Agri Articles
(e-Magazine for Agricultural Articles)
Volume: 06, Issue: 03 (MAY-JUNE, 2026)
Available online at http://www.agriarticles.com

Patenting Agricultural Microorganisms and Biofertilizer: A Comprehensive Review of Legal Frameworks, Ethical Paradigms and Socio-Economic Implications

[*]Vaibhav Kumar[1], Sparsh Sharma[1], Rupesh Kumar Verma[1], Yogendra Kumar Sain[1], Naresh Meena[1], Akashdeep[1], Vikash Fogia[1], Abhishek Chandankeri[1], Dodiya Brijeshkumar[1], Bapodara Vraj[1] and Dr. H. B. Limbani[2]
[1]M.Sc. Scholar, College of Agriculture, Junagadh Agricultural University, Junagadh
[2]Assistant professor, Department of Genetics and Plant Breeding, CoA, JAU, Junagadh, Gujarat, India
[*]Corresponding Author's email: vaibhavkumar116608@gmail.com

The shift toward sustainable agriculture has accelerated the use of biofertilizers-microbial formulations that improve soil fertility, mobilize nutrients and enhance crop resilience. Their commercialization, however, is shaped by complex intellectual property rights (IPR). This review traces the evolution of biological patents from Griffith's discovery of bacterial transformation (1928) and Avery's proof of DNA as genetic material (1944) to the landmark Diamond v. Chakrabarty case (1980), which recognized genetically engineered organisms as patentable. At the global level, frameworks like the TRIPS Agreement (1995) and the Budapest Treaty (1977) standardized microbial patenting, while in India, the Patents Act, 1970 (amended in 2002 and 2005) and the Biological Diversity Act, 2002 set strict boundaries through Sections 3(c), 3(e), 3(h) and 3(j). Key jurisprudence such as Dimminaco A.G. v. Controller of Patents (2001) established the "vendibility test," affirming biological processes as patentable. Beyond law, the article examines ethical and socio-economic concerns-biopiracy, monopolization risks and the need for Access and Benefit-Sharing (ABS) under the CBD (1992) and Nagoya Protocol (2010).

Introduction

Agriculture is steadily moving away from synthetic fertilizers toward sustainable, microbe-based practices. At the core are biofertilizers - formulations of microbes like *Rhizobium* and *Azotobacter* that improve nutrient supply and restore soil health. Unlike chemicals that often harm ecosystems, biofertilizers work symbiotically within the soil microbiome, supporting long-term sustainability.

This shift is closely tied to intellectual property rights (IPR). Once seen as the "common heritage of mankind," biodiversity has with advances in recombinant DNA technology and synthetic biology, become proprietary. Corporations, startups and public institutions now seek patents to protect engineered microbial strains and formulations.

Yet, this pursuit of exclusivity often clashes with traditional farming, the sovereign rights of biodiversity-rich nations and the realities of smallholder farmers. This review examines the scientific, legal, ethical and socio-economic dimensions of microbial patenting-drawing on global treaties like TRIPS (1995), the Budapest Treaty (1977) and the CBD (1992), alongside India's Patents Act (1970, amended 2002/2005) and Biological Diversity Act (2002). The aim is to highlight the delicate balance between incentivizing innovation and safeguarding food security and indigenous knowledge.

Historical background of biological patents

Year	Event / Person	Key Contribution / Impact
1928	Frederick Griffith	Discovered bacterial transformation in *Streptococcus pneumoniae* (“transforming principle”).
1944	Avery, MacLeod and McCarty	Proved DNA was the transforming principle → foundation for recombinant DNA technology.
1980	*Diamond v. Chakrabarty* (US Supreme Court)	Dr. Ananda Chakrabarty’s engineered *Pseudomonas* bacterium could degrade crude oil. Court ruled “anything under the sun made by man” is patentable → opened patents for living, engineered organisms.
1995	TRIPS Agreement (WTO)	Article 27.3(b) required patents for microorganisms and microbiological processes; countries could exclude plants/animals. Forced nations like India to amend laws, sparking ethical and farmer rights debates.

Concept and scientific foundations of biofertilizers

Biofertilizers contain beneficial microorganisms that enhance plant growth, improve soil health and reduce dependence on chemical fertilizers through natural biological processes.
The most important microbial groups include:

- **Nitrogen-fixing bacteria:** Species such as *Rhizobium*, *Azotobacter* and *Azospirillum* convert atmospheric nitrogen into plant-available forms using the enzyme nitrogenase. They are widely used in both legume and non-legume crops.
- **Phosphate-solubilizing bacteria (PSB):** Microbes like *Bacillus megaterium* and *Pseudomonas fluorescens* release organic acids and enzymes that make unavailable soil phosphorus accessible to plants.
- **Potassium-solubilizing bacteria (KSB):** These bacteria help release potassium from soil minerals for plant uptake.

Many of these microbes, particularly *Pseudomonas* species, also function as Plant Growth-Promoting Rhizobacteria (PGPR), enhancing nutrient availability, stimulating root growth through hormones such as IAA, suppressing pathogens via siderophores and strengthening plant defense mechanisms.

