



Intellectual Property Laws in Pakistan - Evolution, International Compliance, and Enforcement Challenges

Zainab Effendi-Haqqi

Advocate High Court of Sindh; and Head of Law Department, SZABIST, Karachi, Pakistan
(zainab.effendi@szabist.edu.pk)

Shah Murad

Assistant Professor, Faculty of Law, Federal Urdu University of Arts, Sciences and Technology,
Karachi, Pakistan (s.murad@fuuast.edu.pk)

Dr. Tansif Ur Rehman

Teaching Associate, Department of Sociology, University of Karachi, Pakistan; and Visiting
Faculty, Department of Law, Dadabhoy Institute of Higher Education, Pakistan
(tansif@live.com) (<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5454-2150>)

Abstract:

Pakistan has developed a substantial intellectual property framework, but legislation alone cannot establish that creators obtain effective remedies or that protection generates innovation. This article examines the evolution of that framework, the relationship between domestic legislation and international obligations, and the institutional conditions needed for credible enforcement. It adopts a qualitative doctrinal approach based on legislation, treaty texts, verified scholarship, and institutional publications. The analysis distinguishes registration from adjudication, copyright from industrial property, and formal compliance from practical effectiveness. It addresses patents, trademarks, copyright, industrial designs, geographical indications, integrated circuit layout designs, and confidential commercial information. Particular attention is given to digital infringement, small enterprise participation, university commercialization, and the balance between private rights and public access. The article argues that Pakistan needs clearer procedures, accessible services, competent adjudication, and transparent performance evidence rather than an undifferentiated expansion of exclusive rights. Its recommendations connect institutional reform with proportionate enforcement, research capacity, consumer protection, and development priorities. Because the study does not collect administrative records or interview enforcement officials, its conclusions concern legal design and policy requirements rather than measured national infringement rates or demonstrated economic effects.

Keywords: intellectual property, Pakistan, international compliance, enforcement, innovation, public interest

Introduction

IP law governs the control, exchange and use of specific forms of knowledge, creative expression, technical invention, and commercial reputation. The importance of its role in Pakistan is not just about the protection of multinational brands; a novelist dealing with the publishing deal, software developer with the licensing of software, a manufacturer to improve the machinery, and an agricultural producer to market regional products have different questions of ownership and legal protection. Lumping these activities together will hide the rights, eligibility criteria and remedies that apply to each of them. Pakistan has laws on copyright (Copyright Ordinance, 1962), patents (Patents Ordinance, 2000), designs (There is legislation in Pakistan on designs) and geographical indications (Trade Marks Ordinance, 2001). The labeling of these instruments does not make the framework coherent, however. The main issue to be explored here is the connection between the rights that are recognised and the institutional mechanisms by which they can be put into use. The article poses the following questions: how the framework came about, how international commitments shape its content, and what reforms it would need to become more effective without doing so more than it might unwarrantably limit legitimate competition and access to knowledge.

The basic idea behind this argument is to ensure that an effective system does not encroach on the valid rights of others without the ability to do so fairly, and that space is still left to research, education, market entry and technological adaptation. Knowledge isn't being used to do that by being widely infringed, nor by being overly controlled. Policy should therefore differentiate between a missing legal rule and poor implementation of an existing legal rule and between harmful imitation and the legitimate use of a legal rule. For instance, copying software that has been protected by copyright law is a different matter than creating a competitive program on one's own. Tricky packaging is a different matter than selling a product that is clearly labeled as an alternative product. Similarly, recognition of international membership can mask problems in the process of securing prompt domestic remedies. Pakistan's experience is therefore judged based on three related questions: Does rights have a legal definition? Can institutions enforce rights in a consistent manner? Can businesses and creators effectively access rights? Economic benefits are not a certainty of statutory protection, but a proposition that needs to be proven.

The research approach and analytical scope.

The methodology adopted in this article is qualitative doctrinal analysis with a limited review of academic publications and institutional publications. Primary materials are Pakistani IP laws as provided in WIPO Lex and the international instruments published by the World Trade Organization. Secondary materials are employed to identify issues related to historical development, implementation, awareness, and incentives for innovation. Sources are understood based on their use: legislative documents contain legal provisions, documents from institutions describe the programs and treaties, and research documents are used as evidence of claims within the scope of their methods and jurisdiction. A practitioner commentary is not considered as a nationwide empirical assessment while a study of another country would not be accepted as an empirical assessment of Pakistan's economic experience. The analysis is structured around the themes of legal evolution, rights categories, international commitments, institutional enforcement and implications for development.

