Patent Assertion Entities (PAEs) in India: A Critical Study of Regulatory Frameworks and Enforcement

Dr. Santhosha Kumara A[1] *& Dr. Kittisak Wongmahesak*[2]
[1] LGPR Post-Doctoral Candidate, Lincoln University College, Petaling Jaya, Malaysia;
[2] Faculty of Political Science, North Bangkok University, Thailand
Email: drsanthoshprabhu@gmail.com

Abstract: The rapid commercialisation of technology has fostered the rise of Patent Assertion Entities (PAEs) or "patent trolls", which acquire patents not to manufacture products but to extort disproportionately high licensing fees through frivolous infringement litigation. This opportunistic behaviour significantly burdens practising companies, draining resources from research and development (R&D) and stifling the innovation market. This paper conducts a critical and comparative analysis of PAE behavioural economics and the effectiveness of regulatory frameworks across the United States, the European Union, and India to identify optimal statutory and judicial deterrence mechanisms. Empirical evidence reveals NPEs target cash-rich firms regardless of actual infringement, leading to a 20% reduction in R&D at targeted firms. While the US system historically facilitated such litigation, the Indian patent framework, through stringent working requirements, compulsory licensing and aggressive post-grant objections, structurally dismantles the PAE business model. By comparing why certain legal systems succeed while others fail, these insights help businesses use India's "working requirement" as a model for building stronger defences against abusive patent lawsuits.

Keywords: Patent Trolls; Patent- Assertion Entities; Non-Performing Entities; Intellectual Property; Compulsory Licensing; Patent Litigation.

Introduction

The fundamental premise of intellectual property (IP), specifically patent law, is to grant an exclusive monopoly right to an inventor for a limited period, empowering them to exploit their invention commercially. The primary aim is to promote scientific research, incentivise new technology and stimulate industrial progress. However, new patent intermediaries known as Non-Performing Entities or Patent Assertion Entities, have recently become a defining and often controversial feature of the global IP landscape [1].

While some NPEs such as universities, individual inventors, and legitimate patent clearinghouses play a vital role in facilitating technology markets by aiding inventors who lack manufacturing resources, a malicious subset has emerged. Colloquially termed "patent trolls," these entities acquire vague or low-quality patents predominantly for licensing and litigation purposes. They do not manufacture products

or provide services based on the patented inventions; instead, their business model revolves around suing producing companies for alleged infringement, using the threat of exorbitant litigation costs to force out-of-court settlements. The global market size for PAEs was valued at approximately USD 12 billion in 2023, reflecting the massive financial incentives driving this litigation [2].

The purpose of this paper is to critically examine the seriousness of the patent troll problem. By analysing the empirical realities of PAE targeting behaviours and their economic impacts, this paper seeks to evaluate how different jurisdictions namely the United States (US), the European Union (EU) and India have responded to this menace. The problem statement addressed is whether the existing regulatory mechanisms in India offer a sufficiently effective framework to prevent the systemic abuse of patent rights observed in other global markets.

Related Work

The academic debate over Patent Assertion Entities (PAEs) is a study in contrasts, oscillating between viewing them as helpful "market architects" for small inventors or "parasitic extortionists" exploiting legal flaws. This polarization began with Lemley and Shapiro's Holdup Theory, which posits that PAEs extract "ransom" settlements by threatening injunctions after companies have already made significant product investments [3]. Conversely, Jiaqing Lu's research challenges the notion of systematic overcompensation, suggesting that PAEs act as efficient intermediaries who receive royalty rates comparable to practicing companies [4]. Shifting the focus to targeting behaviour, Cohen, Gurun, and Kominers argue that PAEs are opportunistic rather than merit-based, specifically suing "cash-rich" companies following successful financial quarters regardless of actual infringement levels [5]. In the Indian landscape, researchers like Gautam, Kandi, and Dr. Raju Narayana Swamy note that the "troll" model fails due to a legal framework that prioritizes innovation over patent litigation [6, 7]. Specifically, India's low damage awards, high litigation costs, and the "Working Requirement" under Section 146 which mandates commercial use of an invention collectively act as a "weed killer" against entities that do not manufacture products. Below table summarises these viewpoints.

