



INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY AND TECHNOLOGY LAW UPDATES

S&A IP-Tech

AUGUST 2019

Contents

Working Statements under Indian Patent Law	02
Chanel Loses Infringement Case in Double “C” Logo against Counterfeit Jewelry in China	04
Geographical Indication protects Indian traditional knowledge	06
Assignment and Licensing of Copyright	08
Sun Pharma gets global license for CSIR-IICT’s patents for new drug compounds	14

WORKING STATEMENTS UNDER INDIAN PATENT LAW

By Manish Kumar

Introduction

Under the Indian patent regime, patents are granted to encourage inventions and to secure the working of inventions in India on a commercial scale and to the fullest extent that is reasonably practicable without undue delay. To further enhance the same, the Central Government on May 31, 2019, through the Department of Industrial Policy and Promotion u/s 159 of the Patent Act, 1970, has proposed changes in the Patent Rules, 2003, for submission of an annual working statement.

Background

The aim of presenting the working statement is to inform the public about the working status of a patent. As per Section 84 of the Indian Patent Act, 1970, in case a patent is not worked for 3 years from the date of its grant, an interested third party can use that information to approach the patentee to seek voluntary license to work the patent in India and if the patentee refuses to license or exercises unreasonable conditions for issuing the license, then the interested third party can approach the Patent Office for issuance of compulsory license.

The statement is filed using Form 27 mentioned in the Second Schedule of Patents Rules, 2003, by stating whether the invention is worked or not worked.

a.) If **worked**, then indicate Quantum of Sales and Revenue generated by direct and indirect use (based on internal evaluation), details of import of the product (country specific details),

provide a list of licensees if licenses have been granted. Further also furnish whether a reasonable requirement of the public was met partly, adequately or to the fullest extent.

b.) If **not worked**, the reasons for not working and the steps being taken for the working of the invention. Some common reasons for not working can be patented invention is not fully developed into a marketable product or the market is not mature for the patented invention or the patentee is on a lookout for right partner /licensee.

The Bombay High Court, in ¹**Bayer Corporation v Union of India** held that acknowledging importation of the patented product is also working of Patent. However, the patentee must establish why it has been impossible to manufacture the patented product in India and the efforts made by the patentee to set up manufacturing unit or in any way trying to work the invention must also be mentioned.

Timeline & Procedure

The patentee and every licensee shall furnish a statement as to the extent to which the patented invention has been worked on a commercial scale in India, in Form 27, in respect of every calendar year, within three months of the end of each year.

Further, the Controller has the power to call for information such as periodical statements as to the extent to which the patented invention has been commercially worked in India, as may be specified

¹ *Bayer Corporation v Union of India, Writ Petition No. 1323 of 2013 decided by Bombay High court on 15 July 2014.*

in the notice issued to that effect, at any time during the continuance of the patent. A patentee or a licensee shall furnish such information within two months from the date of such notice or within such further time as the Controller may allow.

In addition to the above, non-filing of Form-27 may necessitate a penalty which may extend up to ten lakh rupees under Section 122(1) of the Patent Act, 1970, and furnishing false information in the working statement knowingly or having reasons to believe it to be false or not true, he shall be punishable with imprisonment which may extend to six months as per Section 122(2) of the Patent Act, 1970.

Proposed recent amendments

To further boost the Annual Working Report on granted patents, the following features have been proposed:

- As per Rule 131 of the Patents Rules, 2003, for sub-rule (2), the following sub-rule shall be substituted, namely:

*“(2) The statements referred to in sub-rule (1) shall be furnished once in respect of every calendar year, starting from the calendar year commencing immediately after the calendar year in which the patent was granted, and shall be furnished **within 3 months from the expiry of each such calendar year.**”*

The above stated amendment clearly demarcates the timeline to file the working statements from the calendar year commencing immediately after the calendar year in which the patent was granted and should be submitted before 31st March of next calendar year.

- An updated Form 27 providing a separate column for submission of information related to process patents is introduced. Further, the form requires the value of the patented product and/or product obtained by patented process manufactured in India and imported into India. In addition to the above, information related to quantum of product is no more required and where it is difficult to derive the value of the patent separately from the value accrued from related patents, such that all the related patents are granted to the same patentee(s), then the details of all such patents, including the patent numbers, shall be provided along with value accrued from all such patents.

The proposed amendments will ease the requirement of furnishing working details of Granted Patents and also help the Patentee to submit the information with Patent Office timely. Hence it will bring more transparency in the working detail submissions.

