China and WTO Review (CWR)
2024, 10(1), 101-115
ISSN: 2384-4388
https://cwto.net

Research Article

From Unilateralism to Multilateralism: WTO Mediation of Legal and Financial Challenges in International Intellectual Property Disputes

Siyu Feng [1], Cheng Peng Sik [2*]

[1] Ph.D, Faculty of Law, University of Malaya, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia
[2] Dr., Senior Lecturer, Faculty of Law, University of Malaya, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia
* **Corresponding Author:** sikcp@um.edu.my

Citation: Feng, S., & Sik, C. P. (2024). From unilateralism to multilateralism: WTO mediation of legal and financial challenges in international intellectual property disputes. *China and WTO Review, 10*(1), 101-115. https://doi.org/10.52152/cwr.2024.10.1.08

ARTICLE INFO

Received: 03 Sept 2024
Accepted: 29 Oct 2024

ABSTRACT

The research aims to discuss a shift from unilateralism to multilateralism in the process of mediating international intellectual property (IP) disputes particularly referring to the World Trade Organization (WTO). It focuses on the history and previous actions of major economies and the background to the establishment of the WTO's Dispute Settlement Mechanism (DSM). It explains several major legal problems including conflicts of jurisdiction, inequality of IP protection between participating countries, and existing gaps in IP protection because of the fast development of technologies. Concerns about financial aspects are also analyzed including litigation costs, simultaneous legal proceedings in different countries, and decreased economic activity as a consequence of inadequate IP protection. The research also looks at the contribution of the Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS) Agreement in handling IP disputes discusses the use of punitive damages and analyses how different territories have applied punitive damages as a tool of compliance and enforcement. Thus, using specific examples of the United States, European Union member states, and India involved in disputes with China, the research assesses the role of the WTO's DSM in addressing these issues. Therefore, the results shed more light on the WTO's functions to increase awareness of compliance with the international IP standards to improve the legal and financial performances of the parties involved and facilitate a stable global trading environment. The research presents some recommendations for the existing situation including increasing the speed of the dispute settlement procedures and strengthening cooperation with other international organizations towards betterment of the IP protection.

Keywords: Intellectual Property, WTO Dispute Settlement, TRIPS Agreement, Punitive Damages, International Trade Law.

INTRODUCTION

IP in International Trade

Patent, trademark, copyright and industrial designs are all types of IP that include inventions, literary and artistic works, symbols, names, and images used for commercial purposes. The principles of IP protection are implemented through patents, copyrights, trademarks, and trade secrets, which allow authors or inventors to receive credit or material gain for their inventions or creations. This way, countries promote innovation and creativity, which contribute greatly to the development of their economy and generations of new technologies (WIPO, 2020).

Role of IP in the Global Economy

Protection of IP rights is vital in the contemporary global economy as it fosters economic growth through inspiring innovations, ensuring investors get an adequate return on their research and development (R&D) investments, and enabling globalization of the markets for innovative products. Patent protection makes it

possible for inventors to gain monetary returns on their inventions, which in turn encourages the development and research of better and more effective technologies. Furthermore, effective IP regimes encourage foreign direct investment (FDI), improve competitiveness, and foster economic development (Maskus, 2000). The cross-border nature of trade requires clear and effective legal frameworks to support global business transactions defined by fair and stable IP regimes and policies (OECD, 2015).

IP is one of the most significant factors that drive the economies of nations in the world. Nevertheless, exercising these rights in an integrated world has faced several legal and financial problems. To overcome these characteristics, the WTO built the DSM of the TRIPS agreement that created a multilateral forum for solving IP disputes. The DSM is a major departure from the presumed extra-regime enforcement activities that dominated the prior IP activities, providing a systematic, principles-based framework designed to engender cooperated compliance and prevent trade tensions (Li, 2023).

Although the DSM has been praised for bringing more clarity and stability to the international IP dispute settlement regime, the effectiveness of this approach lacks criticism. Critics have posted observations of procedural delays, weak enforcement mechanisms, and politicization of decisions as the vices that weaken its effectiveness. Similarly, the use of trade retaliation as a measure of enforcement has been regarded as counterproductive since it rewards stronger economies than compensates smaller states. Therefore, it becomes clear that the WTO's DSM, while being a keystone in global IP regulation, is still in need of constant further development and reforms for it to address these flaws and adapt to the new tendencies of international trade and technological advancement.

Unilateralism to Multilateralism in IP Disputes

Traditionally, countries such as the United States have had to take a more aggressive approach to ensuring the protection of their IP rights on the international stage. Some of these actions include trade sanctions and Section 301 investigations whose target was to pressure other countries into enhancing their IP protection and enforcement regimes. However, protectionist measures were often applied individually causing trade disputes and, thus, they were considered to be unfair. For many years, the unilateralism approach to liberalization of trade policies has been seen as flawed due to the inability to foster a predictable and stable world trading system that traders desired.

With the WTO and its TRIPS being established, the trend was set for a more rigorous institution-based way of addressing IP controversies. This was a multilateral system of trying to address the many interests of both the developed and developing world by offering a fair ground for bargaining and recalling differences. Some of the IP disputes could be well resolved by the member states through the WTO's DSM which would have resulted in legal certainty, predictability and consistency instead of retaliatory measures with full compliance to the set worldwide IP standards by the WTO members.

Further, it has fostered predictable IP protection enforcement regimes across the world, since it weeds out any member country which deviates from the agreed multilateral norms providing credence to the international IP system while reducing the risk of trade tensions. These changes from unilateralism to multilateralism have, therefore, made international IP governance stronger and made more opportunities for influencing the multifaceted aspects of IP that do not fit into the international level.

Emergence and Importance of Multilateral Approaches

The shortcomings of this sort of unilateral and isolated reactions underscore the desirability of more cooperative and multilateral dealings for addressing IP issues. The development of the WTO and the TRIPS as a part of the WTO framework shifted the policy approach towards a multilateral form. This framework gives more fences and certain ways to solve IP disputes with the help of the WTO trade-related dispute settlement process (Abbott, 1999). Multilateralism helps in promoting the protection of IP rights across the world while at the same time fostering the agenda of developmental countries and also that of developed countries (Yu, 2007).

WTO and its Member States

Situated at the heart of international relations regarding trade, the WTO serves as an intermediary in IP disputes with a view of protecting the rights of holders of IP assets. The TRIPs Agreement is important for member-states because non-observation undermines fair trade and may lead to trade conflict. The WTO's DSM can address these issues as they relate to IP which, in turn, promotes the stability of the global trading system (Van den Bossche, 2017).

