
The Intersection of Unfair Trade Practices and Intellectual Property Rights: A Comprehensive Analysis of Legal Frameworks, Enforcement Mechanisms, and Global Approaches

[Raj, Kumar](#) * and Vaishali Verma

Posted Date: 16 September 2025

doi: 10.20944/preprints202509.1276.v1

Keywords: unfair trade practices; intellectual property rights; competition law; antitrust regulation; TRIPS agreement; patent trolling; technology transfer; traditional knowledge; geographical indications; trade secrets; enforcement mechanisms; biopiracy; digital piracy; FRAND licensing; consumer protection; international legal framework; EU directive; WTO; Paris convention; Berne convention



Preprints.org is a free multidisciplinary platform providing preprint service that is dedicated to making early versions of research outputs permanently available and citable. Preprints posted at Preprints.org appear in Web of Science, Crossref, Google Scholar, Scilit, Europe PMC.

Copyright: This open access article is published under a Creative Commons CC BY 4.0 license, which permit the free download, distribution, and reuse, provided that the author and preprint are cited in any reuse.

Disclaimer/Publisher's Note: The statements, opinions, and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of MDPI and/or the editor(s). MDPI and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions, or products referred to in the content.

Article

The Intersection of Unfair Trade Practices and Intellectual Property Rights: A Comprehensive Analysis of Legal Frameworks, Enforcement Mechanisms, and Global Approaches

Raj Kumar * and Vaishali Verma

Central University of Punjab, India

* Correspondence: rajkumar.yadav@cup.edu.in

Abstract

This paper examines the complex intersection between unfair trade practices and intellectual property rights (IPR), where the fundamental goals of promoting innovation and ensuring fair competition often create tension. The study analyzes how IPR systems, while designed to protect innovations and foster economic growth, can sometimes facilitate anti-competitive behaviors that necessitate intervention through competition law and unfair trade practice regulations. The research explores multiple dimensions of this intersection, including the pro-competitive features of IPRs, antitrust influences, and enforcement mechanisms across various jurisdictions, with particular emphasis on the European Union, United States, and India. The paper examines sector-specific applications across copyrights, patents, industrial designs, trade secrets, geographical indications, traditional knowledge, and technology transfer agreements. Key findings reveal that while international frameworks like TRIPS, Paris Convention, and Berne Convention provide foundational protection, significant challenges persist in harmonization, enforcement, and addressing power imbalances between developed and developing nations. The study highlights emerging issues such as digital piracy, patent trolling, forced technology transfer, and the protection of traditional knowledge from biopiracy. The analysis demonstrates that effective regulation requires a nuanced approach that balances IPR protection with competition law principles, emphasizing the need for continuous adaptation of legal frameworks to address evolving market dynamics and technological advancements.

Keywords: unfair trade practices; intellectual property rights; competition law; antitrust regulation; TRIPS agreement; patent trolling; technology transfer; traditional knowledge; geographical indications; trade secrets; enforcement mechanisms; biopiracy; digital piracy; FRAND licensing; consumer protection; international legal framework; EU directive; WTO; Paris convention; Berne convention

1. Introduction

The intersection of unfair trade practices and intellectual property rights (IPR) represents a critical juncture in modern legal and economic discourse, where the imperatives of innovation protection and fair market competition frequently intersect and sometimes conflict. IPR systems, encompassing patents, copyrights, trademarks, trade secrets, geographical indications, and traditional knowledge, are fundamentally designed to incentivize creativity, reward inventors, and drive economic growth by granting exclusive rights to creators and owners. However, these rights can inadvertently or deliberately foster anti-competitive behaviors, such as monopolistic practices, patent trolling, forced technology transfer, and the misappropriation of cultural heritage, which undermine consumer welfare, stifle emerging competitors, and distort global trade dynamics. This

paper provides a comprehensive analysis of this interplay, drawing on international treaties like the TRIPS Agreement, Paris Convention, and Berne Convention, as well as regional and national frameworks, with a focus on the European Union, United States, and India. It examines sector-specific challenges in areas like information technology, pharmaceuticals, and cultural industries, while addressing emerging issues such as digital piracy, biopiracy, and greenwashing. The objective is to highlight the need for balanced regulatory approaches that harmonize IPR protection with competition law, ensuring equitable enforcement and adaptation to technological advancements. Through this exploration, the paper underscores the importance of global cooperation to mitigate power imbalances between developed and developing nations, ultimately fostering sustainable innovation and fair trade.

1.1. Reconciling Intellectual Property Rights with Fair Competition

The intersection of unfair trade practices and intellectual property rights (IPR) is a complex area where the goals of fostering innovation and ensuring fair competition often collide. Intellectual property rights are designed to protect the innovations and creations of individuals and companies, granting them exclusive rights to their use. However, these rights can sometimes lead to anti-competitive practices, necessitating the intervention of competition law to maintain market balance. This intersection is particularly significant in sectors like information technology and pharmaceuticals, where the potential for market power abuse is high. The interplay between IPR and competition law is crucial for ensuring that the protection of intellectual property does not stifle competition or innovation.

1.2. Pro-Competitive Features of IPRs

IPRs inherently contain pro-competitive features by encouraging innovation and creativity, which are essential for economic growth and competitiveness in the global market (Ghidini, 2019) (Chepis & Chepis, 2024). The European Union emphasizes the need for a balance between IPR protection and competition law to foster a single market for goods and services, promoting innovation and job creation (Chepis & Chepis, 2024).

1.3. Antitrust Influence on IPRs

Antitrust laws play a critical role in regulating the use of IPRs to prevent monopolistic practices. This includes ensuring access to essential facilities and innovations on fair, reasonable, and non-discriminatory (FRAND) terms (Ghidini, 2019) (Ghidini, 2022).

In the EU and the US, there is a trend towards convergence in applying antitrust rules to IPRs, particularly in sectors prone to market power accumulation, such as ICT and pharmaceuticals (Todino, 2014).

1.4. Legal Framework and International Considerations

The interaction between IPR and unfair competition laws is also a significant concern in private international law, where the choice of law rules must adapt to multi-state activities and technological advancements (Asensio, 2009). The EU's approach to unfair competition laws is flexible, aiming to reduce tension between IPR protection and competition law by optimizing regulatory frameworks (Chepis & Chepis, 2024).

1.5. Cumulative Application of IPR and Unfair Competition Laws

The cumulative application of IPR and unfair competition laws is debated, with some arguing for their joint application to address issues like the protection of unregistered or expired intellectual property (Büyükkılıç, 2024). In international trade, protecting intellectual property is crucial to prevent unfair competition, especially for companies expanding into global markets (hendges, 2023).

1.6. Consumer Protection and IPR

IPRs also play a role in consumer protection by ensuring the availability of quality products and safeguarding against substandard goods that could pose health risks (Singh et al., 2015).

The proper enforcement of IPRs is essential for protecting consumers from unfair competition and maintaining market integrity (Singh et al., 2015). While the intersection of unfair trade practices and IPR presents challenges, it also offers opportunities for synergy. The balance between protecting intellectual property and ensuring fair competition is vital for fostering innovation and economic growth. However, the dynamic nature of global markets and technological advancements necessitates continuous adaptation of legal frameworks to address emerging issues effectively. The ongoing dialogue between IPR and competition law highlights the need for a nuanced approach that considers the interests of all stakeholders, including innovators, competitors, and consumers.

2. Global Intellectual Property Framework

2.1. Harmonizing Protection and Equity

The international legal framework for Intellectual Property Rights (IPR) is a complex system designed to protect and manage intellectual property across borders. It involves a variety of international treaties and agreements that aim to harmonize the protection of intellectual property while balancing the interests of creators, users, and the public. This framework is crucial for fostering innovation, creativity, and economic growth globally. However, it faces challenges such as differing national laws, enforcement issues, and the need to protect traditional knowledge and biodiversity. The following sections explore key aspects of this framework.

2.3. International Treaties and Agreements

2.3.1. TRIPS Agreement

The Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS) is a cornerstone of international IP law, setting minimum standards for IP protection and enforcement. It integrates provisions for dispute resolution and aims to balance IP holders' interests with the public good through limitations and exceptions like the Three-Step Test (BABA, 2024).

