International Journal of Economic Practices and Theories (IJEPT)
ISSN: 2247-7225
Volume 2026, Issue 1

Plant Variety Protection and Farmers Rights in India: A Critical Analysis under the PPV&FR Act, 2001

[1]Dr. Anita Parmar, [2]Dr. Diptirekha Mohapatra, [3]Dr. Bishnanand Dubey

[1]Assistant Professor, School of Law, Prestige Institute of Management and Research, Deemed to be University, Indore.

[2]Assistant Professor, P.G. Department of Law, Sambalpur University.

[3]Assistant Professor, Teerthanker Mahaveer College of Law & Legal Studies, Teerthanker Mahaveer University, Moradabad.

Abstract

Recognizing the significance of ***Sui Generis System*** in the World and one of the most important among them is **"India's Protection of Plant Varieties and Farmers Rights Act, 2001".** The legislation, which was adopted to fulfill India's obligation under **"Article 27.3(b) of the TRIPS Agreement",** was consciously designed to jettison the "breeder-centric" approach of the "1991 UPOV Convention" in favor of putting the cultivating, conserving and breeding farmer at the heart of the intellectual-property equation. The author has critically evaluated the Act twenty years after its operationalisation in this review paper, with reference to the **"Luxembourg Accords on catechetical reform"**. It presents an overview of the international and constitutional framework of the law, reviews the system of breeders and farmers rights and rights and benefits of communities, and evaluates the institutional and adjudicatory mechanisms set up in the Act. The paper relies on some benchmark disputes, such as **"Monsanto Technology LLC v. Nuziveedu Seeds Ltd."** and the **"PepsiCo FC-5 potato dispute**", to contend that normatively the statute is a precursor, but it is incomplete in its transformative potential. Persistent gaps in **"farmer awareness",** an **"underutilized benefit-sharing"** and **"National Gene Fund mechanism"**, definitional ambiguity around the "branded seed" proviso, an unresolved interface with the "Patents Act, 1970", and the post-2021 dilution of specialized adjudication have blunted the Act's redistributive edge. The paper concludes with a set of legal and economic reform proposals aimed at restoring the balance between innovation incentives and the livelihood security of India's farming communities.

Keywords: Plant variety protection; farmer's rights; PPV&FR Act 2001; TRIPS Article 27.3(b); benefit sharing; sui generis regime; seed sovereignty; agricultural innovation.

1. Introduction

"Seed is at once a biological artifact, an economic input and a cultural inheritance." For the greater part of agrarian history, the farmer was simultaneously the breeder, the conserver and the distributor of seed, freely saving, exchanging and improving planting material within and across communities. The emergence of formal plant breeding, the commercialization of the seed industry and, ultimately, the extension of intellectual-property norms to living matter unsettled this arrangement. The central policy question that confronted India at the turn of the millennium was therefore deceptively simple: ***how could a legal regime reward and incentivize investment in plant breeding without dispossessing the very farming communities whose accumulated selection and conservation had generated the genetic base upon which modern breeding depends?***

"The Protection of Plant Varieties and Farmers Rights Act, 2001" is the well-thought-out response of the Indian State to that question. Its use of the word **"plant variety protection"** together with **"farmer's rights"** indicates a philosophy of legislation which does not see the farmer primarily as consignee of protected seed. It rather values the farmer as a cultivator who has the right to "save" and "sell" his seed, and as a breeder who is able to register his varieties, and likewise as a conserver who has the right to benefit from maintaining Agro biodiversity. In this regard, the Act is different from the prevailing global model, as in the **"1991 Act of the International Union for the Protection of New Varieties of Plants" (UPOV).**

This review paper addresses issues pertinent to the PPV&FR Act over 20 years after it was enacted, and about 17 years after the launch of the Authority. The analysis goes forward on three claims. First, because the legislation is normatively groundbreaking and, on paper, is one of the most farmer-friendly plant-variety laws in the world. Secondly, that its impact in practice has been uneven, effective in establishing commercial and existing varieties but languid in the provision of its redistributive benefits to rural communities and farmers. Third, that several structural features of the statute and its surrounding legal ecosystem the ambiguous "branded seed" proviso, the fraught interface with the "Patents Act, 1970", the underperformance of benefit-sharing, and the post-2021 restructuring of adjudicatory for a require targeted reform if the Act's founding balance is to be preserved.

