



MAX-PLANCK-GESELLSCHAFT



TECHNISCHE
UNIVERSITÄT
MÜNCHEN

THE GEORGE
WASHINGTON
UNIVERSITY
LAW SCHOOL
WASHINGTON DC

MIPLC Studies

Edited by

Prof. Dr. Christoph Ann,
Technische Universität München

Prof. Robert Brauneis,
The George Washington University Law School

Prof. Dr. Thomas M.J. Möllers,
University of Augsburg

Prof. Dr. Dres. h.c. Joseph Straus,
Max-Planck-Institute for Intellectual Property,
Competition and Tax Law

Volume 2

Murray Lee Eiland

Patenting Traditional Medicine



Nomos

MIPLC

Munich
**Intellectual
Property**
Law Center

Augsburg
München
Washington DC

Die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek verzeichnet diese Publikation in der Deutschen Nationalbibliografie; detaillierte bibliografische Daten sind im Internet über <http://www.d-nb.de> abrufbar.

The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliografie; detailed bibliographic data are available on the Internet at <http://www.d-nb.de>.

Zugl.: Munich, Munich Intellectual Property Law Center LL.M., Thesis., 2006

ISBN 978-3-8329-3766-9

1. Auflage 2008

© Nomos Verlagsgesellschaft, Baden-Baden 2008. Printed in Germany. Alle Rechte, auch die des Nachdrucks von Auszügen, der fotomechanischen Wiedergabe und der Übersetzung, vorbehalten. Gedruckt auf alterungsbeständigem Papier.

This work is subject to copyright. All rights are reserved, whether the whole or part of the material is concerned, specifically those of translation, reprinting, re-use of illustrations, broadcasting, reproduction by photocopying machine or similar means, and storage in data banks. Under § 54 of the German Copyright Law where copies are made for other than private use a fee is payable to »Verwertungsgesellschaft Wort«, Munich.

Inhaltsverzeichnis

| | |
|---|----|
| Patenting Traditional Medicine <i>Murray Lee Eiland*</i> | 7 |
| INTRODUCTION | 7 |
| The Controversy | 8 |
| I. TERMINOLOGY OF TRADITIONAL KNOWLEDGE | 10 |
| 1. WIPO Model Provisions | 10 |
| 2. The Convention on Biological Diversity | 11 |
| 3. Declaration of the Rights of Indigenous Peoples | 12 |
| 4. Traditional Knowledge: A Certain Term? | 13 |
| 5. IP Laws and Traditional Knowledge | 13 |
| II. PATENT PROTECTION | 14 |
| III. TRIPS | 15 |
| IV. US PATENT SYSTEM | 16 |
| 1. Categories of Patent | 16 |
| 2. Novelty | 17 |
| 3. Joint Invention | 20 |
| 4. Potential Conflict with TRIPS Obligations | 21 |
| V. INDIA | 22 |
| 1. Patents | 22 |
| 2. Tumeric | 23 |
| 3. Indian Bio-Diversity Act | 23 |
| 4. Neem | 24 |
| 5. The Neem Patent at the EPO | 25 |
| 6. Geographic Disparity in US Patent Law | 25 |
| 7. Neem Patent in New Zealand | 26 |
| 8. Databases | 27 |
| 9. Fair Use | 29 |
| 10. Is the Database Project Viable? | 30 |
| VI. DISCLOSURE OF ORIGIN | 30 |
| VII. PROSPECTING AGREEMENTS | 32 |
| VIII. GEOGRAPHICAL INDICATIONS | 35 |
| IX. TRADEMARKS | 36 |
| X. TRADE SECRET PROTECTION | 37 |
| XI. CHINA | 39 |
| 1. Statutory Protection | 39 |
| 2. Patent Law | 40 |

| | |
|--|----|
| 3. A Database of Traditional Chinese Medicine? | 42 |
| XII. FLEXIBILITY OF THE PATENT SYSTEM? | 43 |
| XIII. CONCLUSION | 44 |