CHANEL LOSES INFRINGEMENT CASE IN DOUBLE “C” LOGO AGAINST COUNTERFEIT JEWELRY IN CHINA

Kartikeya Prasad

The 110 year old fashion house Chanel has lost a trademark infringement suit against a jewelry store in China which was selling jewelry in the shape of Chanel’s world-famous double “C” logo. In July 2016, the Administration for Industry and Commerce of Haizhu District (now merged with another organization to form the State Administration for Market Regulation) raided the two year old jewelry store, Zhou-Bai-fu, in Guanzhou, China after receiving a tip off from a third party who remains anonymous. The store was owned by a national of China named Ye Meng-zong. The raid resulted in discovery of goods in the shape of the famous double “C” logo owned by Chanel. Chanel later confirmed that the discovered goods were fake.

The investigation by Administration for Industry and Commerce resulted in a penalty according to which the infringing goods were confiscated by the agency and Ye was instructed to pay RMB 80,000 (approx. \$ 12,000) to Chanel. Apart from this penalty, Chanel, famous around the world for its notoriety in being aggressively protective of its brand, decided to pursue this matter further through litigation in the Guanzhou Haizhu District People’s Court, wherein they sought an additional damage of RMB 100,000 (approx. \$ 15,000).

Ye Meng-zong was accused of trademark counterfeiting and infringement. Ye countered this by saying that the store, which was no longer in operation, was a mere franchise of the Hong Kong based MNC Zhou-Bai-fu Jewelry International

Group, and the goods sold at his store were all approved by the franchisor prior to their display and sale, including the infringing goods, which made him the wrong defendant in the case. This argument was not entertained by the court. The court gave a favorable judgement for Chanel, and held that Ye had indeed infringed on the double “C” trademark and ordered him to pay RMB 60,000 (approx. \$ 9,000) in damages due to “*the level of harm, nature of business, business scope, scale of operation, time of infringement, infringement area, [and] the value of infringing goods,*”¹ among other factors.

Ye appealed this decision to the Guangzhou Intellectual Property Court, where the primary issue framed by the court was “*whether the shape of the (allegedly counterfeit Chanel) products, alone, could be deemed infringing.*”² The same could be interpreted as to whether the double “C” logo which was clearly forming the shape of the pieces of the jewelry, was also acting like a trademark, and as a corollary identified the source of the products, or was the double “C” logo merely acting as a decoration. Further, if the double “C” logo was indeed acting in a source-identifying capacity, were the consumers likely to be confused regarding the source of origin of the goods? The court held that “there was no evidence to prove that when Ye’s store sold the products in question there was any chance that the shape of products ... was used as

¹ ‘Chanel Handed an “Unacceptable” Loss in Chinese Counterfeit Jewelry Case — The Fashion Law’ (*The Fashion Law*, 2019) <<https://www.thefashionlaw.com/home/chanel-handed-an-unacceptable-loss-in-chinese-counterfeit-jewelry-case>> accessed 17 August 2019.

² *Ibid.*

a trademark.”³ The Court further held that the jewelry was not misleading people with respect to the source of the products, and there was no evidence that “ordinary consumers with a general level of understanding would deem that they were purchasing Chanel products.”⁴ The court stated that Chanel had not built its case for infringement and counterfeiting properly and ordered the lower court’s order to be vacated.

Industry insiders have held the decision to be highly erroneous as Ye’s goods were not held to be acting as trademark and thus there was no infringement. The Court has seemingly denied the chance of a 2-D trademark (here Chanel’s trademark for its double “C” logo) into a 3-D product as trademark infringement. The good news for Indian brand owners is that the definition of a trademark is broad enough to include anything that functions as an indicator of source, which according to Rule 26(3) of the Trade Marks Rules, 2017, includes three-dimensional shapes.⁵

3 *Ibid.*

4 *Ibid.*

5 ‘Chanel Loses Double “C” Trademark Infringement Case In China - Intellectual Property - Canada’ (Mondaq.com, 2019) <<http://www.mondaq.com/canada/x/829254/Trademark/Chanel+Loses+Double+C+Trademark+Infringement+Case+In+China>> accessed 22 August 2019.

GEOGRAPHICAL INDICATION PROTECTS INDIAN TRADITIONAL KNOWLEDGE

Vijaylaxmi Rathore

Geographical Indication (GI) is an indication which identifies products as agricultural, natural or manufactured goods (including handicrafts, textiles and processed food items) with specific geographical origin, and process qualities and reputation attributable to its geographical origin. The GI registration of a product indicates the quality and distinctiveness of that product associated with the defined geographical territory. The registration and protection of Geographical Indications in India is executed under “Geographical Indications of Goods (Registration and Protection) Act, 1999” effective from September 15, 2003.