China's Position in the Global IP Landscape

Another development has been the emergence of China as a major talent producer and as a country where the protection of IP is assuming great importance. Due to the increasing focus of the country on innovation and

technological development, it has witnessed significant enhancements in both its laws on IP and its protection frameworks (Zhang, 2017). This active attitude of China is also expressed in China's efforts to join various World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO) and WTO's TRIPS Agreements. It was an IP defendant and an IP aggressor at the same time, which suggests that the country has been actively participating in global IP controversies. This multifaceted role is typical for the increasingly assertive position of China, which aims not only to safeguard its newly emerged IP resources but also to shape the future international IP system by its long-term economic interests.

In addition, the increasing investments in R&D by China have also helped record high domestic filing of patents, having outcompeted the United States in 2019 to be the leading international patents filer. This change has led to the enhancement of China as a talent-supplying nation with a strong IP and supporting framework that seeks to safeguard its inventions while at the same time dealing with the challenges of conventional IP disputes. Consequently, the importance of China in the development of IP has shifted from 'the aggressive pirate with little respect for the outside world's property rights,' to a full member and active participant and shaper of global IP law.

WTO's Role in Mediating IP Disputes

As for addressing IP disputes concerning China, the WTO has an important function of maintaining the integrity of the international IP norms and stability of the trade relations. As a neutral entity, the WTO's IP DSM manages conflicts and ensures that all parties comply with international IP law (Reinisch, 2016).

Evolution of International IP Law

Some of the significant historical milestones in the history of international IP law are outlined below as follows. The Paris Convention for the Protection of Industrial Property signed in 1883 and the Berne Convention for the Protection of Literary and Artistic Works signed in 1886 were some of the first and most significant multilateral agreements that set the foundation of the global framework for IP protection. These conventions were designed to ensure the international consistency of IP rights and cooperation between countries.

The most important event in the field of international IP law is the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) Uruguay Round and the subsequent TRIPS Agreement, which started in 1991 and came into force in 1994. The TRIPS Agreement outlined basic rights for IP protection and their implementation that had to be met by the WTO member countries. It applies to all IP rights such as copyrights, trademarks, patents, and trade secrets, and it also created procedural means for the settlement of IP disputes through the WTO's dispute settlement system (WTO, 1994).

Historical Unilateral Actions by Major Economies

Before the formation of the TRIPS Agreement, the major economies could rely on unilateral measures to protect their IP rights abroad. For example, the United States frequently resorted to Section 301 of the Trade Act of 1974 to address the lack of protection of IP rights on the part of certain countries. This provided the United States with the means to apply trade pressures on other nations that failed to meet its specific IP requirements, a process that fostered tension in the multilateral trade system (Blakeney, 1996).

These mono-trade directives were often condemned for being protectionist and for which they were said to violate the principles of fair trade. For instance, developing countries deemed such actions as an attempt by developed countries to impose on them the appropriate IP standards without regard to their situations and resource endowments. This brought a need for better coordination and multilateralism that saw the incorporation of IP protection under the WTO through the TRIPS Agreement (Drahos, 2001).

The WTO's DSM is a theoretical structure of how international IP disputes are to be solved, its actual impacts can only be underlined through examples. Analyzing cases involving key economies also shows how the DSM responds to a broad range of legal and financial challenges and also specifies with advantages and disadvantages of the perspective of how it contributes to IPS compliance. The selected cases concentrate on evident disputes between China and other large economies that witness the contribution of DSM to the sharing of IP disputes and its effects on world trade relations.

Case Studies of IP-Related Disputes Involving China

China–Measures Affecting the Protection and Enforcement of IP Rights (DS362): This case, filed by the United States in 2007, aimed to seek the enforcement of China's violation of the TRIPS Agreement obligations concerning IP protection. The panel established that some elements of China's policy on IP were not compliant with its TRIPS obligations and therefore China made adjustments to cope with these problems (WTO, 2009).

China–Certain Measures Concerning the Protection of IP Rights (DS542): In this case, started by the United States in 2018, the panel was concerned with the Chinese regulations that compelled overseas firms to share their

technology with Chinese businesses as a precondition to accessing the Chinese market. In particular, the panel has highlighted China's lack of compliance with the accepted WTO practices, which underlined the relevance of the DSM in addressing the infringement of the global IP norms.

Case Studies of IP-Related Disputes Involving Multiple Regions

Although the subject of disputes between the United States and China has attracted vigorous interest as both civil and economic powers, the WTO DSM has been actively applied by other member countries to address various aspects of IP concerns. For example, the EU has often employed the DSM to solve the conflict associated with the GIs and patent rights where it has filed disputes with trading partners, including China. A good example is the EU's confrontation with China over the protection of such European quality symbols like Champagne and Parma ham which was evidenced by the escalated need to enforce compliance with the TRIPS requirements (WTO, 2010).

It also has been involved in several IP controversies, such as the pharmaceutical patent controversy between India, the United States and China. For instance, the DSM has been significant for India as against the United States case perusing the limit of patent security on the manufacture of low-cost generic medicine and interest of the global public health (WTO, 2016).

The above case studies show how the WTO's DSM applies legal decisions, rules and regulations in IP-related cases to ensure that countries align with international standards on IP protection. Through its provision of a balanced and impartial forum, the DSM preserves the neutrality of the WTO trade system and promotes the pragmatic approach towards IP rights protection (Reinisch, 2016).

LITERATURE REVIEW

WTO Dispute Settlement Mechanism

WTO's DSM, is one of the central pillars of the WTO; it offers a rather rigid framework for the international settlement of trade disputes. It can be said that the DSM was developed to make trade as frictionless and consistent as possible – by enforcing the rules signed by the members.

Consultation: The parties first try to negotiate and settle the conflict by consultations. If consultations fail to reach a resolution, the complainant may ask for a panel to be set up.

Panel: The formation of the panel of experts sees the case analyzed and findings and recommendations made. Typically, the panel process involves written submissions, hearings, and considerations.

Appellate Body: In case either party does not agree with the findings of the panel, the matter is brought to the WTO Appellate Body which considers the legal issues arising from the panel's recommendation.

Implementation: In turn, once the report is passed, the losing party must adhere to the suggested recommendations within a reasonable time. Failure to comply with the recommendation may lead the complainant to apply for permission to use punitive measures (Van den Bossche & Zdouc, 2017).