2. The International and Constitutional Backdrop

2.1 TRIPS and the sui generis mandate

The immediate legal trigger for the "PPV&FR Act" was India's accession to the "Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights" (TRIPS) as part of the Marrakesh package establishing the "World Trade Organization" in 1995. "Article 27.3(b) of TRIPS permits members to exclude plants and animals from patentability", but obliges them to protect plant varieties "either by patents or by an effective sui generis system or by any combination thereof." The provision thus left members a measure of policy space: they could adopt patents, a bespoke ("of its own kind") system, or a hybrid. Importantly, TRIPS did not specify what an "effective" sui generis system was or that it should conform to UPOV.

India singled the sui generis path and decided not to accept the UPOV. It was no coincidence, or the result of a mere technical decision. With the Act of UPOV from 1991, the flexibility of the "farmers' privilege" (saving and re-using seed) was significantly curtailed and instead the use had to be an "optionally" exception, leaving safeguarding of the breeder's legitimate interests to be determined. Politically and economically it was impossible to implement wholesale the UPOV 1991 model, given the vast majority of farmers are smallholders who seriously rely on the farm-saved seed. Thus, the sui generis provision in Article 27.3(b) enabled India to design a system to fit in with the agrarian reality, which is India.

2.2 The Convention on Biological Diversity and the ITPGRFA

The Act is not to be understood alone and must be complemented by two additional international instruments. "The Convention on Biological Diversity, 1992" (CBD) confirmed rights of the state to its biological resources and introduced "a concept of prior informed consent and fair and equitable benefit sharing from using genetic resources". These principles are referred to in the benefit sharing mechanism foreseen in the "PPW&FR Act" and in its sister legislation, the "Biological Diversity Act, 2002". But the "International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture" (2001) to which India is a signatory went further: its Article 9 explicitly mentions "Farmers Rights", encompassing "the protection of TK, right of benefit-sharing and the right to save and use, exchange and sell farm-saved seeds subject to national law". Basically the "Farmers rights" policy, which is internationally recognized, is being implemented in India through the PPV&FR Act.

2.3 Constitutional anchoring

Article 39(b) of the Constitution "directs the State to ensure that the ownership and control of material resources of the community are so distributed as best to sub serve the common good", while Article 48 enjoins the State to organize agriculture on modern and scientific lines. The farmers rights provisions can be understood as a legislative attempt to reconcile the protection of private innovation with these distributive and developmental commitments, and, more broadly, with the right to livelihood that has been read into Article 21.

3. Legislative Genesis and Objectives

The passage of the "PPV&FR" Act was preceded by nearly a decade of contentious debate. Early drafts in the mid-1990s were criticized by farmer's organisations, civil-society groups and scientists as excessively breeder-centric and insufficiently protective of cultivators. Sustained advocacy notably by groups such as Gene Campaign and other members of the farming and scientific community was instrumental in expanding the farmers' rights component of the Bill before it was finally enacted in 2001. The result was a statute that self-consciously balances two constituencies that are often in tension.

The Preamble and the objects of the Act articulate "a composite purpose: to establish an effective system for the protection of plant varieties and the rights of farmers and plant breeders; to encourage the development of new varieties of plants; to recognize and protect the rights of farmers in respect of their contribution in conserving, improving and making available plant genetic resources for the development of new varieties; to protect plant breeders' rights in order to stimulate investment in research and development, both public and private, for the development of new varieties; and to facilitate the growth of the seed industry so as to ensure the availability of high-quality seeds and planting material to farmers".

4. Registrable Categories and Criteria of Protection

The Act permits the registration of four broad categories of plant varieties, each subject to distinct eligibility requirements:

New varieties that meets the requirements of novelty, distinctiveness, uniformity and stability (often shortened to the N-DUS test). Novelty is related with the absence of previous commercial exploitation; distinctiveness is related to the fact that the variety needs to be clearly distinguishable from other varieties of common knowledge; uniformity is related with the consistency of essential characteristics and stability is related with the fact that the characteristics remain neutral after repeated propagation.

Extant varieties are varieties for which the farmer or applicant has common knowledge or farmers' varieties or notified under the seed act 1966 or varieties present in the public domain. Existing varieties are evaluated based mainly on their distinctiveness, uniformity and stability: Novelty is not considered as it is not applicable for existing material.

Farmer's varieties, or wild relatives or local varieties (landraces) of a variety of which farmers have a body of familiar experience. Importantly, farmers' varieties do not fall under the novelty requirement and, indeed, when traditional and farmer's varieties are defined, traditional varieties are, by definition, already being cultivated.

Essentially Derived Varieties (EDVs), varieties which are mostly derived from an initial variety but where the expression of its essential characteristics is not affected. When considering the EDV concept, one of the most important points of protection is the fact that the original breeder cannot be subjected to cosmetic changes on a protected variety.