Table 1. Comparison of Literature Perspectives on NPEs

Focus Area	Key Researchers	Simplified Finding
Market Impact	Lemley & Shapiro	PAEs "hold up" companies for ransom settlements.
Market Value	Jiaqing Lu	PAEs are not overcompensated; they reflect market rates.
Targeting Tactics	Cohen et al.	PAEs target "cash," not "infringement."
Indian Regulation	Swamy; Gautam	India's "Working Requirement" stops trolls before they start.

Key Contribution

This paper introduces a comprehensive synthesis of empirical economic data and comparative legal analysis to the existing body of knowledge. While previous literature has largely siloed empirical studies on NPE behaviour (primarily US-focused) from doctrinal analyses of Indian patent law, this article bridges the gap. The key contribution is the critical evaluation of India's regulatory mechanisms (such as Section 83, Section 84, and Section 146 of the Patents Act) precisely through the lens of the empirical behavioural patterns of NPEs identified globally. By mapping how India's specific statutory defences neutralize the exact opportunistic tactics (e.g., cash-targeting, litigation cost asymmetries) utilized by patent trolls in the West, this paper provides actionable insights for international IP policy reform.

Method, Experiments and Results

This study adopts a doctrinal and comparative research methodology, relying on secondary sources including statutory laws, judicial pronouncements (case laws), governmental reports, and peer-reviewed empirical studies. The "results" in this context reflect the synthesised findings of PAE behavioural economics and the comparative effectiveness of jurisdictional frameworks.

Empirical Evidence of NPE Behaviours and Economic Impact

The primary modus operandi of a patent troll relies on the financial asymmetry of patent litigation. Because NPEs produce no goods, they are immune to defensive counter-infringement claims and have virtually no documents to produce during the costly pre-trial discovery phase.

Empirical data reveals a highly opportunistic targeting strategy. PAEs do not primarily target firms based on the likelihood of actual patent infringement; rather, they target firms flush with cash. A one standard-deviation increase in a firm's cash level increases the probability of being sued by an PAE by 7.40%. Shockingly, PAEs target cash in business segments completely unrelated to the alleged infringement at nearly the same frequency as related segments. Furthermore, PAEs prey on vulnerability, deliberately targeting firms with smaller legal teams or those already distracted by non-IP-related litigation [8].

Despite holding patents that often score higher on traditional "patent value metrics" (e.g., number of claims), NPEs exhibit a surprisingly low success rate in court. When PAE cases proceed to trial or judgment, their winning rate is less than 10%, compared to a 40-50% win rate for practicing firms. This discrepancy proves that their business model relies on forcing settlements (often 9 out of 10 suits end in settlement) because defendants cannot afford the exorbitant costs of defence, rather than winning on legal merits [9].

The real-world impact is devastating to innovation. Firms targeted by NPEs (and losing via settlement or court) subsequently reduce their R&D investments by approximately 20%. This diverts critical resources away from genuine inventors and stifles the technological advancement of society.

Comparative Jurisdictional Analysis

The United States: The US has historically been the epicentre of the NPE market (valued globally around USD 12 billion), largely due to its legal system where parties bear their own litigation costs. This removes the financial risk for trolls filing baseless claims. The catastrophic potential of NPEs was highlighted in *NTP, Inc. v. Research in Motion, Ltd. (RIM)*, where a troll extracted a $612.5 million settlement under the threat of shutting down BlackBerry services [10]. However, recent reforms have attempted to curb this. The *eBay Inc. v. MercExchange* ruling made it harder to obtain automatic injunctions [11], and the *TC Heartland LLC v. Kraft Foods Group Brands LLC* (2017) decision restricted forum shopping by forcing lawsuits to be filed where the defendant resides [12].

The European Union (EU): The EU is generally more hostile to patent trolls. Stringent provisions in the European Patent Convention (EPC), specifically Articles 93 and 123, prohibit the amendment of patent applications to extend protection beyond original claims, preventing trolls from stretching old patents to cover new tech [13]. Furthermore, the EU employs a "loser pays" system for litigation costs and prohibits contingency fees, effectively neutralizing the risk-free extortion model. Nevertheless, PAEs still exploit loopholes; because patent enforcement is nationalized, trolls engage in forum shopping within the EU, heavily favouring Germany due to its bifurcated court system and higher risk of injunctions.