2.3.2. Paris and Berne Conventions

These conventions laid the groundwork for international IP protection, focusing on industrial property and copyrights, respectively. They are administered by the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO) and have been instrumental in shaping global IP norms (Guan, 2014).

2.3.3. Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) and Nagoya Protocol

These instruments regulate access to genetic resources and promote equitable benefit-sharing, particularly concerning traditional knowledge held by indigenous communities (Sukardi et al., 2024).

2.4. Challenges and Criticisms

2.4.1. Harmonization and Sovereignty

The harmonization of IP laws is challenging due to differing national legal systems and cultural conceptions. The TRIPS Agreement, for instance, provides only a minimum standard, leading some countries to pursue stricter TRIPS-plus provisions, which can cause tensions and resistance (Geiger, 2016).

2.4.2. Enforcement and Digital Piracy

The rise of digital piracy has highlighted the need for robust international enforcement mechanisms. Instruments like the Anti-Counterfeiting Trade Agreement (ACTA) aim to address these issues, but negotiations are complex and often controversial (Palomar, 2011).

2.4.3. Impact on Developing Countries

Developing countries, such as India, face unique challenges in aligning their domestic laws with international IP standards. This alignment can impact biodiversity management and food security, as seen in India's legal regime concerning biological resources (Cullet & Raja, 2004).

2.5. *Balancing IP Protection and Academic Freedom*

2.5.1. Academic Freedom

Strict IP regulations can hinder academic research and collaboration, while too lax regulations may reduce incentives for innovation. A balanced approach is necessary to ensure both IP protection and academic freedom, promoting open access to academic resources (Dihaa et al., 2024).

2.6. *China's Role in International IP Law*

2.6.1. China's Integration and Influence

China has actively engaged with international IP law, updating its domestic laws to comply with international standards and participating in global norm-setting. This involvement reflects China's growing influence in shaping IP protection frameworks that consider the interests of developing countries (Li & Gu, 2024).

While the international legal framework for IPR aims to create a cohesive system for protecting intellectual property, it must navigate the complexities of national sovereignty, cultural differences, and the diverse needs of developed and developing countries. The ongoing evolution of this framework requires careful consideration of these factors to ensure it remains effective and equitable.

3. India's IPR Framework: Balancing Innovation, Competition, and Cultural Heritage

India's legal framework for Intellectual Property Rights (IPR) is a complex system designed to protect and promote innovation, economic growth, and technological advancement. The framework encompasses various forms of intellectual property, including patents, copyrights, trademarks, and trade secrets, each governed by specific legislation. The Indian IPR system has undergone significant reforms to align with international standards and foster a conducive environment for innovation. However, challenges remain in terms of enforcement, competition law interplay, and protection of traditional knowledge. The following sections delve into the key aspects of India's IPR legal framework.

3.1. *Legislative Framework*

3.1.1. Patents

Governed by the Patents Act, 1970, which has been amended to comply with the TRIPS Agreement, patents in India provide exclusive rights to inventors for a limited period, encouraging innovation and investment in R&D (Chauhan, 2024) (Balamurugan & Radhakrishnan, 2010).

3.1.2. Copyrights

The Copyright Act, 1957, protects original works of authorship, including literary, musical, and artistic works, ensuring creators can control and monetize their creations (Bhat, 2017).

3.1.3. Trademarks

The Trade Marks Act, 1999, provides for the registration and protection of trademarks, which are crucial for brand identity and consumer trust (Chauhan, 2024).

3.1.4. Trade Secrets

Although not specifically legislated, trade secrets are protected under common law principles, emphasizing the importance of confidentiality agreements (Chauhan, 2024).

3.2. *Challenges and Reforms*

3.2.1. Enforcement Issues

Despite robust laws, enforcement remains a challenge due to limited resources and judicial delays. Strengthening enforcement mechanisms is crucial for effective IPR protection (Balamurugan & Radhakrisnan, 2010).

3.2.2. Competition Law Interplay

IPR and competition law can appear conflicting, as IPR grants exclusivity while competition law promotes market accessibility. However, a balanced approach can enhance economic efficiency by fostering innovation and competition simultaneously (- & Verma, 2024).

3.2.3. Traditional Knowledge and Biopiracy

India faces challenges in protecting traditional knowledge and biodiversity from biopiracy. The Biodiversity Act, 2002, aims to safeguard indigenous knowledge and ensure benefit-sharing, but implementation hurdles persist (T & Tnk, 2021) (Sharma et al., 2022).

3.3. *Role of Higher Education and Innovation*

3.3.1. Academic Contributions

Higher education institutions play a pivotal role in India's innovation ecosystem, contributing significantly to patent filings and technological advancements. Legal frameworks for IP commercialization in academia are evolving to support this trend (Patil & Sagar, 2024).

3.3.2. Global Innovation Index

India's rise in the Global Innovation Index reflects its growing innovation capabilities, driven by advancements in information and communication technologies (Patil & Sagar, 2024).

3.4. *International and Private Law Considerations*

3.4.1. Private International Law

The territorial nature of IPR necessitates private enforcement, often leading to domestic litigation of international disputes. Indian courts are increasingly considering global implications in IPR cases, integrating private international law into the framework ("Decussating Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights and Private International Law in India," 2023).

While India's IPR legal framework is comprehensive and aligned with international standards, challenges such as enforcement, competition law interplay, and protection of traditional knowledge remain. Addressing these issues through reforms and effective implementation can enhance India's innovation landscape and economic competitiveness. Additionally, the interplay between IPR and competition law, as well as the protection of traditional knowledge, highlights the need for a balanced approach that considers both innovation and market accessibility.

4. Unfair Trade Practices in Copyright Law: Striking a Balance Between Protection and Competition

Unfair trade practices in copyright law often arise from the tension between protecting intellectual property rights and ensuring fair competition in the market. These practices can manifest in various forms, such as restrictive distribution rights, misuse of copyright to stifle competition, and the imposition of excessive control over how copyrighted works are accessed and used. The scholarly debate highlights the need for a balanced approach that protects creators' rights while preventing anti-competitive behavior.

4.1. Restrictive Distribution Rights

Copyright laws often grant owners exclusive rights to distribute their works, which can lead to unfair trade practices when these rights are used to block competition. For instance, the prohibition of parallel imports in Taiwan's Copyright Law creates a distribution right that limits market access and can be seen as an unfair trade barrier, potentially violating international trade agreements like those of the WTO (Chiang, 2010). Similarly, the Australian case involving the ACCC highlighted how copyright owners attempted to control vertical distribution and block parallel imports, which was seen as a breach of competition policy (Papadopoulos, 2002).

4.2. Misuse of Copyright to Stifle Competition

Copyright can be used as a tool to suppress competition by limiting the ability of others to use or build upon existing works. This is particularly evident in the digital realm, where access controls can replace traditional copyright law and limit fair use (Stadler, 2007). The rise of access controls and the "death" of fair use are seen as byproducts of statutes that overly empower copyright owners, leading to potential anti-competitive practices (Stadler, 2007) (Stadler, n.d.).

4.3. Excessive Control and Fair Use

The broad application of the fair use doctrine, as seen in cases involving Google, has been criticized for enabling platform-based firms to engage in mass reproduction without compensating content creators, thus shifting wealth from producers to consumers (Barnett, 2024). However, fair use exceptions, such as those in Canada's Copyright Act, are designed to balance creators' rights with public interest, allowing for private study, research, and criticism without constituting copyright infringement (Boyer, 2007).

4.4. Alternative Approaches

Proposals like the Fair Trade Copyright system aim to address these issues by encouraging voluntary contributions to artists, thereby compensating creators without relying solely on traditional copyright enforcement (Helman & Helman, 2013). This model seeks to redistribute power within the industry, favoring artists over intermediaries, and could potentially mitigate some unfair trade practices by providing a more equitable revenue distribution (Helman & Helman, 2013).