Such differential treatment of the categories constitutes a manifestation of a balancing philosophy evident in the Act. Novelty for the farmers' varieties has been relaxed and the statute creates a separate registration process for landraces, therefore moving the informal and community-based innovation of cultivators into the protective umbrella of formal IPRs, which UPOV does not envision.

5. Breeders Rights

Heart of the Act is the creation of the 'proprietary' and the exclusive rights given to the holder of the "registered variety". When a variety is registered, the breeder or its successor, agent or licensee takes up the exclusive right to produce, sell, market, distribute, import or export the protected variety. Violation of these rights carries civil and; in certain situations criminal liability, including higher sanctions for wrongful use of a registered denomination.

The protection period varies as a function of the type of crop being treated. "For trees the period of protection is up to eighteen years from the date it was registered, and in the case of vines and other crops up to fifteen years from such date, and in the case of extant varieties, up to fifteen years from the date of notification under the Seeds Act, 1966". They are protected provided acceptable annual fees are paid in time, it being possible for a registration to be cancelled on a variety of grounds such as giving protection to an unfit person, provision of false information, or failure to comply with instructions given by the Authority by the breeder. The rationale for these exclusive rights is traditional: with breeders taking a cut of the successful varieties they should increase their investment in research and development activities, increasing the supply of better planting materials through private and public investments.

6. Farmers Rights: The Heart of the Statute

If breeder's rights are the Act's proprietary core, farmer's rights are its normative soul. Section 39 and the surrounding provisions confer on farmers a bundle of rights that has few parallels in comparative plant-variety law. These may be grouped under five heads.

6.1 The farmer as breeder

The Act treats "a farmer who has bred or developed a new variety on the same footing as a commercial breeder: such a farmer is entitled to registration and protection in like manner". This provision formally dissolves the historical distinction between the "professional" breeder and the cultivator-innovator, recognizing that on-farm selection is a legitimate form of plant breeding deserving of intellectual-property recognition.

6.2 The traditional right to save, use, exchange and sell seed

The most celebrated provision of the Act preserves "the farmer's customary entitlement to save, use, sow, resow, exchange, share or sell farm produce, including the seed of a protected variety, in the same manner as before the commencement of the Act". This so-called "farmers' privilege" is not a mere exception grudgingly carved out of the breeder's monopoly; it is affirmatively stated as a right. A single, significant proviso qualifies it: "the farmer may not sell "branded seed," that is, seed put in a package or other container and labeled in a manner indicating that it is of a protected variety". The farmer may therefore continue to sell saved seed of a protected variety in a generic, unbranded form, but may not market it under the protected denomination as a commercial product. This proviso, examined below, is the principal fault-line in the interpretation of farmers' rights.

6.3 The right to reward and recognition

The Act entitles farmers and rural communities engaged in the conservation and improvement of genetic resources to recognition and reward from the National Gene Fund, where the material has been used as a donor of genes in a registered variety. The Plant Genome Savior awards administered under the Act operationalise this entitlement, honoring farming communities whose stewardship of landraces has contributed to varietal development.

6.4 The right to compensation

Two distinct compensation mechanisms protect farmers. First, where a propagating material of a registered variety is sold to a farmer with a representation about its expected performance, and the material fails to perform as claimed under given conditions, the farmer may claim compensation before the Authority, which may direct the breeder to pay such compensation as it deems fit. Second, the benefit-sharing and community-compensation provisions allow communities to claim a share of the commercial gains derived from varieties developed using their genetic material.

6.5 Protective immunities: innocent infringement and fee exemption

The Act shields farmers from the harshest consequences of an infringement regime designed primarily for commercial actors. A farmer who unknowingly infringes a breeder's right is protected from liability if the farmer can establish that, at the time of the alleged infringement, the farmer was not aware of the existence of the registered right. Equally important is the exemption of farmers from the payment of any fee in proceedings before the Authority, the Registrar, the erstwhile Tribunal or a High Court. Together, these immunities reflect a legislative recognition that formal equality between a smallholder and a multinational seed company would, in practice, produce substantive injustice.

7. Community Rights and Benefit-Sharing

The Act is for the community as a collectivity that is the custodian of agro-biodiversity, not just an individual cultivator. Two are key mechanisms. The benefit-sharing provision allows any individual or a group of individuals, or governmental or non-governmental organisation, to file a claim on behalf of a village or local community towards the Authorities for a benefit derived from a registered variety, if the community has made contribution to the evolution of the variety. The Authority, upon hearing the breeder's reply and being convinced of the contribution by the community, can make a decision of placing an amount in the National Gene Fund.