There need to be several barriers. It does not attempt to evaluate all amendments, implementing notification, customs rules, or reported judgments, nor does it quantify the cost of piracy, the length of time to get to the tribunals, or the impact on investments. If jurisdiction is based on commencement rules, territorial notifications, or later judicial determination, the rules and provisions governing such requirements must be reviewed for the specific dispute. Likewise, there is no international treaty system which is independent of the protection afforded in the specific jurisdiction. This discussion is not about litigation advice, but rather the main framework and reform priorities. This does not exclude meaningful analysis: in the absence of the need to create administrative statistics, institutional responsibilities, evidential requirements and procedural safeguards can be analysed. It does not, however, rule out deductions made by specialized tribunals on the reduction in delays throughout the country or that the single reform has led to an increase in foreign investment. This needs to be supported by similar evidence, a time frame and explanation for other causes. The article thus proposes its policy solutions as reasoned recommendations based on analysis of the law.

The research gap and scholarship

It is helpful to note that the concepts of legal modernization and institutional effectiveness have been distinguished in Pakistan in existing scholarship. Allauddin and Anwar (2022) look at the development of the Patent Act since Independence, which will help situate the present legislation in a historical perspective. Murtiza (2017) focuses on public understanding and awareness, and draws attention to the knowledge to be gained to operate a legal system. Imdad et al. (2024) describe the comparative enforcement in Pakistan and Germany, covering institutional capacity, specialization of judiciary and awareness. These studies are focused on related but distinct problems and should not be mistaken for summaries of "proofs" that IP leads to economic development. In the International Bar Association article, Iqbal (2024) provides a non-judgemental overview of the means of protection and dispute processes, but not a controlled assessment of the outcomes of enforcement. Taken together, these sources can inform the inquiry into the interactions between legal rules, administrative capacity and knowledge of the stakeholders. They also serve distinctive functions, which is why it's important to get the credit right: a history can't tell you how they're currently performing, and a comparison can only be adapted to the local resources and procedure to tell you how they're performing.

The innovation literature is quite clear that more rights does not automatically lead to more research. In their analysis of patent reform in Japan, Sakakibara and Branstetter (1999) conclude that there is no evidence of the impact of patent expansion on innovative effort. What they find cannot be directly applied in Pakistan but it raises doubts on a universal assertion of enhanced patents. Development analysis also considers WIPO's scientific, technological and productive capacities as means to diversify economies, and situates IP in a wider innovation environment (World Intellectual Property Organization [WIPO], 2024a). The gap to be filled, therefore, is not analytical but that Pakistan is a lack of intellectual property scholarship. The desire to discuss legislative inventories, enforcement complaints and development expectations are often divorced without explaining the relationships, or the evidential limits. In this article they are brought together within one framework, namely the appropriateness of the right; the competence of the institution; the accessibility of the procedure; and the capacity to commercialize knowledge. It

contributes to recommendations which go beyond just “strengthen laws”, “increase awareness” or “increase investments”, and are more specific.

The history of development and institutionalization

Legal structures that were in place at the time of Pakistan's Independence, such as the Patents and Designs Act 1911, and the previous copyright law, were also passed on to Pakistan. Commitment to historical continuity is important because independence did not simply bring about the creation of a new legal framework and categories still exerted an influence over administration and practice. This was later modified in successive laws. The Copyright Ordinance, 1962, established a totally different national copyright regime, with the Patents Ordinance, 2000 and Registered Designs Ordinance, 2000, distinguishing between the treatment of technical inventions and industrial appearance. The previous trademarks regime was superseded by the Trade Marks Ordinance, 2001. Such developments need to be seen as legal organization and international alignment as opposed to smooth progress towards the effective enforcement. While allauddin and anwar (2022) give a historical overview of the development of the patent, information on implementation also needs to be available to evaluate the consequences of each reform. The "when" a statute was passed is not the only historical question; it is also important to consider how categories, offices, and procedures within a statute modified the opportunities available for domestic applicants and users.