While copyright law aims to protect creators, it can inadvertently lead to unfair trade practices that stifle competition and innovation. The challenge lies in finding a balance that respects intellectual property rights while promoting fair market practices. Alternative models, such as the Fair Trade Copyright system, offer potential solutions by aligning the interests of creators and consumers, thus fostering a more equitable and competitive environment.

5. Enforcement of IPR and Unfair Trade Practices: Global Mechanisms and Case Law

The enforcement mechanisms and case law on unfair trade practices and intellectual property rights (IPR) are complex and vary significantly across different jurisdictions. These mechanisms are

crucial for maintaining fair competition and protecting the rights of creators and businesses. The enforcement of IPR involves both civil and criminal measures, and the interaction between competition law and IPR is a critical area of focus, especially in regions like the European Union. The following sections provide an overview of the enforcement mechanisms and case law in various contexts.

5.1. European Union Enforcement Mechanisms

The European Union (EU) has a robust framework for enforcing IPR, which includes both civil and criminal measures. The EU's approach emphasizes the balance between competition law and IPR to foster innovation and economic growth (Chepis & Chepis, 2024). Key decisions from the Court of Justice of the European Union and national courts have shaped the enforcement landscape, addressing issues such as anti-counterfeiting and parallel trade (Gommers et al., 2024). The EU IP Enforcement Directive provides a comprehensive set of remedies, including injunctions and damages, to address IPR infringements (Brown et al., 2023).

5.2. International Trade and TRIPS Agreement

The TRIPS Agreement under the World Trade Organization (WTO) sets minimum standards for IPR protection and enforcement, influencing national laws worldwide (Peppo & Bode, 2023). Cross-retaliation under TRIPS is an innovative mechanism to address power disparities between developed and developing countries, though it requires further refinement (Wang, 2024). Countries like Iran and Indonesia are aligning their IPR laws with TRIPS to enhance enforcement mechanisms, though challenges remain in implementation (Barthos & Sara, 2019) (Milani & Ahmadi, 2018).

5.3. U.S. Section 337 and ITC

In the United States, Section 337 of the Tariff Act allows the International Trade Commission (ITC) to investigate and exclude imports that infringe on U.S. IPR, providing a unique enforcement mechanism that complements traditional court actions (Schwartz, 1995). The ITC's ability to issue exclusion orders is a powerful tool for IPR holders, allowing them to address infringement by multiple parties in a single forum (Schwartz, 1995).

5.4. Criminal Enforcement and Challenges

Criminal enforcement of IPR is essential for deterring counterfeiting and piracy. In the Balkans, criminal law plays a significant role in protecting trademark rights, though practical challenges exist in proving intent to deceive consumers (Peppo & Bode, 2023). In Nigeria, the judicial system is crucial for IPR enforcement, with a need for experienced judges and comprehensive procedures to address both civil and criminal infringements (Itanyi, 2018).

5.5. Unfair Competition and IPR Interaction

Unfair competition laws interact with IPR to ensure fair market practices. The EU's flexible and general unfair competition laws aim to reduce tension between these legal areas (Chepis & Chepis, 2024). International frameworks, such as the Paris Convention, provide guidelines for protecting against unfair competition, influencing national laws across Europe (Hilty & Henning-Bodewig, 2007). While the enforcement of IPR and unfair trade practices is well-established in many regions, challenges remain, particularly in aligning national laws with international standards and addressing power imbalances in global trade. The ongoing development of legal frameworks and case law is essential for adapting to dynamic trade practices and ensuring effective protection of intellectual property rights.

6. Unfair Trade Practices: EU Directive 2005/29/EC and Global Enforcement Mechanisms

Unfair trade practices encompass a range of deceptive, fraudulent, or unethical methods used by businesses to gain an advantage over competitors or exploit consumers. The enforcement mechanisms and case law surrounding these practices are crucial for maintaining fair market conditions and protecting consumer rights. The European Union's Directive 2005/29/EC on unfair commercial practices plays a significant role in shaping the legal landscape across member states, influencing both national legislation and enforcement strategies. This directive, along with various national laws, provides a framework for addressing unfair practices in both business-to-consumer (B2C) and business-to-business (B2B) contexts.

6.1. Directive 2005/29/EC and Its Interpretation

The Directive 2005/29/EC aims to harmonize the laws of EU member states regarding unfair commercial practices, ensuring a consistent level of consumer protection across the EU. It covers practices that are misleading or aggressive, and its scope includes both B2C and B2B transactions (Ilett, 2022) (El-Hagin, 2021). The Court of Justice of the European Union (CJEU) has played a pivotal role in interpreting the directive, addressing issues such as the definitions of "commercial practice" and "product," and the application of general clauses within the directive (Ilett, 2022). The directive's relationship with other EU and national regulations has been a subject of legal scrutiny, with the CJEU clarifying its precedence in cases of conflict with sector-specific laws (El-Hagin, 2021).

6.2. National Legislation and Enforcement Mechanisms

EU member states have adopted various legislative measures to enforce the directive, with some countries, like Italy, granting enforcement powers to national antitrust authorities. This has led to legal challenges and reforms to clarify the roles of different regulatory bodies (Lorenzoni, 2015). In Hungary, the implementation of the directive has significantly altered the traditional enforcement models, highlighting the impact of Europeanization on national legal systems (Balogh & Cseres, 2013). The enforcement of unfair trade practices in B2B relationships varies across member states, with some countries adopting specific legislation to address these issues, reflecting the diverse legal landscapes within the EU (Cafaggi & Iamiceli, 2018).

6.3. Case Law and Enforcement Strategies

Case studies, such as the Massachusetts Attorney General's approach to unfair mortgage lending, illustrate the role of state-level enforcement in addressing unfair practices. This case highlights the importance of combining consumer protection with investor protection to enhance enforcement outcomes (Kirsch, 2025). The "dynamic duo" of state and private enforcement mechanisms in the U.S. demonstrates the effectiveness of combining public and private actions to deter unfair practices and provide remedies to affected consumers (Pridgen, 2018). While the EU directive and national laws provide a robust framework for addressing unfair trade practices, challenges remain in ensuring consistent enforcement across different jurisdictions. The balance between harmonization and respecting national legal traditions is a delicate one, and ongoing legal developments continue to shape the enforcement landscape. Additionally, the interaction between unfair competition and unfair commercial practices remains a complex issue, with overlapping legal principles requiring careful navigation by courts and regulators (Mihajlović, n.d.).

7. Unfair Trade Practices in Patents: Balancing Innovation and Competition

Unfair trade practices in the context of patents involve a range of activities that exploit intellectual property rights to the detriment of fair competition and consumer welfare. These practices can manifest in various forms, such as patent trolling, abusive licensing conditions, and

strategic patenting to stifle competition. The intersection of patent law and unfair trade practices is complex, as it involves balancing the protection of innovation with the need to maintain competitive markets. This answer explores the key aspects of unfair trade practices related to patents, drawing insights from the provided papers.

7.1. Patent Trolling

Patent trolling refers to the practice where entities, often not involved in manufacturing or innovation, acquire patents solely to enforce them against alleged infringers, typically through litigation. This practice is considered a form of unfair competition as it exploits the legal system for financial gain without contributing to technological advancement (Diduk & Lytvyn, 2022). Patent trolls can create significant barriers for businesses, especially small and medium enterprises, by imposing legal costs and uncertainties, which can stifle innovation and market entry (Diduk & Lytvyn, 2022).

7.2. Abusive Licensing Practices

In the Information Communication Technology (ICT) sector, certain licensing practices are deemed unfair under Art. 102(a) TFEU. These include grant-back clauses, no-challenge clauses, and portfolio-wide licenses, which can have anti-competitive effects by restricting licensees' freedom and innovation potential (Galli & Botta, 2023). The abuse of dominance in patent licensing can lead to exploitative conditions, where licensors impose terms that are not fair, reasonable, and non-discriminatory (FRAND), particularly in the case of standard-essential patents (SEPs) (Missbräuchliche Ausnutzung von FRAND-Unterworfenen SEPs Im US-Kartellrecht, 2022).