India: India has established a unique and robust regulatory framework that structurally repels Non-Practicing Entities (NPEs) and patent trolls, moving away from the vulnerabilities seen in its IT sector prior to the 2005 Patents (Amendment) Act. At the heart of this defence is Section 83, which mandates that patents must benefit the public and not merely create a monopoly [14, 15], supported by Section 146's requirement for annual statements of commercial working [16]. This effectively dismantles the "hoard and sue" model, as Section 84 allows for compulsory licensing if a patent remains unworked for three years. Furthermore, the legal landscape empowers challengers through Section 25(2), which permits post-grant opposition within 12 months, and Section 13(4), which removes any presumption of validity, forcing the patentee to carry a heavy burden of proof during litigation [17]. The efficacy of these measures is reinforced by historical Intellectual Property Appellate Board (IPAB) rulings. For instance, in *Spice Mobiles Ltd. & Samsung India v. Somasundaram Ramkumar*, the board revoked a dual-SIM technology patent for lack of novelty and penalized the troll for frivolous litigation [18]. Similarly, in *Aditi Manufacturing Co. v. Bharat Bhogilal Patel*, the IPAB invalidated patents used to harass commercial entities by citing prior art, cementing India's proactive stance against the misuse of intellectual property rights [19].

Discussions

The empirical evidence and jurisdictional comparison illuminate why patent trolls thrive in certain environments and fail in others. The success of PAEs is highly contingent on exploiting procedural

asymmetries specifically, the high cost of legal defence versus the low cost of prosecuting a claim when one produces no goods.

In the US, despite recent Supreme Court corrections (*TC Heartland*, *eBay*), the fundamental rule that each party pays its own legal costs continues to incentivize nuisance suits. NPEs rationally calculate that settling for a sum slightly lower than the defendant's projected legal fees guarantees a payout.

The Indian framework serves as a vital case study in structural deterrence. India did not need to draft specific "anti-troll" legislation; instead, its foundational patent philosophy requires the IP holder to actively contribute to the economy. The compulsory licensing regime (Section 84) and the mandatory statement of working (Section 146) ensure that patents act as instruments of industrial progress rather than mere financial assets for extortion. An PAE cannot sustain a business model in India if it must actively manufacture a product to maintain its exclusive rights. Furthermore, India's exclusion of software *per se* from patentability removes the most common weapon in the modern tech-troll's arsenal.

However, the Indian system is not entirely foolproof. A significant limitation is the three-year waiting period post-grant before a compulsory license can be triggered. This three-year window provides a temporary safe harbour during which a patent troll can acquire a patent and initiate aggressive litigation against emerging start-ups before the compulsory licensing defence becomes available.

Conclusions

The study analyses the growing challenge posed by Patent Non-Practicing Entities (NPEs), often referred to as patent trolls, which acquire patents mainly to demand settlements through strategic litigation rather than to develop or commercialize innovations. It adopts a doctrinal and comparative research approach by combining large-scale empirical economic data on NPE targeting patterns with an examination of legal frameworks and judicial decisions in the United States, the European Union, and India. The findings reveal that these entities tend to target financially strong but legally vulnerable companies, imposing significant litigation costs and contributing to an estimated 20% reduction in research and development investment among targeted firms. While the United States and the European Union attempt to curb such practices through judicial doctrines and cost-shifting rules, India benefits from relatively stronger statutory safeguards, including compulsory licensing, requirements for domestic working of patents, post-grant opposition procedures, and the absence of automatic presumptive patent validity. Nevertheless, the study highlights a limitation in India’s framework due to the three-year waiting period before compulsory licensing can be invoked and proposes future reforms such as open post-grant review triggered by patent transfers, the establishment of centralized patent defence funds for SMEs, and the vigilance mechanism to identify and invalidate vague patent claims at an early stage.

References

[1] A. Sarker, N. Reddy, and N. Sethi, "The Menace of Patent Trolls: What the World Can Learn from India," *Journal of Intellectual Property Rights*, vol. 24, no. 1, pp. 21-27, Jan.-Mar. 2019.

[2] R. Sharma, "Patent Troll NPEs Market Segments - by Type (Operating Companies, Non-Operating Entities), Industry (Technology, Pharmaceuticals, Automotive, Consumer Electronics, and Others), Litigation Type (Defensive, Offensive), and Region (Asia Pacific, North America, Latin America, Europe, and Middle East & Africa) - Global Industry Analysis, Growth, Share, Size, Trends, and Forecast 2025-2033," Market Research Report id: ICT-SE-513287, 2024.