The Geographical Indication (GI) under the Department for Promotion of Industry and Internal Trade has recently registered four new GIs - Palani Panchamirtham from Palani, Tamil Nadu, Tawlhlohpuan and Mizo Puanchei from Mizoram, and Tirur betel vine from Kerala.

- Palani Panchamirtham, an abishegam prasadam, from Palani Town is one of the main offerings in the abishegam of Lord Dhandayuthapani Swamy, a temple situated in Palani Hills, Palani Town in Dindigul District of Tamil Nadu. The prasadam is made up of five natural substances, namely, banana, jaggery sugar, cow ghee, honey and cardamom in a definite proportion without addition of any preservatives or artificial ingredients. This is the first time a temple ‘prasadam’ from Tamil Nadu has been be-

stowed with the GI tag.

- Tawlhlohpuan, a medium to heavy, compactly woven, good quality fabric from Mizoram is known for warp yarns, warping, weaving & intricate designs handicraft. Tawlhlohpuan is produced throughout the state of Mizoram, Aizawl and Thenzawl town being the main centre of production.
- Mizo Puanchei is a colourful Mizo shawl/textile from Mizoram. It is also the most commonly used costume in Mizo festive dances and official ceremonies. The weavers insert the designs and motifs by using supplementary yarns while weaving to create this beautiful and alluring textile.
- Tirur betel vine from Kerala, which is mainly cultivated in Tirur, Tanur, Tirurangadi, Kuttippuram, Malappuram and Vengara block panchayaths of Malappuram District, is valued both for its mild stimulant action and medicinal properties¹.

GI registration can benefit in growing income of the artisans, farmers, weavers and craftsmen by increasing the marketability and salability of their GI products. GI also protects the unique skills and knowledge of traditional and regional practices of GI producers by promoting their GI products.

Various steps has been taken by the Department for Promotion of Industry and Internal Trade (DPIIT) to

¹ https://dipp.gov.in/sites/default/files/GI_pressRelease_16August2019.pdf

promote the sales and marketing of Indian products registered as GIs. The DPIIT has launched a common GI logo and tagline, where the GI Logo acts as a certifying mark for Indian GI products, ensures its authenticity and acceptability to consumers. GI Tagline 'अतुल्य भारत की अमूल्य निधि (Invaluable Treasures of Incredible India)' will create awareness and effective branding and promotion of GIs.

At present India has secured more than 600 Geographical indications in its account. Amongst states Karnataka charts the highest number of GIs followed by Maharashtra, Tamil Nadu, Kerala and Uttar Pradesh. The Indian handicraft industry has highest number of GI followed by agriculture and food stuff.

ASSIGNMENT AND LICENSING OF COPYRIGHT

Ishan Sambhar

Introduction

Copyright is a protection given to the creators of certain types of works as an acknowledgment to their intellectual input¹. The objective of copyright has always been the protection of the interest of a creator, coupled with dissemination of knowledge. Though this protection started with the recognition of rights of authors in their books, but modern technology has substantially changed the nature of work and its mode of exploitation.

Economic rights allow an owner to reap economic benefits from his intellectual creations. According to section 14 of the Copyright Act, 1957, different rights are recognised with respect to the nature of the work. As per this section, it is the exclusive right of the owner to do or authorise the doing of the acts provided thereunder.

The owner of copyright work can generate wealth not only by exploiting it himself but also by sharing it with others for mutual benefits. This can be done by way of assignment or licensing of copyright.

Assignment of Copyright (Section 18)

The owner of the copyright of a work has the right to assign his copyright to any other person. The effect of assignment is that the assignee becomes entitled to all the rights related to the copyright to the assigned work². However, mere grant of right to publish and sell the copyrighted work amounts to publishing right and not assignment of copyright.

¹ This is known as the 'Doctrine of Sweat of the Brow', whereby a work is given copyright protection if the author has applied 'labour, skill or judgment' in creating the work irrespective of the level of originality in the work. Evolved from the decision in *Ladbroke v William Hill*, [1964] 1 All E.R. 465.