7.3. Antitrust and Patent Law

The relationship between antitrust laws and patent rights is pivotal in addressing unfair trade practices. Antitrust laws aim to prevent monopolistic behaviors that can arise from the misuse of patent rights, such as price-fixing and market division agreements (Hovenkamp & Hovenkamp, 2015). The challenge lies in ensuring that patent laws do not inadvertently support anti-competitive practices by granting excessive market power to patent holders, which can lead to reduced consumer welfare and innovation suppression (Flynn, 2016).

7.4. Cross-Border Patents and Trade

Cross-border patents can influence international trade by either promoting or impeding it. While patents can protect innovations and encourage exports, they can also act as barriers to trade if used to enforce market segmentation and prevent the free flow of goods ("Do Cross-border Patents Promote Trade?," 2022). The impact of patents on trade varies across industries and is influenced by the strength of intellectual property regimes in different countries. Stronger patent protections can enhance trade by providing security for exporters, but they can also lead to strategic behaviors that limit competition ("Do Cross-border Patents Promote Trade?," 2022).

While patents are essential for protecting innovations, their misuse can lead to unfair trade practices that harm competition and consumer interests. The balance between protecting intellectual property and ensuring fair competition is delicate and requires careful regulation and enforcement. Addressing these challenges involves not only legal reforms but also increased awareness and strategic policy interventions to prevent the abuse of patent rights.

8. Unfair Trade Practices and Industrial Design Protection: Ensuring Fair Competition and Innovation

Unfair trade practices and the protection of industrial designs are interconnected issues that impact the competitive landscape of industries. Unfair trade practices involve deceptive or fraudulent business activities that can harm consumers and businesses, while industrial design

protection focuses on safeguarding the aesthetic aspects of products from unauthorized use. Both areas are crucial for maintaining fair competition and encouraging innovation. The relationship between these two areas is complex, as unfair practices can undermine the legal protections intended for industrial designs, leading to economic and social consequences.

8.1. Unfair Trade Practices

8.1.1. Definition and Impact

Unfair trade practices encompass fraudulent, deceptive, or dishonest business activities that mislead consumers and harm businesses. These practices can lead to economic instability and reduced consumer trust, affecting both small and large enterprises (Dewan, 2015).

8.1.2. Legal Framework

Various jurisdictions have established legal frameworks to combat unfair trade practices. These laws aim to protect consumers and ensure fair competition by prohibiting deceptive practices and providing remedies for affected parties (Campbell & Cotter, 1997).

8.1.3. Challenges and Solutions

Despite existing laws, challenges persist in effectively addressing unfair trade practices. These include low public awareness and the complexity of legal procedures. Suggested solutions involve enhancing institutional frameworks and increasing public education on consumer rights (Dewan, 2015).

8.2. Industrial Design Protection

8.2.1. Importance of Protection

Industrial designs are crucial for product differentiation and consumer appeal. Legal protection of these designs prevents unauthorized copying, ensuring that creators can benefit from their innovations (Xiao-jun, 2005) (Xiao-jun, n.d.).

8.2.2. Legal Limitations

The protection of industrial designs faces limitations, such as the difficulty in proving novelty and the challenges in enforcement. International experiences suggest the need for robust legal systems to address these issues effectively (Xiao-jun, 2005).

8.2.3. Fair Dealing and Balance

The concept of fair dealing in industrial design law allows limited use of designs for educational and research purposes, balancing the rights of designers and public interests. This balance is essential for promoting innovation while ensuring societal welfare (Nugroho et al., 2021).

8.3. Intersection of Unfair Trade Practices and Industrial Design

8.3.1. Overlap and Conflicts

There is a significant overlap between unfair trade practices and industrial design protection. Unfair practices can undermine the legal protections for designs, leading to market distortions and reduced incentives for innovation (Ohly, 2018).

8.3.2. Case Studies and Examples

Instances of design infringement often involve unfair practices, such as copying without consent. Legal cases highlight the importance of clear criteria for novelty and the need for effective enforcement mechanisms to protect design rights (Rahmawati & Kerti, 2023) (Elpina, 2019). While the protection of industrial designs and the prevention of unfair trade practices are distinct legal areas, they are interconnected in their impact on market fairness and innovation. Addressing these issues requires a comprehensive approach that includes robust legal frameworks, public awareness, and international cooperation. Balancing the rights of designers with public interests is crucial for fostering a competitive and innovative market environment.

9. Trade Secrets and Unfair Trade Practices: Navigating Protection and Competition

9.1. Legal Frameworks for Trade Secret Protection

Unfair trade practices and trade secrets are closely intertwined in the realm of business competition and intellectual property law. Trade secrets, which include confidential business information such as customer lists, manufacturing processes, and marketing strategies, are protected under various legal frameworks to prevent unfair competition. These protections are crucial as they help maintain a company's competitive edge by safeguarding information that has economic value. However, the legal landscape surrounding trade secrets is complex and varies across jurisdictions, often leading to challenges in enforcement and protection.

9.1.1. Indonesia's Approach

In Indonesia, trade secrets are protected under Law Number 30 of 2000, which does not explicitly define what constitutes economically valuable information, such as customer lists. This lack of specificity necessitates legal efforts to protect such information from unfair competition (Sudaryat, 2023).

9.1.2. US and EU Systems

The US and EU have developed hybrid systems that blend elements of unfair competition and intellectual property law to protect trade secrets. These systems rely heavily on judicial interpretation to balance trade secret protection with fundamental rights, highlighting the absence of a clear normative framework (M., 2023).

9.1.3. EU Directive

The EU's Directive on the protection of undisclosed know-how and business information aims to harmonize trade secret protection across member states, focusing on honest commercial practices and proportionality in legal measures (Pila & Torremans, n.d.) (Amorim, n.d.).

9.2. Challenges in Trade Secret Protection

9.2.1. Judicial Interpretation

Courts play a significant role in shaping trade secret protection, often struggling to establish clear guidelines due to the complex interplay between trade secrets and fundamental rights (M., 2023).

9.2.2. Criminal Law Measures

In Korea, the Unfair Competition Prevention and Trade Secret Protection Act aims to protect trade secrets, but its reliance on the breach of professional trust crime has led to ambiguities in enforcement (Chung, 2023).

9.2.3. National Variations

The Uniform Trade Secrets Act in the US, along with various no uniform amendments, illustrates the challenges in defining and protecting trade secrets consistently across states (Dole, 2016).

9.3. *Unfair Trade Practices and Their Impact*

9.3.1. Definition and Consequences

Unfair trade practices involve fraudulent or deceptive business activities that can harm consumers and businesses, leading to economic and social welfare issues (Dewan, 2015).

9.3.2. Legal Remedies

Legal frameworks often provide for civil liability or unjust enrichment claims to address the unlawful use of trade secrets, as seen in Lithuania's approach to awarding damages for unfair competition actions (Kontrimas, 2017).

While trade secret protection is essential for maintaining competitive advantage, it must be balanced with other considerations such as employee mobility and innovation. Overly stringent protections can stifle competition and innovation by restricting the flow of knowledge and skills in the workforce. Additionally, the global nature of business today requires harmonized international standards to effectively protect trade secrets across borders, which remains a significant challenge given the diverse legal systems and cultural attitudes towards intellectual property.

10. Mitigating Unfair Trade Practices in IPR: Legal Synergies and Global Cooperation

The removal of unfair trade practices in the realm of Intellectual Property Rights (IPR) involves a complex interplay of legal frameworks, regulatory measures, and international cooperation. Unfair trade practices, such as industrial espionage, trademark infringement, and the dissemination of misleading information, can significantly impede innovation and market competition. Various jurisdictions have developed legal mechanisms to address these issues, often integrating competition law with intellectual property law to create a synergistic approach. This integration is crucial for maintaining a fair market environment and promoting economic growth. The following sections explore the strategies and legal frameworks employed to mitigate unfair trade practices in IPR.

10.1. *Legal Frameworks and International Conventions*

The Paris Convention for the Protection of Industrial Property (1883) and the TRIPS Agreement under the World Trade Organization provide foundational international frameworks for addressing unfair competition in IPR. These conventions establish guidelines for member states to develop national laws that protect against unfair trade practices (Elizabeth et al., 2021) (Lilla, 2024).