[3] M. A. Lemley and C. Shapiro, "Patent Holdup and Royalty Stacking," *Texas Law Review*, vol. 85, no. 7, pp. 1991–2049, 2007.

[4] J. Lu, "The Myths and Facts of Patent Troll and Excessive Payment: Have Nonpracticing Entities (NPEs) Been Overcompensated?," *Business Economics*, vol. 47, no. 4, pp. 234-249, Oct. 2012, doi: 10.1057/be.2012.26.

[5] L. Cohen, U. G. Gurun, and S. D. Kominers, "Patent trolls: Evidence from targeted firms," *Harvard Business School Finance Working Paper*, No. 15-002, Jun. 2018. [Online]. Available: http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2464303.

[6] D. Gautam and T. S. Kandi, "Patent Trolls and Their Regulation in India," International Journal of Law Management & Humanities, vol. 1, no. 5, pp. 1-13, 2018.

[7] R. N. Swamy, "Practical ways to weed out Patent Trolls within legal frameworks of different countries," SSRN Scholarly Paper 4194457, 2022. http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4194457.

[8] J. Bessen, J. Ford, and M. J. Meurer, "The private and social costs of patent trolls," *Regulation*, vol. 34, no. 4, pp. 26–35, 2011.

[9] DataIntelo, "Patent Troll NPEs Market Segments - Global Industry Analysis, Growth, Share, Size, Trends, and Forecast 2025-2033," *Market Research Report*, pp. 1-258, 2024.

[10] NTP, Inc. v. Research in Motion, Ltd., 418 F.3d 1282 (Fed. Cir. 2005). [Online]. Available: http://law.justia.com/cases/federal/appellate-courts/F3/418/1282/.

[11] *eBay Inc. v. MercExchange, L.L.C.*, 547 U.S. 388, U.S. Supreme Court, May 15, 2006. [Online]. Available: http://caselaw.findlaw.com/us-supreme-court/547/388.html.

[12] *TC Heartland LLC v. Kraft Foods Group Brands LLC*, 581 U.S. 258, U.S. Supreme Court, May 22, 2017. [Online]. Available: http://supreme.justia.com/cases/federal/us/581/16-341/.

[13] European Patent Office, *European Patent Convention – Article 123: Amendments*. Available: http://www.epo.org/en/legal/epc/2020/a123.html.

[14] Government of India, *The Patents Act, 1970 – Section 83: General Principles Applicable to Working of Patented Inventions*, Intellectual Property India. [Online]. Available: http://ipindia.gov.in/writereaddata/portal/ev/sections/ps83.html.

[15] Government of India, *The Patents Act, 1970 (as amended): Chapter XVI – Working of Patents and Compulsory Licences*, Intellectual Property India. [Online]. Available: https://ipindia.gov.in/writereaddata/Portal/IPOAct/1_113_1_The_Patents_Act__1970___incorporating_all_amendments_till_1-08-2024.pdf.

[16] Intellectual Property India, *Statement of Working of Patents (Form-27) – Requirement under Section 146 of the Patents Act*, Controller General of Patents, Designs and Trade Marks. [Online]. Available: https://ipindia.gov.in/writereaddata/Portal/News/10011FinalFAQsForm-27_26thAugust2024.pdf.

[17] *Dr. (Miss) Snehlata Gupte v. Union of India*, interpretation of Sections 13(4) and 25(2) of the Patents Act, 1970, Indian Kanoon. [Online]. Available: https://indiankanoon.org/doc/ 25640047/.

[18] *Spice Mobiles Ltd. & Samsung India Electronics Pvt. Ltd. v. Somasundaram Ramkumar*, ORA/17/2009/PT/CH and ORA/31/2009/PT/CH, Intellectual Property Appellate Board (IPAB), Chennai, India, decided June 1, 2012. [Online]. Available: http://www.courtkutchehry.com/judgements/1037322/spice-mobiles-ltd-a-company-incorporated-under-the-compani/.

[19] *Aditi Manufacturing Co. v. Bharat Bhogilal Patel*, Intellectual Property Appellate Board (IPAB), TRA/05/2008/PT/MUM & TRA/06/2008/PT/MUM, decided on 12 June 2012. [Online]. Available: http://www.casemine.com/judgement/in/5b2c81404a93261f9d35316a.