INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY EXEMPTIONS IN VERTICAL AGREEMENTS

Aryan Durga[*] Aashna Chopra[*]

ABSTRACT

This article aims to analyze the interconnection between vertical agreements and IP (Intellectual Property) exemptions under the competition law with special reference to the impact of IP exemption on innovation and the market. Vertical agreements are widespread in many industries and are contracts between companies at distinct levels of production and distribution. However, the potential for welfare-increasing and decreasing effects increases significantly when these agreements include IPRs (Intellectual Property Rights). The article's first section investigates how IP exclusions are regulated legally within the framework of vertical agreements between US and EU authorities. To prove how the laws balance the maintenance of competition and the protection of innovation, a quick overview of the legislative provisions of the Sherman Act in the United States and Article 101 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU) in the European Union is provided. We also look at issues about the status of court rulings and policy directives on the use of intellectual property exemptions. Some of the issues that are covered include the possible impact of IP exemption on innovation; the creation of market dominance; the conditions under which IP-related vertical agreement is considered anti-competitive; and the conditions under which it can be exempted from the anti-trust laws. The article concludes that although vertical agreements' IP exemptions are important in encouraging innovation, they should be controlled to avoid anti-competitive effects. Some recommendations are given to the policymakers to enhance the balance of IP protection and competition, these exemptions should be aimed at achieving their purpose without skewing the market.

INTRODUCTION

Relationships between two or more businesses working at the same level are known as vertical agreements. Examples of these types of relationships include those between a supplier and a retailer or a manufacturer and a distributor. These agreements play a crucial role in coordinating the production, marketing, and customer delivery of goods and services. In the context of IP,

[*]BBA LLB, FOURTH YEAR, UNIVERSITY OF PETROLEUM AND ENERGY STUDIES, DEHRADUN.
[*]BBA LLB, FOURTH YEAR, UNIVERSITY OF PETROLEUM AND ENERGY STUDIES, DEHRADUN.

vertical agreements are mostly licensing where rights in an IP asset are transferred or licensed by one party to another. Such agreements are most connected with the IP and competition law relationship when they may create an impact on competition in the market. Vertical agreements are somewhat free from the antitrust laws due to intellectual property rights protected under competition law. Although it is acknowledged that these arrangements may unintentionally foster anti-competitive behaviour, these exclusions are meant to foster innovation by allowing IP (intellectual property) owners to safeguard and profit from their creations.

In light of this, this essay investigates the function of intellectual property exemptions in vertical agreements and how they are used in US and EU legal systems. This article aims to provide a brief on the legal requirements for these exemptions, the matters in controversy about IP rights and market competition, and the implications for businesses and regulators.

VERTICAL AGREEMENTS: A CONCEPTUAL OVERVIEW

Definition & Types

Vertical agreements[1] refer to those agreements or contracts signed by two or more businesses that are placed at various levels of the supply chain network hierarchy, such as between a wholesaler and retailer or a manufacturer and distributor. These agreements are "vertical" because they involve various stages of production and distribution and not firms at the same level which will be a "horizontal" agreement. Vertical agreements can take various forms, including but not limited to[2]:

- *Exclusive Distribution Agreements*: A manufacturer allows a distributor to market its products within a specified region of the market.
- *Exclusive Supply Agreements*: A retailer undertakes to source all its requirements for certain products from a particular supplier.
- *Franchise Agreements*: A franchisor allows the franchisee to carry on the business under a trademark and a business format, and in most cases, the supply of products or services.

[1] Competition Act 2002, s 3
[2] Khushi Sharma, 'Vertical Agreements under Competition Act, 2002' <https://blog.ipleaders.in/vertical-agreements-under-competition-act-2002/> accessed 13 August 2024

- *Resale Price Maintenance (RPM) Agreements*: This is when a manufacturer decides the lowest and highest price a retailer should offer his products for sale.
- *Licensing Agreements*: A licensor conveys the rights to a licensee to use an object, for example, patents, trademarks, or copyrights although they are restrained in the way the rights can be employed or disseminated.

Legal & Economic Rationale Behind Vertical Agreements

The legal and economic basis for vertical agreements is rooted in their ability to refine supply chain relations, minimize transaction costs, and protect the welfare of consumers by guaranteeing product quality and availability on the market. In the economic context, vertically integrated agreements can create economies of scale, rationalize channels, and offer more effective motivation for marketing and service investment[3].