In China, the Anti-Unfair Competition Law, first enacted in 1993 and amended in 2003, specifically targets unfair competition practices, including those related to intellectual property. This law aims to protect market operators and consumers from deceptive practices and has been adjusted to keep pace with evolving market dynamics (Elizabeth et al., 2021).

10.2. Regional Approaches and Case Studies

The European Union (EU) emphasizes the synergy between competition law and intellectual property law to ensure a single market system that fosters innovation and competitiveness. The EU's legal framework is designed to be flexible, allowing for adaptation to dynamic trade practices while maintaining a balance between protecting IPR and ensuring fair competition (Chepis & Chepis, 2024).

In Ukraine, the Antimonopoly Committee plays a crucial role in monitoring and addressing unfair competition related to IPR. This includes tackling issues such as the illegal use of trademarks and misleading advertising, with the High Court on Intellectual Property handling disputes in this area (Lutz, 2023).

10.3. National Regulatory Measures

In India, the integration of IPR protection with consumer protection laws helps safeguard consumers from substandard products and unfair competition. This approach underscores the importance of a robust IPR regime in promoting economic growth and protecting consumer interests (Singh et al., 2015).

Indonesia's Business Competition Supervisory Commission is tasked with enforcing competition laws that protect IPR, addressing issues like counterfeit products and monopolistic practices. This regulatory body ensures a healthy business environment by preventing unfair competition (Wijayanto & Sumanto, 2025).

10.4. Challenges and Recommendations

Despite existing legal frameworks, unfair competition practices remain prevalent due to the reliance on civil liabilities rather than criminal penalties. This allows operators to violate laws if they can afford the penalties. Strengthening enforcement mechanisms and increasing penalties could deter such practices (Elizabeth et al., 2021).

The need for a unified international approach to address issues like greenwashing, which involves misleading environmental claims, highlights the importance of global cooperation in regulating unfair trade practices in IPR (Шахназаров, 2024).

While significant progress has been made in addressing unfair trade practices in IPR, challenges persist due to the evolving nature of market practices and the limitations of existing legal frameworks. The integration of competition law with intellectual property law, as seen in the EU and other regions, offers a promising approach to maintaining fair competition and fostering innovation. However, continuous adaptation and international collaboration are essential to effectively combat unfair trade practices and protect intellectual property rights globally.

11. Geographical Indications and Unfair Trade Practices: Protecting Regional Identity and Fair Competition

Geographical Indications (GIs) are a form of intellectual property that protect products originating from specific regions, ensuring that only those products meeting certain criteria can use the designated name. This protection is crucial in preventing unfair trade practices, as it safeguards both producers and consumers from misleading claims about product origins. GIs not only enhance the brand value of regional products but also play a significant role in preserving cultural heritage and promoting economic growth in rural areas. The intersection of GIs with unfair trade practices is multifaceted, involving legal frameworks, market dynamics, and international trade considerations.

11.1. Legal Framework and Protection

The TRIPS Agreement under the World Trade Organization (WTO) mandates that member countries provide legal means to prevent the misuse of GIs, which includes preventing misleading indications of origin and acts of unfair competition as defined by the Paris Convention (Blakeney,

2006) (Blakeney, 2006). GIs are protected through sui generis systems or as part of trademark law, with the latter allowing for the registration of geographical signs as trademarks, provided they meet distinctiveness criteria (Leppelmann, 2023) (Tekin, 2021).

In the EU, GIs are protected under a sui generis system that ensures fair competition and allows local producers to use GIs, provided their use aligns with honest practices in industrial or commercial matters (Knaak, 2015).

11.2. *Economic and Cultural Impact*

GIs contribute to the economic development of regions by allowing producers to command price premiums and by fostering agrotourism and cultural heritage preservation (Ty & Devaraja, 2024). They serve as a tool for rural economic growth by providing a unique identity to indigenous products, which can be leveraged in international trade negotiations (Ty & Devaraja, 2024). In developing countries, GIs are increasingly being used as part of development strategies to generate export revenues and promote local industries (Saavedra-Rivano, 2012).

11.3. *Challenges and Unfair Trade Practices*

Despite the legal frameworks, GIs face challenges such as infringement and misuse, which can lead to consumer deception and unfair competition (-, 2024). The overlap between GIs and trademarks can lead to conflicts, particularly when a trademark application precedes a GI registration or vice versa. This necessitates careful legal navigation to ensure that both systems can coexist without undermining each other (Tekin, 2021) (Knaak, 2015). Internationally, disagreements over GIs often arise, as countries have different levels of protection and recognition, leading to disputes that require resolution through WTO mechanisms (Saavedra-Rivano, 2012).

11.4. *Consumer Protection and Fair Competition*

GIs play a crucial role in consumer protection by ensuring that consumers are not misled about the origin of products, thereby maintaining trust in regional brands (Kapur, 2022). In countries like Indonesia, GIs are seen as essential for maintaining fair business competition and protecting the rights of both producers and consumers (Simanjuntak, 2023).

While GIs offer significant benefits in terms of economic development and cultural preservation, they also present challenges in terms of legal enforcement and international recognition. The balance between protecting local producers and ensuring fair competition in the global market remains a complex issue that requires ongoing attention and adaptation of legal frameworks.

12. **Traditional Knowledge and Unfair Trade Practices: Safeguarding Cultural Heritage in Global Trade**

The intersection of unfair trade practices and traditional knowledge (TK) is a complex issue that involves the protection and commercialization of indigenous and local community knowledge within the global trade framework. Traditional knowledge, often linked to cultural identity and heritage, faces challenges in protection due to the inadequacies of existing intellectual property rights (IPR) systems. These challenges are exacerbated by unfair trade practices, which can lead to the misappropriation and exploitation of TK without fair compensation or recognition to the original knowledge holders. The following sections explore the legal frameworks, benefit-sharing models, and the role of international agreements in addressing these issues.

12.1. *Legal Frameworks and Challenges*

Traditional knowledge is not adequately protected under current intellectual property regimes, which are primarily designed for individual property rights rather than communal or cultural knowledge. This creates a gap in protection, leaving TK vulnerable to exploitation by external entities (Abdullin & Gazizova, 2019) (Dutfield, 2000). The TRIPS Agreement under the World Trade

Organization (WTO) provides some level of protection for TK through geographical indications (GIs) and unfair competition laws, but these measures are often insufficient for the unique characteristics of TK (Panizzon, 2005) (Voon, 2015). Unfair competition laws can offer some protection by preventing the misappropriation and imitation of cultural heritage-based products, but their focus on market regulation limits their effectiveness in safeguarding cultural innovations (Waruwu, 2022) (Shao, 2022).

12.2. *Benefit-Sharing Models*

Benefit-sharing models are crucial for ensuring that traditional communities receive fair compensation for the use of their knowledge. In China, for example, various benefit-sharing modes have been developed, although they often exhibit substantial unfairness due to power imbalances in negotiations (Song, 2023). The principle of substantive fairness is advocated as a guiding principle for benefit-sharing systems to promote sustainable development and equitable treatment of traditional communities (Song, 2023).

12.3. *International Agreements and Negotiations*

The Doha Development Agenda (DDA) and the TRIPS Agreement have introduced discussions on enhancing the protection of TK and GIs, emphasizing the need to consider the development dimension in any reforms (Panizzon, 2005).

Free Trade Agreements (FTAs) can either support or hinder the protection of TK, depending on the commitments made by the parties involved. Some FTAs include provisions for protecting cultural heritage, while others may limit the possibilities for such protection (Frankel, 2012). The role of international economic law is highlighted in promoting compulsory benefit sharing and prior consultation, as seen in case studies like argane oil from Morocco and rooibos from South Africa, which have been integrated into global value chains (Martens, 2014). While the current legal frameworks and international agreements provide some mechanisms for protecting traditional knowledge, they often fall short of addressing the unique needs and rights of indigenous and local communities. The inherent bias in intellectual property law, which favors corporate interests over communal knowledge, exacerbates the challenges faced by TK holders (Dutfield, 2000). To ensure fair trade practices, there is a need for dedicated solutions that recognize the communal nature of TK and provide equitable benefit-sharing arrangements.