The community-compensation provision goes with this in that, where a variety developed using genetic material conserved by a village or local community, a claim may be made. The National Gene Fund is the financial fulcrum of this architecture: benefit-sharing amounts, annual fees, compensation, contributions are all deposited in it and these amounts are disbursed for benefit-sharing, for compensation to communities, or for conservation and sustainable use of genetic resources. Tasking the Fund is, in theory, turning farmers' and community rights from a vague concept into a tangible stream of resources to the guardians of genetic diversity.

8. Conclusion

“The Protection of Plant Varieties and Farmers Rights Act, 2001” is thus a key component of Indian IP policy and a truly original component in international plant-variety legislation. India showed that it could use the sui generis space of TRIPS Article 27.3(b) to promote distributive justice over simply reinforcing private monopoly by refusing the logic of the breeder’s template which is the UPOV 1991 and by bringing the farmer as breeder, conserver and cultivator into the centre of the statutory matrix. The affirmation of farmer’s rights coupled with the enunciation of benefit sharing for farmers as a tenet of the plant-variety statute, and protective immunities for cultivators these are epic in terms of a normative achievement.

But the review conducted here should not be an opportunity for complacency. 20 years of operation highlight an enduring gap between the promise & delivery of the Act's redistributive element. Some of the most notable weaknesses are that registrations are dominated by commercial and extant varieties, benefit-sharing and the National Gene Fund are underused, the “branded seed” condition is volatile, the connection with patent law remains unsettled and the abolition of specialized adjudication has reduced accessibility to justice for those farmers this Act seeks to assist. The battle over PepsiCo clearly illustrated the strength of farmers' rights as well as the weakness of the practical implementation of those rights.

The test of the future will not be a re-legislation of the bold concept behind the Act, but whether it is enabled to function. Better rules, lower enforcement costs, a comprehensive documentary infrastructure, a better patent interface, accessible adjudication and real efforts to raise farmer awareness would make the rights in the Act reality. Would only then be the defining cybernetic vision of the statute, to pay the cultivator without dispossessing her of an innovation, be truly respected.

References

[1] Convention on Biological Diversity opened for signature 5 June 1992, 1760 UNTS 79 (entered into force 29 December 1993).

[2] Batar, S. PATENTING BIOTECHNOLOGICAL INVENTIONS: A CRITICAL ANALYSIS. INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY RIGHTS, 46.

[3] Cullet, P. (2005). Intellectual Property Protection and Sustainable Development. New Delhi: LexisNexis Butterworths.

[4] Gopalakrishnan, N. S. (2001). “An ‘Effective’ Sui Generis Law to Protect Plant Varieties and Farmers' Rights in India.” Journal of World Intellectual Property, 4(1), 157–172.

[5] International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture, opened for signature 3 November 2001 (entered into force 29 June 2004).

[6] Kochupillai, M. (2016). Promoting Sustainable Innovations in Plant Varieties. Berlin: Springer.

[7] Monsanto Technology LLC v. Nuziveedu Seeds Ltd., (2019) 3 SCC 381 (Supreme Court of India).

[8] Batar, S. (2025). Farmers’ Rights, Market Access, and Social Justice: An Analysis of India’s Plant Variety Protection Regime. Journal of Marketing & Social Research, 2, 151-154.

[9] PepsiCo India Holdings Pvt. Ltd. revocation proceedings and related litigation concerning the FC-5 potato variety, PPV&FR Authority (2021) and Delhi High Court.

[10] Protection of Plant Varieties and Farmers' Rights Act, 2001 (No. 53 of 2001), Government of India.

[11] Protection of Plant Varieties and Farmers' Rights Rules, 2003, Government of India.

[12] Ramanna, A. (2003). "India's Plant Variety and Farmers' Rights Legislation: Potential Impact on Stakeholders." Economic and Political Weekly / EPTD Discussion Paper.

[13] Sahai, S. (various). Writings and policy interventions on farmers' rights and the PPV&FR Act, Gene Campaign, New Delhi.

[14] Tribunals Reforms Act, 2021 (No. 33 of 2021), Government of India.

[15] TRIPS Agreement (Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights), Marrakesh Agreement Establishing the World Trade Organization, Annex 1C (1994), Article 27.3(b).

[16] UPOV, International Convention for the Protection of New Varieties of Plants, 1961, as revised in 1972, 1978 and 1991.