For instance, restrictions on the geographic area of distribution can hinder the problem of free-riding, where a distributor gains from the marketing activities of another distributor but does not have to pay for it. Also, resale price maintenance may deter price cutting which may be detrimental to the brand image and results in substandard service provision by retailers. Vertical agreements also enable companies to better coordinate their activities at various stages of production and distribution; this can lead to reductions in costs and increased product quality.

JLRJS Journal of Legal Research and Juridical Sciences

However, these agreements may also have anti-competitive impacts that include; market exclusion whereby competitors are locked out from the relevant distribution channels, or the provisions for the setting of the resale price that restrict competition in the price amongst retailers. Hence, competition law pays special attention to vertical agreements to prevent them from foreclosing competition in exchange for efficiency gains.

Examples of Vertical Agreements in Different Industries

Vertical agreements can be seen in all sectors of economic activity. Car manufacturers enter vertical contracts with component manufacturers with a view to getting high-quality and reliable parts. In the context of the retail industry, franchising is a typical form of vertical integration, in which an independent businessperson or a company such as Mcdonald's or

[3] Bharat Budholia, 'At a glance: Vertical Agreements in India' <https://www.azbpartners.com/bank/at-a-glance-vertical-agreements-in-india/> accessed 13 August 2024

Subway receives the right to use the company's name and buy goods from it. In the technology sector, all firms involved will adopt licensing where Microsoft or Apple licenses their software or patents to other firms under certain conditions. These examples are the best in illustrating why vertical agreements are capable of guaranteeing business operations and why approaches to handling the impact of vertical agreements on competition should be moderated legally.

INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & COMPETITION LAW

The intersection of IP & Competition Law

IP laws and competition law are two primary pillars of the current generation of economic regulation, which have different but often competing objectives. Patents, trademarks, and copyrights are legal rights that aim to encourage innovation by providing inventors or creators proprietary rights over their creations. Such rights afford temporary protection and stimulate the flow of capital to research and development. However, the exclusivity that comes with IP rights is also disadvantageous as it may create monopolistic situations that limit competition and consumers' options.

Competition law aims at protecting consumer welfare by preventing anticompetitive conduct and maintaining the competitive structure of markets. It controls the behaviour of the market participants with a view of eliminating conduct that is likely to be detrimental to consumer interest, including cartels, who engage in fixing prices, and market sharing as well as abusing their dominance. Thus, there is a delicate balance to be struck between the need to safeguard competition and innovation when it comes to IP rights and competition legislation.

The Balance between Promoting Innovation and Preventing Anti-Competitive Practices

Finding a balance between promoting innovation and putting an end to unethical business practices is a challenging task. Intellectual property rights (IP rights) are crucial for promoting innovation because they give inventors the motivation, they need to devote their time and money to creating new goods and technology[4]. Innovation owners could be hesitant to make

[4] Preeti Sharma, 'Balancing Act: Navigating the Friction Between Competition Law and Patent Law' <https://www.mondaq.com/india/antitrust-eu-competition-/1392768/balancing-act-navigating-the-friction-between-competition-law-and-patent-law> accessed 13 August 2024

investments without the protection that intellectual property rights provide, as they worry that rivals would be able to readily replicate their works.

The monopolistic character of intellectual property rights, however, can result in anti-competitive behavior if unchecked. To keep other companies out of the market, a patent holder with a dominating position in it could, for instance, demand harsh licensing terms. The market may suffer because of such actions, which can also restrict customer choice and hinder competition.

Key Principles Governing IP & Competition Law Interaction

There are many key elements that govern the connection between IP rights and competition legislation[5]:

- *IP rights are not absolute*: Exclusion is granted by intellectual property rights, although it is not absolute. By preventing anti-competitive behavior that can damage the market, competition law makes sure that these rights don't happen. Anti-competitive agreements, such as some IP licensing methods, are prohibited by the Act[6].
- *Essential Facilities Theory*: According to this theory, there are situations in which an intellectual property right qualifies as a necessity. Anti-competitive behavior could result from refusing to license such a facility. But to prevent discouraging creativity, this idea is used cautiously.
- *Licensing Requirements*: To stop the exploitation of market dominance, competition authorities may occasionally impose licensing requirements. This applies especially where denying a license for an intellectual property right would significantly lessen competition.
- *Promoting Consumer Welfare*: The ultimate aim of both legislations is to promote consumer welfare. While intellectual property rights encourage innovation, competition law ensures that the benefits of this type of innovation go to the entire market and aren't limited to a single entity.