² Section 18(2)

Where the assignee of a copyright becomes entitled to any right comprised in the copyright, he shall be treated as the owner of the copyright in respect of those rights. The assignor shall also be treated as the owner of copyright with respect to unassigned rights. The legal representatives of the assignee shall be entitled to the benefits of assignment, if the assignee dies before the work comes into existence. In *Video Master v. Nishi Production*³, the Bombay High Court considered the issue whether assignment of video rights would include the right of satellite broadcast as well. The Court agreed with the contentions of defendant that there were different modes of communication to the public such as terrestrial television broadcasting (Doordarshan), satellite broadcasting and video TV. The owner of the film had separate copyright in all those modes, and he could assign it to different persons. Thus, satellite broadcast copyright of film was a separate right of the owner of the film and the video copyright assigned to the plaintiff would not include this.

MODE OF ASSIGNMENT (SECTION 19)

As per section 19, assignment of copyright is valid only if it is in writing and signed by the assignor or his duly authorized agent. The assignment of a copyright in a work should identify the work and specify kind of rights assigned and the duration and territorial extent of such assignment. Further, it should specify the amount of royalty payable, if any, to the author or his legal heirs during the continuance of assignment and the assignment will be subject to

³ 23 IPLR 388 (1998)

revision, extension or termination on terms mutually agreed upon by the parties.

If the period of assignment is not mentioned it will be deemed to be taken as five years from the date of assignment. If the territorial extent of such assignment is not stipulated, it will be taken as applicable in whole of India.

Also, Section 19(8) contemplates that the assignment of copyright work against the terms and conditions on which rights have been assigned to a particular copyright society where the author of the work is a member shall be void. Further, Section 19(9) and section 19(10) opine that the assignment of copyright for making cinematograph film or sound recording shall not affect the right of the author to claim an equal share of the royalties and consideration payable with respect to use of his protected work.

In *Saregama India Ltd v. Suresh Jindal*⁴, it was held that the owner of the copyright in a future work may assign the copyright to any person either wholly or partially for the whole of the copyright or any part thereof and once the assignment is made the assignee for the purpose of this Act is treated as the owner of the copyright.

Disputes with Respect to Assignment of Copyright (Section 19a)

As per section 19(a) the Appellate Board may on the receipt of a complaint from the assignor and on holding such inquiry as it may deem necessary, revoke such assignment, if the assignee fails to make sufficient exercise of the rights assigned to him, and such failure is not attributable to any act or omission of the assignor.

In case of a dispute with respect to the assignment of copyright, the Appellate Board may pass a suitable order on receiving a complaint from the aggrieved party and after holding such inquiry as it considers necessary including an order for the recovery of any royalty payable.

Assignment by Operation of Law (Section 20)

When the owner of a copyright dies the copyright will pass on to his personal representative as part of the estate, provided that no will has been executed. Section 20 provides that if a person is entitled for copyright under bequest and such work has not been published before the death of the testator, unless contrary intention is shown under testators will or any codicil thereto, such person shall be considered as having copyright in the work so far as testator was the owner of copyright immediately before his death.

Licensing of Copyright

The owner of copyright may grant a license to do any of the act in respect of which he has an exclusive right to do. The license can be classified into following categories:

Voluntary license (Section 30)

The author or the copyright owner has exclusive rights in his creative work and he alone has right to grant license with respect to such work. According to section 30 of the Copyright Act 1957, the owner of the copyright in a work may grant any interest in his copyright to any person by license in writing, which is to be signed by him or by his duly authorised agent. A license can be granted not only in existing work but also in respect of the future work, in this situation assignment shall come into force when such future work comes into existence. Where a

⁴ 2007 (34) PTC 522 (Cal)

licensee of the copyright in a future work dies before such work comes into existence, his legal representatives shall be entitled to the benefit of the license if there is no provision to contrary.

The mode of license is like an assignment deed, with necessary adaptations and modifications in section 19 (section 30A). Therefore, like an assignment, a license deed in relation to a work should comprise of following particulars:

- a. Duration of license
- b. The rights which have been licensed
- c. Territorial extent of the licensed
- d. The quantum of royalty payable
- e. Terms regarding revision
- f. Extension and termination

Voluntary licenses can be:

Exclusive - The term exclusive license has been defined in Section 2(j) as a license which confers on the licensee and persons authorized by him, to the exclusion of all other persons, any right comprised in the copyright work.

Non-exclusive – It does not confer right of exclusion. It is mere grant of an authority to do a particular thing which otherwise would have constituted an infringement. When owner grants an exclusive right, he denudes himself of all rights and retains no claim on the economic rights so transferred.