Why patents matter

The importance of patents becomes clear in challenging environments such as South *Saurashtra*, Gujarat, where medium black calcareous soils have high calcium carbonate content and alkaline pH. These conditions reduce the availability of micronutrients like zinc and iron and cause fertilizers, especially phosphorus, to become unavailable quickly. Research from **Junagadh Agricultural University** shows that conventional fertilizers are less effective in these soils. To improve crop performance, researchers have developed specialized microbial consortia combining *Rhizobium*, PSB, KSB and *Pseudomonas fluorescens*, often delivered through organic carriers such as biochar and farmyard manure. These formulations protect beneficial microbes and enhance their survival under alkaline conditions. Because these carefully designed combinations outperform generic strains by improving nutrient uptake and yields, universities and companies invest in developing and patenting them.

The global intellectual property framework for microorganisms

Patenting microorganisms presents unique challenges because patent law requires sufficiency of disclosure, meaning an invention must be described clearly enough for a skilled person to reproduce and use it. For complex living microbes, written descriptions alone are often insufficient. To address this, World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO) established the Budapest Treaty on the International Recognition of the Deposit of Microorganisms in 1977. The treaty requires inventors to deposit a pure, viable microorganism sample in an International Depository Authority (IDA) with a single deposit recognized internationally.

India joined the treaty in 2001 and now hosts several IDAs, including the Microbial Type Culture Collection and Gene Bank (MTCC), Microbial Culture Collection (MCC) and ICAR-National Bureau of Agriculturally Important Microorganisms (NBAIM). These institutions securely preserve proprietary strains such as *Rhizobium*, *Azotobacter*, *Pseudomonas* and engineered plasmids. The deposited strains remain confidential during patent examination and become available for verification and research after patent grant. This framework makes the global patenting of valuable microorganisms both practical and reliable.

Treaty/Agreement	Core Objective	Implication for Biofertilizers
TRIPS Agreement (1995, Art. 27.3b)	Harmonize global IPR	Requires WTO members to grant patents for microorganisms and microbiological processes.
Budapest Treaty (1977)	Recognition of microbial deposits	A single deposit in an International Depository Authority (IDA) satisfies global disclosure requirements.
Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD, 1992)	Biodiversity conservation and benefit sharing	Establishes sovereign rights over genetic resources; mandates Prior Informed Consent (PIC).
Nagoya Protocol (2010)	Operationalize Access and Benefit-Sharing (ABS)	Companies patenting biofertilizers must share profits equitably with source countries.

The Indian legal framework: navigating the patents act, 1970

India's patent system balances compliance with international obligations and protection of biodiversity through the **Patents Act, 1970** (Government of India, 1970). Key provisions governing biofertilizer patents are Sections 3(c), 3(e), 3(h) and 3(j).

Section 3(j) excludes plants, animals, seeds, varieties, species and essentially biological processes from patentability but expressly permits patents on microorganisms. Added in the 2002 amendments, this provision opened the way for biofertilizer patents in India.

Section 3(c) prohibits patents on naturally occurring living organisms or mere discoveries. Thus, simply isolating a naturally occurring *Azotobacter* strain is not patentable; substantial human intervention, such as genetic modification or a novel formulation, must be demonstrated.

Section 3(e) bars patents on mere mixtures of known components. Therefore, a microbial consortium can be patented only if it shows proven synergistic effects beyond the individual properties of its strains.

Section 3(h) excludes methods of agriculture and horticulture from patentability. As a result, while a biofertilizer product may be patented, the method of applying it in the field cannot, protecting farmers from infringement claims (Government of India, 1970).

Landmark Jurisprudence: *Dimminaco A.G. v. Controller of Patents* (2001)

Aspect	Details
Case Background	Swiss firm Dimminaco A.G. applied for a patent on a process to produce a live poultry bursitis vaccine. The Indian Patent Office rejected it, claiming living organisms could not be patented.
Court Ruling	The Calcutta High Court reversed the decision, applying the **"vendibility test"-** if a process yields a useful, commercially saleable product, it qualifies as an invention. The Court clarified that freeze-drying preserves microbes and that living organisms do not bar patentability.
Impact	The judgment directly influenced the **2002 amendment to Section 3(j)** of the Patents Act, formally recognizing microorganisms as patentable subject matter and advancing biotechnology patents in India.

Ethical paradigms and the commodification of life

The patenting of microorganisms raises a fundamental ethical question: should living organisms be treated as private property?

- **Critics' View:** Indigenous communities, environmental advocates and scholars argue that patents commodify biodiversity and often benefit corporations more than the communities that have conserved these resources. They contend that intellectual property systems can reinforce inequality, despite benefit-sharing mechanisms designed to promote fairness.
- **Proponents' View:** Supporters argue that patents are essential to encourage investment in research, genetic engineering, biosafety testing and field validation. Developing effective microbial formulations, such as nitrogen-fixing and phosphate-solubilizing consortia, requires significant time and resources, which patents help protect.
- **The Ethical Middle Ground:** A balanced approach is to deny patents on naturally occurring microorganisms while allowing protection for genuinely novel, non-obvious innovations, including engineered strains and unique formulations developed through substantial human intervention.