[5] Anusha Shivaswamy, 'Competition Law and IPR: A Critical Analysis' <https://www.legalserviceindia.com/legal/article-7101-competition-law-and-ipr-a-critical-analysis.html> accessed 13 August 2024
[6] Competition Act 2002, s 3

EXEMPTIONS IN VERTICAL AGREEMENTS: LEGAL FRAMEWORK

Overview of Legal Provisions for Exemptions in Vertical Agreements

Vertical agreements mean the contracts signed between firms that are in distinct stages of the production-consumption chain, like the contracts between producers and sellers. While these agreements may increase productivity, they may also create problems for competition if they restrict market access or rivalry. However, under certain conditions, vertical agreements can be exempted from antitrust scrutiny if they meet specific legal criteria aimed at preventing anti-competitive effects and providing more pro-competitive benefits.

Other legislation allows many exceptions for vertical agreements since they often receive help from certain efficiencies and protect consumers' interests. The EU Block Exemption Regulation (BER) and the U.S. Antitrust Guidelines for Vertical Restraints, for instance, specify the circumstances under which vertical agreements may be exempt from antitrust legislation.

Specific IP-related Exemptions in Vertical Agreements

Vertical agreements and intellectual property (IP) rights sometimes collide, especially in licensing deals. Intellectual property rights are highly valued, and both the US and EU legal systems provide unique exemptions for agreements about vertical IP. For example, vertical agreements about technology transfer are particularly covered by Regulation (EU) No 316/2014, the EU Technology Transfer Block Exemption Regulation (TTBER)[7]. Agreements between licensees and licensors are excluded when certain requirements are satisfied, like making sure the agreement doesn't have tight limitations.

A framework for examining vertical agreements[8] involving IP is provided by the DOJ and FTC's Antitrust Guidelines for the Licensing of Intellectual Property in the United States. These principles stress that by encouraging innovation and the spread of technology, intellectual property licensing can improve competitiveness. The rules also say that limits like exclusive

[7] Council Regulation (EU) No 316/2014 of 21 March 2014 on the Application of Article 101(3) of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union to Categories of Technology Transfer Agreements
[8] European Commission, 'Guidelines on Vertical Restraints' (2010) <https://competition-policy.ec.europa.eu/antitrust-and-cartels_en> accessed 13 August 2024

dealing or territorial limitations may be allowed in license agreements if they must produce pro-competitive benefits.

CASE STUDIES & JUDICIAL PRECEDENTS

Analysis of Landmark Cases Where IP Exemptions Were Applied to Vertical Agreements

The availability of IP exemptions to vertical agreements has raised considerable concerns, especially from the jurists and scholars dealing in competition law. In this regard, some well-defined landmark cases in different areas around the world have set the legal framework as to how IP rights and competition regulations would work hand in hand. One such landmark case in the European Union is the *GlaxoSmithKline Services Unlimited v Commission [2009]*, where the European Court of First Instance (also known as General Court) questioned whether certain types of vertical agreements regarding the supply of pharmaceuticals which included restrictions on parallel trade, was capable of receiving an exemption under the Block Exemption Regulation (BER). The court followed this by noting that the agreements failed the exemption criteria under Article 101(1) TFEU as they were designed to divide markets which is a 'per se' violation[9].

Concerning the USA, it is worth referring to the extended case of *Continental TV, Inc. v. GTE Sylvania Inc. [1977]* raising the issues of vertical agreements and IP[10]. Therefore, the vertical non-price restraint was considered to be in the best interest of promoting competition by the Supreme Court, which applied the "rule of reason" in ruling that the restraint is not inherently unlawful under the Sherman Act. This case has influenced the situation concerning the analysis of IP-related vertical agreements, especially those of licensing nature under the purview of the U. S antitrust law.

Comparative Analysis of Different Jurisdictions (EU, US, India)

The legal regimes of Europe, the United States, and India are compared with respect to intellectual property exemptions in vertical agreements. Article 101 TFEU applies to any arrangement that can affect competition within EU borders; the legal analysis outlined in this

[9] GlaxoSmithKline Services Unlimited v Commission (2009) ECR II-2965
[10] Continental TV, Inc. v. GTE Sylvania Inc. (1977) 433 U.S. 36

article is different from the US approach under the Sherman Act. The Competition Act, 2002, which was enacted in India, is comparable to US and EU competition laws.

In *Shamsher Kataria v. Honda Siel Cars India Ltd. [2014]*, the CCI considered vertical agreements in relation to IP through the rule of reason like the United States[11]. However, it also laid down that these types of agreements should not cause an 'appreciable adverse effect on competition' (AAEC) which is in line with the EU system.

