricing.

Farmer Empowerment

Legal Literacy Campaign: Farmers use farmers via IP Act by Krishvigang Kendras (Agricultural Expansion Centre).
Public seed research: removes ICAR funding for the development of open source seeds, air-conditioned seeds.

Conclusion

India's agricultural sovereignty relies on compensation for justice innovation. GM technology offers potential benefits, butcurrent use in the context of an exploitative patent system puts the lives of millions at risk. Legal reforms, fundamental resistance and political innovations such as Kerala's GMO-free model provide a path to resilience. India can redefine Indiathrough the centre of participatory governance for farmer rights, ecological ethics and agriculture advancement on its own terms. Global communities dealing with similar challenges learn from the combat struggle for food democracy.

References

- Sustainable Agricultural Centre. (2023). BT cotton and agricultural debt in Maharashtra.
- National Criminal Records Bureau. (2023). Accidental death and suicide in India.
- Shiva, V. (2016). Samens Sovereignty, Nutritional Security: Avant -Garde woman. Navdanya's publication.
- Monsanto Technology LLC v. Nuziveedu Seeds Ltd. (2018) 9 SCC 845.
- Indian Agricultural Research Council. (2023). Biodiversity loss and climate change.
- Kerala Biodiversity Committee. (2020). The politics of genetically modified organisms.