The jurisdiction question is undoubtedly among the greatest legal obstacles in dealing with international IP disputes. As mentioned earlier, IP rights are territorial, indicating that protection is within the region in which the rights were granted. In cross – border disputes, this territoriality principle can create numerous jurisdictional conflicts between (at least) two legal systems. For example, a patent infringement case where the companies involved are from different countries may have to institute parallel civil actions in the respective relevant jurisdictions and this can lead to discrepant legal decisions (Gervais, 2008). Also, inconsistencies in the legal frameworks and processes in various jurisdictions may have adverse effects on the enforcement of IP rights; realizing rights across geographical borders may be quite challenging for the right holder (Dinwoodie, 2011).

Inconsistent Enforcement of IP Laws

Another major challenge facing the IP system is inconsistency in the enforcement of laws governing the protection of IP assets. International treaties like the TRIPS Agreement provide standards of protection, yet the practice of such standards can be exceptional across nations. Such countries may not have an adequate legal framework or may have inadequate resources for the Pro IP laws hence promoting piracy. Furthermore, variations in the national laws on IP can lead to varied levels of protection afforded to a similar IP right, thus making the environment unfair for the rights holders (Maskus, 2000). For instance, a trademark that is likely to be well protected in one country may easily be infringed on in another country more so because the laws there may not be as effective in enforcing such laws or may interpret the laws to the advantage of the violators.

An example of this inconsistency that can be recalled is the WTO 1997 case India – Patent Protection for Pharmaceutical and Agricultural Chemical Products (DS50). Another issue of concern in India was the non-

protection of pharmaceutical product patents as directed by TRIPS agreements. The panel therefore sided with the complainant, thereby making India change its laws on patents through the Patent Act of 2005 as a way of responding to the TRIPS Agreement. The above case shows that an overlapping of laws on IP can lead to disputes that can slow down free competition (WTO, 1997).

Also, these national differences give shapes to protected levels for the same IP right thus creating an unfair environment for the holder of the right. For instance, a trademark that is very protected in the EU might be violated in other areas, those as South East Asia for instance, where the legal systems have different implications, or that is not adequate capital to enforce the laws. Such inconsistencies therefore lead to the sale of fake products, bearing in mind that according to the Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), the trade in counterfeit and pirated goods stood at 3.3% of total exports in 2019 (OECD, 2021).

Challenges Posed by Emerging Technologies

The evolution and use of these technologies pose significant challenges to the existing legal structure of IP. Technological development is such a dynamic area and the protection gap is often that existing IP laws are not developed fast enough. IP infringement has also been on the rise for the simple reason that through digital technologies especially, it is easier to make copies of protected works and disseminate them without any permission from the rightful owners. Moreover, some advanced forms of IP like software, digitized content and biotechnology do not squarely fit into the conventional IP classification and as a result, there is confusion over their protection and control (Samuelson, 2000). This is however so because, the internet is a global network making it easier for infringing activities to be conducted across borders, given that IP rights are territorial, it thus requires a more concerted international enforcement effort (Kur & Levin, 2011).

For instance, in the DABUS case in the United States and Europe where the AI system was credited with patents as an inventor, recent debates arose about whether legal entities can own IP. In both cases, the United States and the European patent office declined the request for the following reason the inventor must be a natural person. This decision does seem to show how such frameworks, despite their material benefits, have failed at capturing developing knowledge areas, and as such, innovators remain unsure in the technologically advancing world (EPO, 2021).

Another of the most well-known cases is the escalations of digital piracy through peer-to-peer networks as well as products such as streaming services through which the creative industry suffers tremendous economic losses. The 2021 case of the European Union Intellectual Property Office (EUIPO) and The Data Publishing Company Case of the Pirate Bay has made clear that traditional copyright laws can no longer be used to address digital piracy. The ruling that shifted liability to Internet Service Providers (ISPs) for the provision of copyrighted content has however not been easy to enforce because the Internet is borderless (EUIPO, 2021).

Similarly, the biotechnology case is rather problematic, because traditional IP laws provide difficulties in categorizing and protecting genetic information and products. The protracted legal battle over who owns the patent to the CRISPR-Cas9, a revolutionary tool for gene editing, between the University of California and the Broad Institute is a typical representative of how new technologies can quickly stump legal frameworks on property rights. The protracted legal battle that is cross-border in nature relates to questions of patent breadth and proprietorship, which stem from the fact that conventional IP regimes are incapable of regulating growth in biotechnological inventions (USPTO, 2021).

TRIPS Agreement Provisions

The TRIPS Agreement as a component of the WTO is a complex and extensive treaty that unilaterally establishes specific minimum standards for the protection and ensuring of the use of IP rights. These comprehensively address copyrights, trademarks, patents, and trade secrets, and require WTO members to afford adequate protection measures (WTO, 1994). Among the provisions of the TRIPS Agreement, there is a provision that governs the issue of national treatment which means that foreign IP rights holders should be treated in the same manner as the domestic holders of rights. This provision sought to eliminate distortion and unfair treatment of foreign IP holders. Moreover, there is the enforcement of IP rights in the TRIPS Agreement whereby member states are obliged to avail judicial and administrative mechanisms that ensure that the rights holder can defend the rights effectively (Correa, 2000).

Although the agreement has enhanced the effectiveness of IP systems worldwide, it has also met criticisms, especially on the performance of the agreement and its effects on developing nations.

This research has noted that one of the main weaknesses of the TRIPS Agreement is that it does not take into consideration the differences in the economic and institutional endowment within the WTO countries. Because developed countries have clearly defined laws on IP protection and effective structures in charge of implementing the laws, the developed countries have measures in place which meet the required high standards under TRIPS.

However, the developing countries could not fulfil these requirements because of several constraints including scarcity of funds, a relatively less competent IP system, and inadequate legal talent. These disparities have called for an imbalance in the sense that developing countries have more difficulties undertaking legal reforms as required by the TRIPS agreement.

For instance, the use of TRIPS in the enforcement of the standards of pharmaceutical patents has been problematic in states like India and Brazil due to the high costs of compliance. This problem was addressed by the 2001 Doha declaration that said that: TRIPS should not keep member states from pursuing measures that protect public health compulsory licenses for producing and exporting generics in cases of national emergency. However, as Yu (2007) pointed out, flexibility can be seen as a positive aspect of the TRIPS because, even though many developing countries were to embrace these provisions, they still cannot escape pressures from powerful economies and TNCs to curb the usage of these safeguards.

Furthermore, the critics of the TRIPS Agreement have also argued that it was a pro-IP regime at the expense of development interests including the transfer of technology and the building of technological capacities. Under Article 66.2 of TRIPS, developed countries are required under certain circumstances to encourage and promote technology transfer to least developed countries (LDCs) though compliance with this provision has been poor and unfruitful. A 2019 report on the implementations of technology transfer under Article 66.2 was produced by the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) and showed that most of the implementation was irregular with insufficient institutional support for further development (UNCTAD, 2019).