Socio-economic implications for sustainable agriculture

The transition from chemical fertilizers to biofertilizers has significant socio-economic implications, particularly in India, where smallholder farmers dominate agriculture.

- **Current Challenges:** Dependence on subsidized chemical fertilizers has contributed to soil degradation, water pollution and stagnant crop productivity, threatening long-term food security.
- **Benefits of Biofertilizers:** Microorganisms such as *Azotobacter* and *Rhizobium* improve soil fertility through natural nitrogen fixation. Their use can lower input costs, reduce farmer indebtedness and enhance resilience to climate-related stresses.
- **Risks of Patented Technologies:** Excessive control of microbial strains or delivery technologies by large corporations could increase costs and widen inequalities, limiting access for small farmers.
- **India's Safeguards:** Public institutions, including **Indian Council of Agricultural Research (ICAR)** and **Junagadh Agricultural University**, help address this challenge by developing and licensing indigenous technologies, such as the patented bio-encapsulation of *Trichoderma* and *Bacillus* (Patent No. 361021), at affordable rates.
- **Community Empowerment:** Government-supported biofertilizer units promote rural employment and decentralized production. Access to effective microbial consortia reduces dependence on imported chemicals, limits monopolistic control and supports both sustainable agriculture and farmer livelihoods.

Future perspectives

The future trajectory of patenting in the biofertilizer sector is tied to the accelerating convergence of synthetic biology, CRISPR-Cas genome editing and advanced agricultural nanotechnology. As scientists gain the ability to custom-design entire microbial genomes for specific, degraded soil profiles, the legal definitions of "invention" versus "discovery" will be vigorously tested. Patent offices must continuously adapt examination guidelines to assess engineered microbial consortia and products derived entirely from open-source DSI.

Conclusion

Patenting agricultural microorganisms lies at the intersection of innovation, law and food security. Biofertilizers based on microbes like *Rhizobium*, *Azotobacter* and phosphate-solubilizers are essential for sustainable farming, but require a balanced intellectual property system. India's Patents Act, 1970 (amended in 2002/2005) and the landmark Dimminaco A.G. v. Controller of Patents case (2001) show how law can adapt to biotechnology while preventing misuse. At the same time, ethical concerns, biopiracy and monopolization risks demand strict adherence to frameworks such as the Biological Diversity

Act (2002), the Nagoya Protocol (2010) and global mechanisms like the Cali Fund (COP16, 2024) for Digital Sequence Information. The way forward is a balanced regime-one that protects genuine innovation while safeguarding biodiversity, indigenous knowledge and the livelihoods of smallholder farmers.

References

1. Avery, O. T., MacLeod, C. M. and McCarty, M. (1944). Studies on the chemical nature of the substance inducing transformation of pneumococcal types: Induction of transformation by a deoxyribonucleic acid fraction isolated from *pneumococcus* type III. *Journal of Experimental Medicine*, **79**(2), 137-158.
2. Convention on Biological Diversity. (1992). *The Convention on Biological Diversity*. United Nations.
3. Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity. (2001). Handbook of the convention on biological diversity. *Earthscan*.
4. Griffith, F. (1928). The significance of pneumococcal types. *Journal of Hygiene*, **27**(2), 113-159.
5. Griffith, F. and Miescher, F. Bacterial Transformation (The Transforming Principle).
6. Indian Patents Act. (1970). *The Patents Act, 1970* (Act No. 39 of 1970). Government of India.
7. Indian Biological Diversity Act. (2002). *The Biological Diversity Act, 2002* (Act No. 18 of 2003). National Biodiversity Authority, Government of India.
8. Nagoya Protocol. (2010). Nagoya Protocol on Access to Genetic Resources and the Fair and Equitable Sharing of Benefits Arising from their Utilization to the Convention on Biological Diversity. Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity.
9. Buck, M. and Hamilton, C. (2011). The Nagoya Protocol on access to genetic resources and the fair and equitable sharing of benefits arising from their utilization to the Convention on Biological Diversity. *Review of European Community and International Environmental Law*, **20**(1), 47-61.
10. Supreme Court of the United States. (1980). *Diamond v. Chakrabarty*, 447 U.S. 303.
11. High Court at Calcutta. (2001). *Dimminaco A.G. v. Controller of Patents and Designs*, AID No. 1 of 2001.
12. Agreement, T.R.I.P.S. (1994). Agreement on trade-related aspects of intellectual property rights. Geneva, WIPO.
13. Zweigert, K. and Kropholler, J. (1979). Budapest Treaty on the International Recognition of the Deposit of Microorganisms for the Purposes of Patent Procedure, Done at Budapest on April 28, 1977. *In Sources of International Uniform Law* (pp. 264-272). Brill Nijhoff.
14. World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO). (1977). Budapest Treaty on the International Recognition of the Deposit of Microorganisms for the Purposes of Patent Procedure.