13. **Unfair Trade Practices in Technology Transfer: Balancing IP Protection and Fair Competition**

Unfair trade practices in the transfer of technology often arise from the imbalance of power between technology transferors and transferees, where the former may exploit their dominant position to impose restrictive and unfair conditions. This issue is prevalent in international technology transfer agreements, where industrial property rights and proprietary technologies are leveraged to maintain competitive advantages. Such practices are scrutinized under antitrust laws, which aim to balance competition policy with the protection of technological know-how. However, these laws often fall short in addressing the complexities of intellectual property rights (IPR) within technology transfer agreements. This necessitates a nuanced approach to regulation that considers both the benefits and potential abuses of technology transfer.

13.1. *Restrictive Practices in Technology Transfer*

Technology transferors often impose restrictive conditions to maximize benefits and maintain monopolies, which can lead to unfair trade practices. These include territorial restrictions and other anti-competitive clauses that are scrutinized under antitrust laws (Xuheng, n.d.) (Kutty & Chakravarty, 2011). In Brazil, restrictive clauses in technology transfer contracts are subject to state regulation to prevent abuse, highlighting the need for careful analysis and registration of such

contracts (Schirru, 2015). The European Union's Technology Transfer Block Exemption Regulation and the US antitrust guidelines provide frameworks to assess and mitigate anti-competitive practices in technology licensing (Kutty & Chakravarty, 2011) (Galli & Botta, 2023).

13.2. *Forced Technology Transfer*

Forced technology transfer (FTT) is a contentious issue, particularly in the context of the US-China trade war. The US has accused China of using ownership restrictions and administrative processes to compel technology transfer, leading to international scrutiny and calls for new WTO rules (Lee, 2020) (Qin, 2019). Despite reforms in China, FTT remains a significant concern, as it is perceived as undermining fair trade practices and intellectual property protection (Lee, 2020) (Xu, 2024).

13.3. *Legal and Regulatory Challenges*

The complexity of technology transfer agreements often leads to legal controversies, particularly in balancing intellectual property protection with technology transfer obligations. This is evident in WTO dispute cases and the need for a fair legal framework to promote technology circulation (Xu, 2024).

In India, the lack of effective mechanisms to address IP-related unfair trade practices under the Competition Act highlights the challenges in regulating technology transfer agreements (Kutty & Chakravarty, 2011).

13.4. **Impact on Developing Countries**

Technology transfer contracts can exacerbate economic and political dependence in developing countries, as seen in the experiences of Egypt and Saudi Arabia. The absence of robust domestic and international legislation regulating these contracts can lead to increased public debt and dependency on industrialized nations (Khasawneh et al., 2024). The TRIPS Agreement and UNCTAD frameworks attempt to address these challenges, but the intricacies of technology transfer agreements require more tailored solutions to protect the interests of developing countries (Novak, 2009). While unfair trade practices in technology transfer pose significant challenges, they also highlight the need for a balanced approach that considers both the protection of intellectual property and the promotion of fair competition. The international community continues to grapple with these issues, seeking to develop frameworks that ensure equitable technology transfer while preventing exploitation and abuse. This ongoing dialogue underscores the importance of adapting legal and regulatory measures to the evolving landscape of global trade and technology transfer.

14. **Conclusion**

The interplay between unfair trade practices and IPR presents ongoing challenges and opportunities for synergy in contemporary legal systems. While IPRs are essential for promoting innovation and fostering economic growth, they can also be manipulated to restrict competition and harm consumer interests, necessitating robust legal frameworks that integrate both IPR and competition law perspectives. Comparative analysis reveals a global trend towards regulatory convergence, but persistent issues—such as harmonization, enforcement, the protection of traditional knowledge, and adapting to technology-driven market changes—demand continual reform and cross-jurisdictional cooperation. Achieving an effective balance between proprietary rights and fair trade principles is indispensable for supporting sustainable innovation, protecting consumer welfare, and maintaining equitable market access. The evolution of laws at the intersection of unfair trade practices and IPR must remain responsive to technological advances and the diverse needs of stakeholders worldwide.

References

1. -, A. S., & Verma, R. K. (2024). Interface And Interplay Between Intellectual Property Rights (IPR) And Competition Law. *International Journal For Multidisciplinary Research*. <https://doi.org/10.36948/ijfmr.2024.v06i02.18410>
2. -, S. C. (2024). Analysis of Geographical Indications and Its Infringement and Remedies with Case Studies. *International Journal For Multidisciplinary Research*. <https://doi.org/10.36948/ijfmr.2024.v06i02.18524>
3. Abdullin, A. I., & Gazizova, A. S. (2019). *Traditional knowledge and intellectual property rights*.
4. Amorim, A. C. A. de. (n.d.). *Trade secrets legal framework in the new Industrial Property Code*. https://doi.org/10.24840/2182-9845_2019-0002_0002
5. Asensio, P. A. D. M. (2009). *The Private International Law of Intellectual Property and of Unfair Commercial Practices: Coherence or Divergence?*
6. BABA, A. (2024). The agreement on trade-related aspects of intellectual property rights (trips). *Analele Universității Din Oradea*. [https://doi.org/10.47535/1991auoes33\(1\)024](https://doi.org/10.47535/1991auoes33(1)024)
7. Balamurugan, R., & Radhakrisnan, R. (2010). Protection of intellectual property rights an Indian perspective. *The International Journal of Management*. <https://doi.org/10.32890/IJMS.17.1.2010.9981>
8. Balogh, V., & Cseres, K. J. (2013). Institutional Design in Hungary: A Case Study of the Unfair Commercial Practices Directive. *Journal of Consumer Policy*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/S10603-013-9236-Y>
9. Barnett, J. (2024). *The Rise of Unfair Use*. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780197629529.003.0005>
10. Barthos, M., & Sara, R. (2019). Dysfunctional IP Infringements and Ineffectiveness of Enforcement Mechanisms under Indonesian Law. *Journal of Legal, Ethical and Regulatory Issues*.
11. Bhat, J. S. R. (2017). Innovation and intellectual property rights law — an overview of the Indian law. *Iimb Management Review*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.IIMB.2017.12.003>
12. Blakeney, M. (2006a). Geographical Indications and TRIPs. *Research Papers in Economics*.
13. Blakeney, M. (2006b). *Geographical Indications and Trips*. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203133316-7>
14. Boyer, M. (2007). The Economics of Copyright and Fair Dealing. *Social Science Research Network*. <https://doi.org/10.2139/SSRN.1133593>
15. Brown, A., Kheria, S., Cornwell, J., & Iljadica, M. (2023). *IP enforcement and remedies*. <https://doi.org/10.1093/he/9780192855916.003.0021>
16. Büyükkılıç, G. (2024). FİKRİ MÜLKİYET ve HAKSIZ REKABET HÜKÜMLERİNİN KÜMÜLATİF UYGULANABİLİRLİĞİ ÜZERİNE BİR DEĞERLENDİRME. *Ticaret ve Fikri Mülkiyet Hukuku Dergisi*. <https://doi.org/10.55027/tfm.1444529>
17. Cafaggi, F., & Iamiceli, P. (2018). Unfair Trading Practices in the Business-to-Business Retail Supply Chain: An overview on EU Member States legislation and enforcement mechanisms. *Research Papers in Economics*.
18. Campbell, D., & Cotter, S. (1997). *Unfair trading practices*.
19. Chauhan, kislai. (2024). *Intellectual Property Rights and Innovation: A Study of India's Legal Framework*. <https://doi.org/10.36676/ijl.v2.i3.35>
20. Chepis, O. I., & Chepis, T. V. (2024). Protection of intellectual property rights against unfair trade practices in the European Union. *Analitično-Porivnāl'ne Pravoznavstvo*. <https://doi.org/10.24144/2788-6018.2024.03.29>
21. Chiang, Y.-C. J. (2010). Parallel Importation of Copyright Products in Taiwan: A Struggle with International Trade Policy. *The Journal of World Intellectual Property*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/J.1747-1796.2010.00402.X>
22. Chung, Y. (2023). Criminal law measures to protect trade secrets: focusing on the Unfair Competition Prevention and Trade Secret Protection Act. *Beobhag Nonchong (Jeonnam Daehag'gyo Beoblyul Haengjeong Yeon'guso)*. <https://doi.org/10.38133/cnulawreview.2023.43.2.119>
23. Cullet, P., & Raja, J. (2004). Intellectual Property Rights and Biodiversity Management: The Case of India. *Global Environmental Politics*. <https://doi.org/10.1162/152638004773730239>
24. Decussating Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights and Private International Law in India. (2023). *Journal of Intellectual Property Rights*. <https://doi.org/10.56042/jipr.v28i6.762>
25. Dewan, B. (2015). Unfair trade practices and its emerging challenges. *Abhinav-National Monthly Refereed Journal Of Research In Commerce & Management*.
26. Diduk, A., & Lytvyn, S. (2022). Unfair competition in patent law (patent trolling). *Ūridičnij Visnik*. <https://doi.org/10.18372/2307-9061.65.17047>