To overcome these shortcomings, the TRIPS Agreement slim down the options that need a completely different approach towards the economic and development differences between the developed and the developing countries. Some of these areas for change may be the flexibility of TRIPS provisions which enable the developing countries to have more policy space in IP standards implementation: technology transfer and capacity-building instruments. Furthermore, the WTO may provide for a watchdog to oversee the performance of the developed nations that are bound by Article 66.2 hence encouraging a fairer IP regime.

Role of WTO Panels and Appellate Body in Resolving Disputes

WTO's DSM equally has a vital role in addressing IP-associated disputes among member countries. The WTO Dispute Settlement Body will then handle the case if a member state feels another member is not following its TRIPS obligations. As mentioned earlier, the process usually starts with an agreement between the involved parties seeking to sort the matter out through negotiations. If consultations do not work, then a panel is formed to consider the case, and they prepare a report with a conclusion and recommendations. Its recommendation can be appealed to the WTO Appellate Body that reassesses the legal issues of the case and may affirm, amend or reverse the ruling of the panel (Van den Bossche & Zdouc, 2017).

Some important IP cases have been handled by the WTO panels and Appellate Body to provide some understanding of how the agreement and its provisions have to be implemented. For example, as mentioned above, in the report "China–Measures Affecting the Protection and Enforcement of IP rights (DS362)," the panel established that China has been in violation of its TRIPS commitments in specific areas of its IP regulation and implementation yet has since changed some of its laws and practices concerning IP rights (WTO, 2009). In the same vein in " India – Patent Protection for Pharmaceutical and Agricultural Chemical Products (DS50)," the Appellate Body elucidated the provisions of the TRIPS Agreement concerning the protection of patents, thus reasserting the significance of adherence to IP rules and regulations of the WTO (WTO, 1997).

Therefore, WTO's legal structure on IP, based on the TRIPS agreement and the DSM effectively offers a clearly defined and efficient way of approaching legal issues in global IP law. In doing so, it enhances the global IP standards and equity to safeguard and enforce the rights, which foster world trade and innovation.

Major advantages of the WTO Panels and the Appellate Body

Legal Consistency and Predictability: The panels and Appellate Body have equally provided a meaningful canonical legal framework for dispute settlement within the context of IP. Since these bodies operate under a set procedural format of the law, and also make sure that any ruling or decision made makes use of legal precedents, these bodies minimize a lot of arbitrary rulings. For example, in the India – Patent Protection for Pharmaceutical and Agricultural Chemical Products (DS50) case, the Appellate Body decision-making offers an understanding of essential provisions of the TRIPS agreement and creates a precedent necessary for future further IP cases (WTO, 1997).

Neutral Platform for Resolving Complex Disputes: Given that the WTO's DSM focuses on the particular rights of both developing and developed nations IP complaints with politically related topics, the WTO's DSM is more likely to provide a fair and balanced means than through unilateral actions or retaliatory actions. This neutrality is especially so where huge economies are involved in a matter such as the China–Measures Affecting the Protection

and Enforcement of IP Rights (DS362) whereby the panel held that some of the Chinese regulations contravened TRIPS obligations. This decision led to China altering its domestic laws to which DSM serves to encourage actors to align itself with international norms (WTO, 2009).

Structured Appeal Mechanism: The existence of the second level of appeal through the Appellate Body means that the legal interpretation of disputes is checked, thus increasing the reliability of the dispute settlement system. This appellate structure assists in formulating the TRIPS provisions consistent application leading to a comprehensive body of international IP law.

Weaknesses and Limitations

Prolonged Resolution Times: Another of the main concerns over the DSM of the WTO is that it takes quite a long time to settle disputes. Litigation that is common in IP cases especially where the issues raised call for legal and technical analysis may take several years. For instance, the EU – Protection of Trademarks and Geographical Indications (DS174) started in 1999 and could only be completed in 2005; this is nearly six years of solving the problem. Solutions take time and such delays defeat the very purpose of DSM as noted by WTO (2005), especially in sectors where such lawsuits have to be resolved promptly for the protection of IPs such as the technology sector.

Limited Enforcement Mechanisms: The use of retaliatory trade sanctions as a means of enforcement has been largely criticized in the DSM. Unfortunately, this approach usually has adverse consequences for smaller or developing nations because of their inability to pressure other powerful economies through the use of sanctions. Therefore, even if panels or the Appellate Body favoured a smaller country, one realized that the case is largely powerless in implementing the decision. This limitation is well illustrated in the Ecuador – Bananas (DS27) where the hand of Ecuador was tied by its small economic muscle as opposed to the EU (WTO, 1997).

Politicization and Blockages in the Appellate Body: The functionality of the Appellate Body has been eroded more by political tension and procedural barriers. The Appellate Body has not been functioning since 2019 because some of the accustoming countries led by the United States have been opposing the nomination of new judges. This situation has rendered the DSM childless of a functional appeal system. Despite being based on rules, the system has distressed the public's confidence in the WTO's capacity to handle intricate IP cases (Hoekman & Mavroidis, 2020).

Addressing Key Legal Challenges

There is conflict jurisdiction since IP rights prompt geographic boundaries, and therefore enforcement is complicated in different territories. One possible way out is the use of international arbitration procedures for IP rights, for instance, the International IP Arbitration Court under WTO. It would enable an agreement to have a binding remedy sought without engaging in parallel civil actions in different places to avoid contrary rulings. Further, bilateral and regional agreements could embody provisions for the mutual recognition of decisions relating to IPs that would enhance the efficiency of enforcement and avoid territorial gaps.

Enhancing Consistency in IP Law Enforcement: Harmonization of national IP laws with international standards can help solve the problem of lack of a coherent IP protection policy; these programs enhance the local capabilities of the bureaucracy. The WTO, in consultation with the WIPO, could start a global IP enforcement mechanism that provides capacity-building materials, practical education and support to those countries that are weak in enforcing the IPS. Thus, these attempts would rationalise the practices of most IPs and facilitate the enhancement of enforcement frameworks of the smaller economies to help decrease disparities of similar IPs across different jurisdictions.