Co-exclusive – Here the licensor grants a license to more than one licensee but agrees that it will only grant licences to a limited group of other licensees.

Sole license – Where only the licensor and the licensee can use it to the exclusion of any other third party.

Implied license – Author impliedly allows or permits the use of his work. For example, he had knowledge that someone is using his work but he did not take any action.

Compulsory License

Being a member of Berne Convention, India has incorporated the provision of compulsory license in the Copyright Act, 1957. The Act provides for grant of compulsory license for Indian work in the public interest, in certain circumstances:

Works Withheld from Public

The Indian Copyright Act provides for the grant of compulsory licences in work which has been published or performed in public. It empowers the Appellate Board to direct the Registrar to grant license, if a complaint is made to it in writing under the Act, during the subsistence of copyright stating the necessary facts which are conditions precedent to its exercise of power, provided the owner has been approached in the first instance for the grant of license and it is only if he has refused to publish or allow the republication of the work and by the reason of such refusal the work is withheld from the public. In case where two or more persons have made a complaint, the licence shall be granted to the complainant who in the opinion of the Copyright Board would serve the interest of the general public. In *Super Cassette Industries Ltd v. Entertainment Network (India) Ltd, Mumbai*⁵ the respondents who were running a radio FM channel under the brand name Radio Mirchi, made several attempts to obtain

⁵ (2004) 29 PTC 8 (DEL)

a license from Super Cassette Industries Ltd (SCIL) to play its sound recordings but failed to get it. The Copyright Board ultimately issued them a compulsory license against which an appeal has been filed in the Delhi High Court. After contemplating over section 31, Court observed that in case compulsory license had to be granted to all, then there was no need of any enquiry as envisaged by section 31. The court also opined that once the copyright was in public, refusal has to be made on reasonable and valid ground. While making an order under section 31, the Board had to maintain a delicate balance between the private rights and the copyright vis-a vis- public interest. The case was sent back to the Copyright Board for fresh consideration.

Compulsory License in Unpublished or Published Work (Section 31-A)

According to this section, where the author is dead or unknown or cannot be traced, or the owner of the copyright in such work cannot be found, any person may apply to the Copyright Board for a licence to publish such work or translation thereof in any language.

Before making such an application, the applicant should publish his proposal in one issue of a daily newspaper in that language. The application to the copyright board should be in the prescribed form and accompanied by the prescribed fee and with the copy of advertisement issued.

The Copyright Board after making the certain prescribed enquires direct the Registrar of Copyright to grant license to the applicant to publish the work or its translation subject to the payment of royalty and other conditions.

Compulsory License for the Benefit of Disabled Persons (Section 31-B)

Any person working for the benefit of persons with disability on a profit basis or for business may apply in prescribed manner to the Appellate Board for a compulsory licence to publish any work in which copyright subsists for the benefit of such persons. However, where a compulsory licence has been issued, the Appellate Board may on a further application and after giving reasonable opportunity to the owners of the rights, extend the period of compulsory licence and allow the issue of more copies as it deems fit.⁶

Statutory License for Cover Versions (Section 31-C)

Cover means a sound recording made in accordance with section 31C. Any person desirous of making a cover version, being a sound recording in respect of any literary, dramatic or musical work with the consent or licence of the owner of the work, can do so.

The person making the cover version is required to give prior notice to the owner of the copyright in such works and to the Registrar of Copyright at least 15 days in advance of making the cover version. Advance copies of all covers with which the sound recording is to be sold to be provided or royalties to be paid in advance. One royalty in respect of such sound recordings shall be paid for a minimum of fifty thousand copies of each work during each year.

The Delhi High Court in *Star India Pvt Ltd v. Piyush Aggarwal*⁷, stated that sound recording included a subsequent original sound recording made from the

⁶ Indian Copyright Act, 1957, Sec- 32 (B)

⁷ 2014 (58) PTC 169 (Del)

musical and literary work and which was called a version recording i.e. a sound recording made after a first sound recording was made by use of the musical work and literary work.

Statutory Licensing for Broadcasting of Literary and Musical Work and Sound Recording (Section 31-D)

Any broadcasting organization, desirous of communicating published work to the public by way of broadcast (by way of television broadcast or radio) or a performance of any published musical/lyrical work and sound recording, can do so by giving prior notice of this intention to the owners. The notice must specify the duration and territorial coverage of the broadcast. Corresponding royalties are required to be paid to the owner of copyrighted work. Rates of television broadcasting are different from the rate fixed with respect to radio broadcasting. At the time of fixing the rate of royalty the Copyright Board may ask the broadcasting organisation to deposit some amount of money in advance to the owner.