27. Dihaa, D. H., Salman, A. S., Khalaf, L. R., & Jasim, B. A. A.-L. (2024). International Legal Frameworks for Protecting Intellectual Property and Ensuring Academic Freedom. *Journal of Ecohumanism*. <https://doi.org/10.62754/joe.v3i5.3905>
28. Do cross-border patents promote trade? (2022). *Canadian Journal of Economics*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/caje.12577>
29. Dole, R. F. (2016). The Contours of American Trade Secret Law: What Is and What Isn't Protectable as a Trade Secret. *Social Science Research Network*.
30. Dutfield, G. (2000). The Public and Private Domains: Intellectual Property Rights in Traditional Knowledge. *Science Communication*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1075547000021003004>
31. El-Hagin, M. (2021). Dyrektywa 2005/29/WE o nieuczciwych praktykach handlowych w świetle najnowszego orzecznictwa Trybunału Sprawiedliwości Unii Europejskiej - część I: The Directive 2005/29/EC on unfair commercial practices in the light of the latest case-law of the Court of Justice of the European Union – part I. *Scientific Programming*. <https://doi.org/10.37232/SP.2021D>
32. Elizabeth, Y. N., Yu, L. M., Palmer, D. P., & Anyomi, B. (2021). Unfair Competition in the Field of Intellectual Property Rights: Analyzing Concepts, Acts of Unfair Competition and Laws. *Journal of Programming Languages*. <https://doi.org/10.5539/JPL.V14N3P44>
33. Elpina, E. (2019). Juridical Analysis of Law Protection of Industrial Design Owners in the Trade Sector in Indonesia. *Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*. <https://doi.org/10.36348/SJHSS.2019.V04I10.006>
34. Flynn, J. J. (2016). *Antitrust policy, innovation efficiencies, and the suppression of technology*.
35. Frankel, S. (2012). Attempts to protect indigenous culture through free trade agreements. *Social Science Research Network*. <https://doi.org/10.4337/9780857938312.00015>
36. Galli, N., & Botta, M. (2023). It's Unfair! Non-price Exploitation in ICT Patents Licenses. *International Review of Intellectual Property and Competition Law*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40319-023-01287-x>
37. Geiger, C. (2016). *Towards a Balanced International Legal Framework for Criminal Enforcement of Intellectual Property Rights*. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-662-48107-3_21
38. Ghidini, G. (2019). *On The 'Intersection' Ip/Competition*. <https://doi.org/10.12870/IAR-12889>
39. Ghidini, G. (2022). The interplay between antitrust law and intellectual property: stages of the European evolution. *Journal of Antitrust Enforcement*. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jaenfo/jnac025>
40. Gommers, C., Leppink, W. J., & Schneider, M. (2024). Round-up of European enforcement case law 2023. *Journal of Intellectual Property Law & Practice*. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jiplp/jpae031>
41. Guan, W. (2014). *Private-Public Dynamics: The Paradox of Intellectual Property Philosophy*. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-55265-6_2
42. Helman, L., & Helman, L. (2013). Fair Trade Copyright. *Social Science Research Network*.
43. hendges, romulo. (2023). Concorrência desleal e a violação da propriedade intelectual das empresas de comércio exterior no cenário internacional. *Revista de Empreendedorismo e Gestão de Micro e Pequenas Empresas*. <https://doi.org/10.29327/237867.7.3-4>
44. Hilty, R. M., & Henning-Bodewig, F. (2007). *Law Against Unfair Competition. Towards a New Paradigm in Europe*.
45. Hovenkamp, H. J., & Hovenkamp, H. J. (2015). Antitrust and the Patent System: A Reexamination. *Social Science Research Network*. <https://doi.org/10.2139/SSRN.2486633>
46. Ilett, D. (2022). Dyrektywa 2005/29/WE o nieuczciwych praktykach handlowych w świetle najnowszego orzecznictwa Trybunału Sprawiedliwości Unii Europejskiej - część II. *Studia Prawnicze*. <https://doi.org/10.37232/sp.2022d>
47. Itanyi, N. (2018). Enforcing Intellectual Property Rights in Nigerian Courts. *The Law and Development Review*. <https://doi.org/10.1515/LDR-2018-0032>
48. Kapur, A. (2022). *The Geographical Indications Act*. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003299554-18>
49. Khasawneh, M. S., Ali, W. A. M., & Mansour, A. H. (2024). Technology transferring contracts in egypt compared to kingdom of saudi arabia experience. *Journal of Law and Sustainable Development*. <https://doi.org/10.55908/sdgs.v12i2.2878>
50. Kirsch, L. (2025). *Power-Balancing: State Attorneys General and Unfair Mortgage Lending**. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.5016986>