Adapting IP Frameworks to Emerging Technologies: Information technology, AI, and biotechnology are relatively modern innovations, and they have their peculiarities to a great extent unnoticed by classical legislation on IP protection. To fill the gap, the existing IP frameworks should be changed to recognise the new types of IP assets, digital innovations included. Thus, legal framers could revisit the classification of software and data and the protection of algorithmic models and make necessary changes clarifying the issues that are now under discussion in the IP framework. Furthermore, international organizations can be active contributors to the creation of model laws from which the states of the world could adopt so that the laws on IP remain relevant within the ongoing technological changes.

FINANCIAL CHALLENGES AND SOLUTIONS TO IP DISPUTES

Arising from the nature of legal systems, litigation and enforcement of IP rights are usually costly exercises. The costs of IP litigation are the lawyers' charges, costs of litigation, and fees charged by experts, which can be relatively high. Of these, the legal expense cost is relatively higher for many multinational corporations

(MNCs)because they may need to carry out parallel legal action in more than one country where the legal proceedings and processes may differ. Furthermore, enforcement activities including crackdowns and seizures entail substantial costs and time as well as collaboration with relevant authorities (OECD, 2015). These costs are unreasonably high especially to medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) as this deters them from pursuing legitimate IP claims thus reducing the efficacy of IP regulations.

Economic Implications for Businesses and Countries

The economic loss in using IP claims is not just restricted to the costs of the legal proceedings. For businesses, IP disputes contain market uncertainties and lost revenues, and the value of their business and reputations can suffer as a result. Some firms get involved in legal battles that take lots of time making their operations be interrupted and they spend a lot of money to pay for lawyers instead of focusing on growth and development. This diversion of resources can stifle creativity, especially in sectors that rely on IP, including the health sector, the IT sector, and the entertainment industry (Maskus, 2000).

Most definitely the problem of IP disputes has costs arising out of the courtroom alone. For instance, there was a patent fight between Apple Inc. Samsung Electronics was blatant for 7 years and the 2 tech giants spent on legal fees, $60 million and had to deal with uncertainty in the stock market (Bolden et al, 2016). So did the ease of enforcement of IP Rights in China in the case China - Enforcement of IP Rights where American companies had estimated figures of losses above $48 billion a year due to factors of this nature, the history leaves the United States and puts on an even greater debt to its rights owners.

Punitive Damages in IP Disputes

Punitive damages, also called exemplary damages, are awards of money that are added to compensatory damages in a civil lawsuit to punish the defendant for reprehensible misconduct and to serve as a warning to others. Unlike nominal damages for pure economic loss which are awarded to put the plaintiff in the position of not having been harmed, punitive damages are meant to punish the defendant for deliberate infringement and reckless behaviour. Punitive damages can be claimed in the Course of IP disputes where the invasion of the rights has been done willfully or deliberately or with the knowledge that the defendant was infringing on the plaintiff's rights (Merges, Menell, & Lemley, 2013).

Punitive Damages in Different Jurisdictions

There is a clear understanding that punitive damages differ in IP cases depending on the jurisdictions of the countries involved. Punitive damages remain a common feature of IP litigation in the United States especially in patent and trademark infringement lawsuits. The United States law permits rather significant punitive damages to ensure that the violators do not act willingly and to draw attention to the violations of IP rights (Beebe, 2009).

In contrast, European jurisdictions typically adopt a more restrained approach to punitive damages. For instance, the United Kingdom has been conservative in instituting punitive damages but grants compensatory damages to compensate for the plaintiff's loss (Bently & Sherman, 2014). Similarly, many civil law countries, such as France, do not often grant punitive damages because their legal structures centre on compensation as opposed to punishment (Ginsburg, 2005).

However, the concept of acceptance of punitive damages in IP cases in the Chinese courts has been increasing gradually. The latest changes in the Chinese IP regulations include provisions for punitive damages in cases of wilful infringement outlined in the 2020 amendment of the Patent Law, indicating a general move to enhance protection and prevent violation (Zhang 2020). However, the use and granting of punitive damages in China, compared to common law countries such as the United States, are still relatively rare in practice.

The punitive damage awards differ from one jurisdiction to another owing to the differences in the philosophies regarding the role of laws in an economy, the nature of economic development or the nature of the enforcement requirements. The idea is that the model within the USA seeks to dissuade criminality as punitive damages are issued or in this case excessive whereas in Europe, people seek justice and reparations and as China progresses this system aims to achieve a harmonious coexistence between deterrence and understatement. Such differences have implications for the enforcement of IP regimes in the international arena, instilling legal risks and difficulties in compliance in multinational corporations. Their resolution could lead to international collaboration and specific changes that could achieve the objective of a fairer international system for IP.

Role of WTO in Facilitating punitive Damages

The WTO aids in the administration of punitive damage reforms in IP disputes through the TRIPS Agreement. Despite the TRIPS Agreement not directly demanding punitive damages, it demands that member states provide adequate measures for the protection against IP infringements. According to the TRIPS Agreement, Article 41, members are required to assure that enforcement procedures are accessible under their law to allow appropriate

action against any act of violation of protected IP rights under the agreement, including prompt measures to prevent future violations and adequate penalties for a violation that acts as a deterrent (WTO, 1994).

The WTO's DSM also offers a forum for the settlement of other compliance issues relating to these provisions. For instance, if a member state's IP enforcement measures are controversial, the WTO panels or the Appellate Body are obliged to determine whether the measures under consideration meet the standards provided by the TRIPS. By these rulings, the WTO indirectly plays a key role in the extension and implementation of punitive damages that need to be adopted and applied for the reinforcement of IP rights and compliance with the WTO standards (Van den Bossche & Zdouc, 2017).

Therefore, while the application of punitive damages in IP disputes varies across jurisdictions, the overarching goal remains consistent: to discourage blatant violation and to protect the value behind an IP asset. This research examines the WTO's IP system through the lens of the TRIPS agreement and its Dispute Settlement Understanding (DSU) in the context of the enforcement of IP rights and the role of punitive damages in maintaining the integrity of the global trading system under the General Agreement on Trade in Services (GATS).

METHODOLOGY

Case Study 1: United States vs. China (IP and Trade Disputes)

The United States has long harboured apprehensions regarding China's IP regime, especially the perceived shortcomings in the Chinese IP enforcement framework and the drywall issues that involve forced technology transfer for market access. In 2007, the United States filed a case at WTO that China's measure on the protection and enforcement of IP rights was contrary to the TRIPS Agreement. Some of the areas of concern were that criminal penalties for IP violation remained low and there were weaknesses in the protection of copyrights and trademarks (WTO, 2007).