License to Produce and Publish Translation of Literary or Dramatic Work in any Language (Section 32)

Section 32 of the Copyright Act provides that after expiry of a period of seven years from the first publication of a literary or dramatic work, any person may apply to the Copyright Board for a license to produce and publish a translation of work. Where the work is not Indian work, any person may apply to the Board for a license to produce and publish a translation in printed or analogous form of reproduction of a literary or dramatic work in any language in general use in India after a period of three years from the first publication of such work, if such translation is required for the purpose of

teaching, scholarship or research. But where translation is in a language not in general use in any developed country, such application may be made after the period of one year from such publication.

License to Reproduce and Publish Works for Certain Purposes (Section 32-A)

According to this section, any person may apply to the Copyright Board for a license to reproduce and publish any literary, scientific or artistic work after the expiration of the relevant period from the date of first publication of an edition of such work, if the copies of such edition are not made available in India, or such copies have not been put on sale in India for a period of six months to the general public or in connection with systematically instructional activities at a price reasonably related to that normally charged in India for comparable works by the owner of the right of reproduction or by any person authorised by him in this behalf.

The period prescribed are:

- Seven years for work related to fiction, poetry, drama, music or art
- Three years for works related to natural science, physical science mathematics or technology
- Five years for any other work

Conclusion

The term 'assignment' and 'license' are not interchangeable. An assignment is different from a license. Generally, in absence of any provision to the contrary the assignee becomes the owner of the assigned work, whereas in case of a license the licensee gets the right to exercise particular rights only.

An assignment may be general, i.e. without limitation or an assignment may be subject to limitations. It may be for the whole term of copyright or any part thereof. An assignment transfers an interest in and deals with copyright itself as provided under section 14 of the Act, but license does not convey the copyright but only grants a right to do something, which in absence of license would be unlawful. An assignment transfers title in copyright, a license merely permits certain things to be done by licensee.

The assignee being invested with the title in the copyright may reassign⁸.

⁸ *Deshmukh & co (publishers) pvt ltd v/s avinash vishnu khadekar 2006 (32) PTC 358 (Bom)*

SUN PHARMA GETS GLOBAL LICENSE FOR CSIR-IICT'S PATENTS FOR NEW DRUG COMPOUNDS

Arnika Sharma

On August 14, 2019, Sun Pharma and its subsidiaries announced that the company has entered into global licensing agreement with the CSIR Indian Institute of Chemical Technology, Hyderabad (CSIR-IICT), for patents related to certain compounds with potential therapeutic activity across multiple indications in Sun Pharma's specialty focus areas.¹

Terms and conditions of the licensing agreement

According to the source information as per the conditions of the licensing agreement, Sun Pharma has been granted with the global license for all present patents of CSIR along with any patent in future covered under the agreement. Sun Pharma will pay a total amount of Rs.2.40 billion. Along with this amount, the company will also pay royalties on net sales from commercialization of the products developed using these patents. Additionally, Sun Pharma will also be responsible for development, regulatory filings, manufacturing and commercialization of these potential products. It is well-known that Sun Pharma has a huge name in the field of research and development and contributes on a large scale in the development of new compounds. On the other hand, CSIR is also known for its research work and has number of patents in the field of medicine in its achievement list.

With this agreement there will be an addition of the preclinical candidates to Sun Pharma's global specialty pipeline. The agreement will also help the company to proceed with the clinical trials of the

potential compound in list which has been kept for hold for long which will be helpful in treating certain therapy areas with multiple indications.

The merger is a big initiative taken by the company in the field of drug development for new drug entity. CSIR-IICT is a well-recognized organization known for its quality research work. The association will certainly help in bringing the research work from various institutes into the market with funding and giving other aids from the big manufacturers like Sun Pharma.

According to the source information it will facilitate addition of pre-clinical candidates to Sun Pharma's global specialty pipeline. For the quarter ending June 2019, Sun Pharma has reduced its R&D spend. Its R&D investments for Q1-2020 was Rs. 422 crores compared to Rs 500 crores for Q1FY19.

Conclusion

Sun Pharma is a giant in the field of research and development and entering into the licensing agreement with CSIR-IICT will help the patented research work to go public. This will not only promote the discovery and development of new drug but will also make the therapy available to public at the global level.

¹ <https://www.sunpharma.com/media/press-releases>