51. Knaak, R. (2015). *Geographical Indications and Their Relationship with Trade Marks in EU Law*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/S40319-015-0393-1>
52. Kontrimas, V. (2017). *Iš neteisėto pasinaudojimo komercinė paslaptimi gautos naudos priteisimo nukentėjusiam asmeniui problemos*. <https://doi.org/10.15388/TEISE.2017.105.11122>
53. Kutty, A. A., & Chakravarty, S. (2011). *The Competition-IP Dichotomy: Emerging Challenges in Technology Transfer Licenses*.
54. Lee, J.-A. (2020). Forced Technology Transfer in the Case of China. *Social Science Research Network*.
55. Leppelmann, G. (2023). *Overlaps Between Trademarks and Geographical Indications*. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780192844477.003.0014>
56. Li, S., & Gu, Z. (2024). *China and International Intellectual Property Law*. <https://doi.org/10.1093/obo/9780199796953-0254>
57. Lilla, P. E. de C. (2024). *Direitos de propriedade intelectual e o controle das práticas restritivas da concorrência à luz do acordo TRIPS/OMC*. <https://doi.org/10.11606/t.2.2013.tde-02122016-094148>
58. Lorenzoni, L. (2015). *Il Riparto di Competenze tra Autorità Indipendenti nella Repressione delle Pratiche Commerciali Scorrette*. <https://doi.org/10.12870/IAR-11386>
59. Lutz, D. (2023). Protecting Intellectual Property Rights from Unfair Competition in Ukraine. *MPI Studies on Intellectual Property and Competition Law*. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-662-66101-7_11
60. M., D., Mieczyslaw. (2023). Trade Secrets Legal Apprehension: An Uncertain Normative Framework. *Munich Studies on Innovation and Competition*. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-26786-4_5
61. Martens, P. (2014). Protection of Traditional Knowledge and Origin Products in Developing Countries: Matching Human Rights and IP Protection with Business Development Opportunities. *Research Papers in Economics*.
62. Mihajlović, B. (n.d.). *Odnos između nepoštene tržišne utakmice i nepoštene poslovne prakse*. <https://doi.org/10.46793/xxiv-9.323m>
63. Milani, A., & Ahmadi, A. (2018). Enforcement of Intellectual Property Rights in Iran in the Light of TRIPS Agreement. *World Customs Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.55596/001c.116015>
64. *Missbräuchliche Ausnutzung von FRAND-unterworfenen SEPs im US-Kartellrecht*. (2022). <https://doi.org/10.3726/b19668>
65. Novak, C. (2009). Transfer of technology: the considerations in international trade and cross-border investment. *International Journal of Liability and Scientific Enquiry*. <https://doi.org/10.1504/IJLSE.2009.024894>
66. Nugroho, S., Praptirahayu, D., & Sari, M. Y. A. R. (2021). Fairness in Fair Dealing on the Industrial Design Protection. *Yuridika*. <https://doi.org/10.20473/YDK.V36I2.26009>
67. Ohly, A. (2018). "Buy me because I'm cool": the "marketing approach" and the overlap between design, trade mark and unfair competition law. *Social Science Research Network*. <https://doi.org/10.4337/9781785364143.00011>
68. Palomar, A. P. (2011). Beyond the crisis: international instruments on digital piracy. *International Business Research*.
69. Panizzon, M. (2005). Traditional Knowledge and Geographical Indications: Foundations, Interests and Negotiating Positions. *Social Science Research Network*. <https://doi.org/10.2139/SSRN.1090861>
70. Papadopoulos, T. (2002). Copyright law and competition policy: international aspects. *Agenda: A Journal of Policy Analysis and Reform*. <https://doi.org/10.22459/AG.09.02.2002.02>
71. Patil, U., & Sagar, Dr. S. (2024). *Analyzing The Legal Framework For Intellectual Property Commercialization In Indian Higher Educational Institutions: A Doctrinal Study*. <https://doi.org/10.53555/kuey.v30i4.2798>
72. Peppo, E., & Bode, J. (2023). Criminal enforcement of intellectual property rights: an overview and comparative analysis of the Balkans. *Journal of Intellectual Property Law & Practice*. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jiplp/jpad089>
73. Pila, J., & Torremans, P. L. C. (n.d.). 23. *Trade Secrets*. <https://doi.org/10.1093/he/9780198831280.003.0023>
74. Pridgen, D. (2018). The Dynamic Duo of Consumer Protection: State and Private Enforcement of Unfair and Deceptive Trade Practices Laws. *Social Science Research Network*. <https://doi.org/10.2139/SSRN.3116299>
75. Qin, J. Y. (2019). Forced Technology Transfer and the US-China Trade War: Implications for International Economic Law. *Social Science Research Network*. <https://doi.org/10.2139/SSRN.3436974>

76. Rahmawati, R. A., & Kerti, N. (2023). *Unsur kebaruan atas karya desain industri kemasan makanan (studi putusan pengadilan niaga nomor 16/pdt.sus.desain industri/2020/pn.niaga.jkt.pst jo putusan kasasi nomor 162 k/pdt.sus-hki/2021)*. <https://doi.org/10.25105/tribuere.v1i2.20106>
77. Saavedra-Rivano, N. (2012). *Geographical Indications and International Trade*. https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137031907_2
78. Schirru, L. (2015). *As cláusulas restritivas e as práticas abusivas em contratos de transferência de tecnologia no Brasil:: uma análise sob a perspectiva da propriedade intelectual*. <https://doi.org/10.16928/2316-8080.V9N1P.220-259>
79. Schwartz, B. A. (1995). The Fate of Section 337 Litigation after the Uruguay Round Agreements Act. *Law and Policy in International Business*.
80. Shao, S. (2022). *The protection of intangible cultural assets by trade secrets and unfair competition law*. <https://doi.org/10.4337/9781800376915.00013>
81. Sharma, R., Madhusoodanan, L., Soni, P., & Dubey, A. (2022). Biodiversity and intellectual property rights: Conflict or synergy. *The Journal of World Intellectual Property*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jwip.12234>
82. Simanjuntak, Y. N. (2023). Pelanggaran Indikasi Geografis ditinjau dari Aspek Perlindungan Konsumen. *Perspektif Hukum Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.30649/ph.v23i1.188>
83. Singh, A., Suman, T., & Thripura, T. (2015). *Interfaces and Synergies between Intellectual Property Rights and Consumer Protection Law in India: An Analysis*.
84. Song, X. (2023). Benefit-sharing model of traditional knowledge based on substantive fairness in China. *Queen Mary Journal of Intellectual Property*. <https://doi.org/10.4337/qmjip.2023.01.04>
85. Stadler, S. K. (2007). Copyright as Trade Regulation. *University of Pennsylvania Law Review*.
86. Stadler, S. K. (n.d.). *Copyright As Trade Regulation*. <https://doi.org/10.2307/40041329>
87. Sudaryat, S. (2023). Customer List Protection in Avoiding Unfair Business Competition Based on Law Number 30 of 2000 concerning Trade Secrets and Law Number 5 of 1999 concerning Prohibition of Monopoly Practices and Unfair Business Competition. *Jurnal Indonesia Sosial Sains*. <https://doi.org/10.59141/jiss.v4i03.793>
88. Sukardi, D. H., Malagano, T., Muhadi, M., Maharani, A. D., & Yonnawati, Y. (2024). International Legal Framework for Traditional Knowledge and Intellectual Property Rights. *International Journal of Multicultural and Multireligious Understanding*. <https://doi.org/10.18415/ijmmu.v11i10.5917>
89. T, B. B., & Tnk, S. (2021). *Intellectual Property Rights: Bioprospecting, Biopiracy and Protection of Traditional Knowledge - An Indian Perspective*. <https://doi.org/10.5772/INTECHOPEN.99596>
90. Tekin, U. (2021). *Relationship Between Geographical Indications and Trade Marks under Turkish Law*. <https://doi.org/10.1093/GRURINT/IKAB003>
91. Todino, M. (2014). *Antitrust rules and Intellectual Property Rights in the EU and the US – Towards convergence?* <https://doi.org/10.12870/IAR-10196>
92. Ty, D., & Devaraja, T. (2024). Geographical indications as a brand strategy: A literal review. *International Journal of Research in Marketing Management and Sales*. <https://doi.org/10.33545/26633329.2024.v6.i1a.147>
93. Voon, T. (2015). The World Trade Organization, the TRIPS Agreement and traditional knowledge. *Social Science Research Network*. <https://doi.org/10.4337/9781781955901.00010>
94. Wang, K. (2024). Cross Retaliation Under TRIPS: A Creative Remedy When Power Disparity Exists. *Journal of Education, Humanities and Social Sciences*. <https://doi.org/10.54097/yxjrmf16>
95. Waruwu, K. (2022). *The protection of intangible cultural assets by trade secrets and unfair competition law*. <https://doi.org/10.4337/9781800376915/book-part-9781800376915-13>
96. Wijayanto, B. T., & Sumanto, L. (2025). Perlindungan Hak Kekayaan Intelektual Dalam Hukum Persaingan Usaha: Perspektif Komisi Pengawas Persaingan Usaha. *Jurnal Riset Multidisiplin Dan Inovasi Teknologi*. <https://doi.org/10.59653/jimat.v3i01.1349>
97. Xiao-jun, C. (2005). Imitation or Innovation — — The Legal Protection of Industrial Designs. *Journal of Hunan Institute of Engineering*.
98. Xiao-jun, C. (n.d.). *Imitation or Innovation--The Legal Protection of Industrial Designs*. <https://doi.org/10.3969/j.issn.1671-1181.2005.03.038>

99. Xu, F. (2024). On the Regulation of Technology Transfer. *International Journal of Global Economics and Management*. <https://doi.org/10.62051/ijgem.v4n2.23>
100. Xuheng, J. (n.d.). *The Regulation and Control of Restrictive Commercial Activities in the Transfer of International Technology*. <https://doi.org/10.16400/j.cnki.kjdkz.2013.06.063>
101. Шахназаров, Б. А. (2024). Greenwashing, Greenwishing and Greenhushing in the context of Unfair Competition, Intellectual Property Protection and Consumer Rights. *Lex Russica*. <https://doi.org/10.17803/1729-5920.2024.216.11.063-073>

Disclaimer/Publisher's Note: The statements, opinions and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of MDPI and/or the editor(s). MDPI and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions or products referred to in the content.