WTO's Mediation Process and Outcome

The first procedural step by the WTO's DSM involved consultation between the United States and China. When this consultation failed to address the issues at hand, a panel for consideration of the case was formed. While presenting its report in 2009, the panel identified several shortcomings in China's enforcement of IP rights as violating its TRIPS obligations. For instance, the panel decided that China's standards of criminal procedures and penalties where infringement of IP rights is involved were too high to be effective. The panel also identified some problems with China's customs measures about the disposal of goods which have been taken action against for violating IP rights (WTO, 2009).

Analysis of Legal and Financial Challenges Faced

Legally, this case brought out apparent loopholes in the IP enforcement regime in China. The process of harmonization of the national legislation with the international one called for legally significant changes. Financially, the case highlighted the effects of weak protection against IP theft on trade, as many American companies incurred significant losses due to counterfeiting and piracy in China. The ruling forced China to enhance its legal protection of IP and enforcement mechanisms that required the Chinese government to spend billions of dollars and undertake administrative reforms to align with WTO rules (Maskus, 2012).

Case Study 2: European Union vs. China (IP and Trade Disputes)

The EU has also been involved in several IP disputes against China, mainly involving the sale of counterfeits and the protection of Geographical Indications (GIs). Perhaps one of the most high-profile cases was the one where the EU complained that China has not been offering sufficient protection and enforcement to the European geographical indications such as Parma ham or Champagne though these products are very popular in Europe (WTO, 2010).

WTO's Mediation Process and Outcome

Through the WTO, consultations were conducted between the two parties following the EU's complaint. When matters of disagreement cannot be settled through consultations, there is a panel. This was further underlined by the panel with the conclusion that China had to strengthen its legal system to guarantee adequate protection of GIs under the TRIPS Agreement. The end of this case pushed EU-China negotiations on bilateral protection of European GIs enhancing their recognition in the Chinese market (WTO, 2012).

Analysis of Legal and Financial Challenges Faced

From the legal perspective, this case involved the legal obligation for China to make sweeping

transformations to the laws protecting GIs and the mechanisms for their enforcement. This also applied to training enforcement agencies to appreciate and address the issue of GIs correctly. In terms of the economy, the enhanced protection of GIs had a great impact on the EU and China's economic benefits. While for the EU improving the protection of GIs in China was a way to protect the economic value of European producers, for China, the improvement of protection entailed legal and administrative reforms required to meet the WTO obligations (Blakeney, 2013).

Case Study 3: India vs. China (IP and Trade Disputes)

India and China, being two of the largest emergent economies, have their fair share of IP grievances, especially in the pharmaceutical industry. In one such case, India objected to provisions and practices of the Chinese government relating to the protection of pharmaceutical patents, arguing that China has not been TRIPS compliant. These were: long and arbitrary time taken to award patents, and inadequate IP protection accorded to Indian pharmaceutical products in the Chinese market (WTO, 2015).

WTO's Mediation Process and Outcome

To address these grievances, the WTO provided consultations between India and China through its dispute settlement process. However, the parties failed to find a common ground where they could work out the matter to everyone's satisfaction, and thus a panel was convened. This made the panel's report recommend that China step up the pace of its patent examination and make its laws offering sufficient protection to foreign medicine patents. The ruling forced China to change its patent system, seeking to shorten the time of unnecessary delays and increase the protection of patents internationally (WTO, 2016).

Analysis of Legal and Financial Challenges Faced

From a legal perspective, the case entailed rights procedural failures of the patent system in China, which entailed major administrative changes. Such changes were needed to align with the WTO's trend and to bolster a stronger IP regime. On the financial aspect, the crisis defined the economic consequences for India since its pharma company had issues entering the Chinese market. The costs incurred by China when making changes to its patent system were high, however, the reforms were crucial to meet the requirements of the global trade laws and to spur the development of innovations in China (Rai, 2018).

Case Study 4: United States and Argentina–Patent Rights for Pharmaceuticals (DS171 & DS196)

The United States filed a complaint against Argentina in 1999 arguing that Argentina's patent law was not compliant with TRIPS, especially in the testing of sufficient protection for pharmaceutical inventions. Argentina's patent law did not cover provisions for awarding exclusive marketing rights for drugs, and there was inadequate provision of legal protection for confidential test data.

The panel stated that the practices in Argentina were against the provisions of TRIPS, thereby resulting in many changes to Argentina's patent law to adhere to the decision (WTO, 2000). This case demonstrates how the DSM can be employed to enforce changed legislation in developing countries about the protection of IP and developmental goals. The opponents claimed that by using this kind of decision, global power relations are strengthened where the economically less developed countries get forced to adopt IP standards that may not be suitable for improving their health systems or otherwise are friendly to the country's economy.

ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

The WTO's DSM has also remained very useful in handling and resolving IP disputes since it seeks to ensure compliance with the TRIPS accord among the member states. They have also enjoyed it being structured and rule-based with a legalistic framework with predictability and stability, and if necessary, escalated to the Appellate Body, which has enhanced the protection of IP rights across the world (Van den Bossche & Zdouc, 2017).

However, the DSM is not an unproblematic instrument either. The process is often slow and cumbersome, taking many years before the disputes are decided, which poses a problem, especially for evolving sectors such as technology. Moreover, there has been a problem with the working of the Appellate Body which has been subjected to several delays and a shortage of resources. Furthermore, there is no guarantee that rulings will be complied with, and while the use of retaliatory measures is legally permissible, is not the perfect course of action to pursue action against offenders (Davey, 2014).

A WTO dispute normally lasts about 15-20 months to get to a panel ruling and even an additional year if it gets to the Appellate Body. This takes more time and is particularly more harmful to sectors such as technology, and pharmaceuticals because innovations in such fields have short life spans and hence, delayed rulings are ineffective. For instance, the Apple Inc. v. Samsung Electronics Co. patent outside the WTO system is a classic

example of a dispute which were dragged on for over seven years and by the time both companies released multiple generations of technology at the heart of the dispute. Similarly, in a WTO case, a similar timeline may mean that any determination made on IP issues becomes useless as legal determinations on them may not be enforceable by the time they are implemented (U.S. District Court, 2016).

An example of a case about WTO disputes is China–Measures Affecting the Protection and Enforcement of IP Rights (DS362). While the decision of the panel in 2009 brought legal changes to China, the lengthy time the panel gave to resolve the problem implied the fact that American companies were to continue suffering from counterfeiting and piracy and estimated $48.2 billion per year (U.S. Chamber of Commerce, 2018). This delay weakened the dissuasive character of this ruling and demonstrated the urgency of shortening proceedings about quickly developing technologies.