Critical Analysis of IP Exemptions in Vertical Agreements

Exemptions for intellectual property (IP) in vertical agreements have benefits and drawbacks that impact innovation and competition. Positively, by enabling businesses to safeguard their intellectual property rights and guarantee returns on investment, these exemptions can encourage innovation. Companies may be encouraged to spend in R&D via selective distribution agreements or exclusive licensing, for instance, since they allow them to manage how their intellectual property is used in the marketplace.

However, there are significant drawbacks. IP exemptions may result in price-fixing or market-forcing activities that are anti-competitive and harmful to the interests of consumers[12]. Dominant companies may misuse vertical agreements having intellectual property exemptions to stifle competition, especially if those agreements have resale price maintenance or exclusivity provisions. Under competition law, this abuse potential is a major problem because it can restrict consumer choice and result in smaller competitors having less access to the market.

The effect on innovation and competition is complex[13]. IP exemptions can safeguard IP holders' interests and encourage innovation, but if they are used to impede competition by erecting obstacles to entry, they can also have the opposite effect. To make sure that IP exemptions don't negatively affect market dynamics, regulatory control is needed to maintain a careful balance between promoting innovation and prohibiting anti-competitive behavior.

[11] Shamsher Kataria v Honda Siel Cars India Ltd (2014) Comp LR 1 (CCI)
[12] Federal Trade Commission, "Antitrust Guidelines for the Licensing of Intellectual Property" (Federal Trade Commission, 2017) <https://www.ftc.gov/system/files/documents/public_statements/1049793/ip_guidelines_2017.pdf> accessed 14 August 2024
[13] OECD, "Competition Law and the Digital Economy" (OECD, 2019) <https://www.oecd.org/en/topics/competition.html> accessed 14 August 2024

POLICY CONSIDERATIONS & FUTURE CONSIDERATIONS

In view of changing market dynamics and technological improvements, the regulation of intellectual property exemptions in vertical agreements is being examined more closely. Trends today indicate that preserving competitive marketplaces while balancing IP protection is becoming increasingly important. For example, the Block Exemption Regulation (BER) of the European Union is amended on a regular basis to take into account the evolving digital markets and the possibility of anti-competitive behavior in IP-driven vertical agreements. On the other hand, the US Antitrust Guidelines for the Licensing of Intellectual Property strongly emphasise the need to stay away from IP-related agreements that hinder competition.

Regulators and policymakers should think about updating current frameworks to consider the complexity of today's global and digital marketplaces. One suggestion is to introduce more precise standards that differentiate between IP protections that are allowed and those that unreasonably impede competition[14]. To stop the misuse of IP exemptions in vertical agreements, especially in sectors with quick invention cycles, improved oversight and enforcement measures are also essential.

Going forward, issues like the growing significance of data as an intellectual property asset and the internationalization of markets call for a better-coordinated worldwide strategy. Potential reforms could include ensuring that IP exemptions are not used to support anti-competitive behavior that could jeopardize consumer welfare and innovation, as well as harmonizing regulations across areas to prevent regulatory arbitrage.

JLRJS Journal of Legal Research and Juridical Sciences

CONCLUSION

The relationship between intellectual property (IP) protection and competition law is a complex and delicate matter that needs careful consideration to strike a balance between promoting innovation and preventing anti-competitive practices. The relationship between intellectual property rights and competition law, the legal basis for vertical agreements, and the exceptions that allow anti-competitive behavior under specific conditions have all been discussed in this article.

[14] United States Department of Justice and Federal Trade Commission, "Antitrust Guidelines for the Licensing of Intellectual Property" (2017)

By enabling companies to work together and use their intellectual property to launch new goods and services, IP exemptions in vertical agreements are essential for supporting innovation. To avoid misuse and guarantee that they do not impair consumer welfare or hinder competition, these exemptions must be strictly managed. Increased productivity, lower expenses, and the possibility of technological improvements are some advantages of IP exemptions. But there are also serious disadvantages, such as the possibility of raising obstacles to entrance, lessening market competition, and promoting monopolistic conduct.

In conclusion, intellectual property exemptions in vertical agreements are essential for innovation, but to prevent anti-competitive behavior, they must be balanced with intense competition laws. To guarantee that the legal environment fosters innovation while upholding fair competition, regulators and policymakers must continuously assess and change it. The ever-evolving nature of technology and intellectual property (IP) will probably provide issues in the future, and continuous reforms will be needed to support a fair and productive balance between IP protection and competition.

JLRJS
Journal of Legal Research and Juridical Sciences