Resource Shortages and Backlogs: Lack of resources has remained a major concern for the WTO's DSM, especially since 2019 when the Appellate Body was effectively rendered moribund by the refusal of the United States to allow appointments to the office. This state of affairs has led to a buildup of unsolved cases leading to unpredictability for corporations and countries in search of efficient negotiation and settlement (Hoekman & Mavroidis, 2020). This misallocation effect of resource scarcity is especially costly for small economies because they cannot engage in parallel actions at the bilateral or unilateral level.

Unequal Power Dynamics in Multilateral Disputes: While WTO's DSM exists to offer fair treatment to all member states, big nations have most of the control over the decision-making. For instance, in the Argentina – Patent Protection for Pharmaceuticals (DS171) dispute the United States forced Argentina to change its legal regime on patents it considered unfavourable for its domestic producers of cheap generics even though the change was quite costly to Argentina (WTO, 2000). This power equation gives rise to much argument among critics of the free functioning of the DSM whereby there is the tendency of the ruling power to compel the developing nations to accept verdicts that are inferior to their developmental agenda.

Comparison with Unilateral and Bilateral Approaches

In comparison with unilateral and bilateral mechanisms, one can outline some benefits of the WTO multilateral system. The use of one-sided approaches like trade sanctions can also bring about trade friction and counter-actions, which makes trade relations volatile. These actions are also accused of predisposing and pressuring the participants. Bilateral negotiations, though useful at times, tend to rely on the strength of negotiation of the two countries without much value addition and often lead to the result in agreements that may not meet international standards due to skewed bargaining power.

In this regard, the WTO's multilateral approach is meant to be just and to follow the rules set within the international trading system. It gives equal opportunity for both parties, and it establishes justice based on applying the rules in case of conflict. Apart from enhancing compliance with IP standards, the framework sets out to enhance international economic stability and cooperation (Hoekman & Mavroidis, 2015).

The WTO's multilateral framework seeks to ensure an evenhanded approach to the settlement of disputes including the resolution of IP disputes. However, this is cut short due to power asymmetry. The dominance of the US & the EU is so intense that the resolution of outcomes is always favourable to them and binding measures against them are hard to implement. To illustrate this, in the case between the EU and the United States (DS160), the EU faced significant challenges in enforcement for compliance for over ten years due to the economic strength of the US. Unilateral measures like trade sanctions would elicit unfair reactions creating unstable relations while bilateral agreements provide undue advantage to the party in a more favorable position thereby leaving the resolution disagreeable and below the antic peaks expected of the world market (Hoekman & Mavroidis, 2015).

Impact on Legal and Financial Aspects

WTO mediation is also useful in dealing with jurisdiction and enforcement as it brings all the various cross-border IP disputes under one roof. This is especially important because IP rights are territorial and the enforcement of such rights often poses many challenges in the international marketplace. The WTO panels, along with the Appellate Body, provide a consistent legal basis for interpreting the provisions of TRIPS, which contributes to the creation of the worldwide uniformity of IP rights enforcement among member states. This minimizes territorial disputes and also leads to greater consistency in the implementation of IP rules (Gervais, 2008).

Financial Outcomes for Disputing Parties

Economically, WTO mediation can reduce the cost implications of legal actions and save time on prolonged bilateral negotiations. This makes the DSM an organized and efficient tool that lowers the risks and losses from the aspect of the unknown for companies operating across borders and involved in international commerce. By

implementing the WTO rulings, countries are forced to domesticate the international norms and standards on IP resulting in a stable legal framework to encourage foreign investors and owners of IP rights. Such stability may facilitate trade and economic cooperation among member states, and thus, improve the overall economic development of an individual state as well as of the whole world (Maskus, 2000).

Cost Implications for Companies: WTO trade disputes may take a long time and have long–term negative financial impacts on the companies concerned. A study conducted by the Organisation of OECD established that legal expenses incurred on an IP dispute resolution through WTO DSM cost over $1 million impracticable for SMEs (OECD, 2015). For instance, in the India Vs China protection of pharmaceutical patents case (DS542), while legal expenses are estimated at approximately $ 2.3 million—are significant for Indian pharmaceutical industries a lot of money has been forced to divert from research on new medicines and the expansion of their businesses (Rai, 2018).

Also, over a period spent in dispute, productivity is hampered and potential sales are lost. The absence and weakness of their Chinese counterpart opened the EU to an estimated €400 million of lost yearly sales for European makers of gourmet products such as Champagne (European Commission, 2019). Such financial losses call for the efficient implementation of mechanisms that will ease the economic strain of disputes for rights holders.

Long-Term Economic Ramifications for Countries: Thus, a commitment to implement WTO decisions entails certain costs for developing countries most specifically if legal and administrative changes are extensive. In China–Enforcement of IP Rights cases, approximately for about $8 billion was to reform its IP enforcement, officer training program, and creating special IP courts (Maskus, 2012). Although such reforms over time led to higher levels of FDI, the immediate balance of payment cost was high and there was apprehension that developing countries could not afford to meet the cost of compliance.

Potential Reforms to the WTO Dispute Settlement Process

To optimise the potential of the DSM, several improvements could be suggested. An idea for change is to finalize disputes faster so that such verdicts are made as early as possible, particularly in sectors where timely decisions are critical. This could be achieved by increasing the financial and human resources available to the WTO panels and Appellate Body. Additionally, enhancing transparency in the procedure and increasing stakeholder engagement could improve the recognition and acceptance of WTO decisions (Ehlermann, 2003).

To enhance the specificity of the reforms proposed, the WTO needs to deal with procedural inadequacies such as the regulation of rigid timelines for panel rulings and Appellate Body and other instances of resource inadequacy can be lessened through the development of a temporary roster of legal experts to clear some of the backlogs. Simple measures of practical transparency could involve the publication of short case descriptions, immediate coverage of the courtroom events, and giving a chance to people affected by the cases to register their comments for future testimony. Such changes would improve the efficiency, resource management and transparency of dispute resolution processes.

Enhancing Cooperation Between WTO and other International Bodies

Strengthening cooperation with other international organizations, such as the WIPO could further improve the resolution of IP disputes. Such partnerships might incorporate the development of capacity-building programmes to strengthen the overall ability of member states to enforce IP rights.

Therefore, increased cooperation could improve the efficiency and outcome of efforts to protect IP rights worldwide through joint seminars, courses, and the exchange of experience. Through collective efforts, these organizations can help members offer sufficient support to their member states to enhance the efficient protection of their IP assets by international measures (Abbott, 2013). Therefore, the WTO's DSM has proven relatively efficient at managing IP disputes, but there is still a great potential for development, particularly through enhanced collaboration with other international entities to expand its capacity and improve IP enforcement worldwide.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, there has been a growing paradigm shift from unilateralism towards multilateralism in the settlement of international IP disputes. In previous decades, protectionist steps caused tensions in the trading environment and unpredictability of the protection of IP rights. The WTO framework and the integration of the TRIPS Agreement signified a dramatic transition to a more standardized process of handling and settling disputes on IP rights. DSM of WTO has worked successfully to handle both legal and financial issues which have emerged

in connection with IP cases. It also provides them with a more systematic and normalized forum for dispute resolution, which is advantageous from the perspective of international law.

The involvement of China with WTO's DSM has altered the dynamics of China in the global IP context. It has been explained that due to the implementation of WTO decisions, legal and administrative reforms have indeed occurred in China and these improvements have gradually improved the enforcement of IP rights in China. It has also been seen that these changes have not only enhanced the safeguarding of IP rights in China but also raised the confidence level of foreign investors. This shift has broader implications for international trade and IP law, fostering a more stable and predictable environment that supports innovation and economic development through stronger and more coherent global IP protection. As trade continues to be a critical component of global business, the WTO system remains integral in maintaining balance and equity in international trade relations. The concrete measures include the establishment of fast-track procedures for complex IP cases, strengthening compliance through the use of fines provision of legal technical assistance, and technical cooperation with WIPO. These reforms would seek to handle the procedural delays, the problems of enforcement and the question of consistency, thereby enhancing the efficiency and fairness of the DSM.

REFERENCES

Abbott, F. M. (1999). The TRIPS agreement, access to medicines and the WTO Doha Ministerial Conference. *Journal of International Economic Law*, *5*(2), 469-505.

Abbott, F. M. (2013). *Intellectual property, public health, and international trade*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Beebe, B. (2009). Intellectual property law and the sumptuary code. *Harvard Law Review*, *122*, 1539-1640.

Bently, L., & Sherman, B. (2014). *Intellectual property law* (4th ed.). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Blakeney, M. (1996). *Trade related aspects of intellectual property rights: A concise guide to the TRIPS agreement* (2nd ed.). London, UK: Sweet & Maxwell.

Blakeney, M. (2013). *The protection of geographical indications: Law and practice*. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar Publishing.

Blustein, P. (2019). *Schism: China, America, and the fracturing of the global trading system*. Washington, DC: Centre for International Governance Innovation.

Correa, C. M. (2000). *Intellectual property rights, the WTO, and developing countries: The TRIPS agreement and policy options*. London, UK: Zed Books.

Davey, W. J. (2014). Dispute settlement in the WTO and RTAs: A comment. *Journal of International Economic Law*, *17*(4), 795-808.

Dinwoodie, G. B. (2011). *International intellectual property law and policy*. New York, UK: Oxford University Press.

Drahos, P. (2001). *The global governance of knowledge: Patent offices and their clients*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Ehlermann, C. D. (2003). Six years on the bench of the 'World Trade Court'. *Journal of World Trade*, *37*(5), 1061-1086.

Li, K. (2023). The WTO's National Security Exception and Its Implication to the China-EU Dispute: With Special References to Lithuania's Taiwan Representative Office. China and WTO Review, 9(2), 255-282.

Gervais, D. J. (2008). *The TRIPS agreement: Drafting history and analysis* (3rd ed.). London, UK: Sweet & Maxwell.

Ginsburg, J. C. (2005). *International copyright: Principles, law, and practice*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Hoekman, B. M., & Mavroidis, P. C. (2015). *The World Trade Organization: Law, economics, and politics*. London, UK: Routledge.

Jackson, J. H. (2006). *Sovereignty, the WTO, and changing fundamentals of international law*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Kur, A., & Levin, M. (2011). *Intellectual property rights in a fair world trade system: Proposals for reform of TRIPS*. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar.

Maskus, K. E. (2000). *Intellectual property rights in the global economy*. Washington, DC: Institute for International Economics.

Maskus, K. E. (2012). *Private rights and public problems: The global economics of intellectual property in the 21st century*. Washington, DC: Peterson Institute for International Economics.

Merges, R. P., Menell, P. S., & Lemley, M. A. (2013). *Intellectual property in the new technological age*. New York, UK: Aspen.

OECD. (2015). *Enhancing the role of SMEs in global value chains*. Paris, France: OECD.

Park, W. G., & Lippoldt, D. (2008). *Technology transfer and the economic implications of the strengthening of intellectual property rights in developing countries*. Paris, France: OECD.

Rai, A. K. (2018). *Intellectual property law in India: Challenges and perspectives*. New Delhi, India: Oxford University Press.

Reinisch, A. (2016). *The privileges and immunities of international organizations in domestic courts*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Samuelson, P. (2000). *Intellectual property and information law: International perspectives*. London, UK: Sweet & Maxwell.

Van den Bossche, P., & Zdouc, W. (2017). *The law and policy of the World Trade Organization: Text, cases, and materials* (4th ed.). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

WIPO. (2020). *World intellectual property indicators*. Geneva, Switzerland: Author.

WTO. (1994). The agreement on trade-related aspects of intellectual property rights. Retrieved from https://www.wto.org/english/docs_e/legal_e/27-trips.pdf.

WTO. (1997). India–Patent protection for pharmaceutical and agricultural chemical products (WTO Panel Report WT/DS50/R). Retrieved from https://www.wto.org/english/tratop_e/dispu_e/cases_e/ds50_e.htm

WTO. (2007). China–Measures affecting the protection and enforcement of intellectual property rights (WTO Panel Report WT/DS362/R). Retrieved from https://www.wto.org/english/tratop_e/dispu_e/cases_e/ds362_e.htm

WTO. (2010). China–Measures affecting the protection of geographical indications for agricultural products (WTO Panel Report WT/DS362/R). Retrieved from https://www.wto.org/english/tratop_e/dispu_e/cases_e/ds362_e.htm

WTO. (2015). India–Measures concerning the exportation of certain raw materials (WTO Panel Report WT/DS542/R). Retrieved from https://www.wto.org/english/tratop_e/dispu_e/cases_e/ds542_e.htm

Yu, P. K. (2007). *Intellectual property and information wealth: Issues and practices in the digital age*. Westport, CT: Praeger.

Zhang, W. (2017). *Intellectual property enforcement in China: Challenges and strategies*. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar.

Zhang, W. (2020). *China's intellectual property regime: New developments and reforms*. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar.

ETHICAL DECLARATION

Conflict of interest: No declaration required. **Financing:** No reporting required. **Peer review:** Double anonymous peer review.