The introduction of the Intellectual Property Organization of Pakistan Act, 2012, added another dimension in the wake of institutional consolidation. The Act creates an intellectual property organization with administrative and policy-making powers, and the introduction of Intellectual Property tribunals. IPO-Pakistan should, therefore, not be termed as a court. Different powers and protection are involved in registration administration, public advocacy, coordination and adjudication. When applying the provisions of the Intellectual Property Organization of Pakistan Act, 2012, attention also needs to be given to the provisions relating to tribunals, their powers, jurisdiction and appeals (sections 16–19). By this distinction, the institution which deals with an application does NOT necessarily make the final decision on every infringement dispute as is often believed in general accounts. Any reform program must maintain coordination without combining the executive and judicial functions. Reliable registration services are needed for applicants and independent decisions and appropriate review for litigants. Historical evolution can thus be seen as the building of multiple successive institutions, and their effectiveness needs to be evaluated on a case-by-case basis and collectively.

The core legal system in operation. The actual substantive system of law in operation

It is copyright, and not its control over every idea discussed in a creative work that protects the creative work's value, and specified acts that relate to it. The Copyright Ordinance, 1962, addresses a variety of forms of expression and defines ownership, infringement, remedies and exceptions. There are exceptions: fair dealing for certain purposes is in Section 57 and their conditions must be understood and respected, not assumed to be lawful if used in education. However, registration is not an indication of the existence of any underlying copyright in a

qualifying work. Practical conflicts typically arise with authors, publishers, universities and software companies at issue concerns ownership, the nature of a licence, and the type of activity permitted by a licence. It is important to distinguish between print publication, translation and digital distribution / other exploitation in a publishing agreement. University policies should also state ownership and permissions, not take it for granted that because a student is at the university, it is a matter of ownership. Although clear agreements may not be able to prevent infringement, they can alleviate uncertainty prior to a dispute with enforcement authorities (Copyright Ordinance, 1962).

Patent protection does not extend to expressions of creativity, or business reputation. Novelty, an inventive step and industrial applicability (with some exceptions) form the basis of patentability under section 7 of the Patents Ordinance, 2000. It also covers disclosure, examination, patent rights and public interest mechanisms and in interpreting it, reference should be made to the 2002 amendment to the framework (the Patents Ordinance, 2000, Patents [Amendment] Ordinance, 2002). An examination that is not of good quality is important because it can prevent that a valid grant should be made, and it can be a cause of denial for a valid invention. A good approach begins before anyone knows of it, involves documentation, prior art evaluation and a realistic evaluation of commercial applications, for a Pakistani research team. A patent does not provide the assurance that a product is marketable, safe, or free of other legal restrictions. Nor does it guarantee that anybody who gets a copy has the expertise to manufacture it or the funds to finance it. The right policy goal is thus something that is credible, namely protection of eligible inventions backed up by able examination, and not grants for any invention.

Trademarks are used to designate commercial origin and serve to safeguard sign in the scope of legal regulation. The Trade Marks Ordinance, 2001, regulates registration and the related rights while the Trade Marks Rules, 2004, provide for the procedures for implementing. Trademarks analysis should consider the sign, the products or services, and the context of the allegedly conflicting usage, but not just the similarity of the signs can be a legal conclusion. Choosing a unique brand and doing some preliminary research on the rights that may exist before investing in packaging can save small businesses from some disputes. Additionally, there should be a link between registration and market monitoring and the provision of correct product data, as without safety regulation and quality assurance, trademark protection is not sufficient. The Registered Designs Ordinance, 2000, handles another commercial asset – the appearance of articles, which are subject to the conditions of novelty and originality (as specified in the Ordinance). Different approaches to technical function, visual appearance, and branding may then be necessary for a manufacturer. Such explanation, on a practical level, would be beneficial for businesses to select the protection that's right for them rather than paying for protection that doesn't cover the risks they face in competition.

Geographical indications are a collective and geographically-based system of protection

The Geographical Indications (Registration and Protection) Act 2020, concerns goods for which the qualities, reputation or characteristics are linked to their geographical origin. Section 11 gives ownership to the Federal Government and arrangements for the registrants and

authorized users; at the core of the framework is specifications and conformity mechanisms. It requires more than just familiarity with a familiar local name to value it for its development. Producers require standards that are workable, verifiable, and in the decision-making that will affect the use of the indication. Otherwise, it could create a new expense for smaller producers which would destroy an initiative designed to help preserve the region's reputation. The legal framework is technically diverse with separate legislation protecting registered layout designs of integrated circuits (Registered Layout-Designs of Integrated Circuits Ordinance, 2000). It is important to not make the assumption that all categories of students have the same administrative needs or demands. Resources need to be tailored to the needs of stakeholders and need to have the specialist knowledge to competently administer less frequently used rights.

Commercial information that is of a confidential nature needs a different protection approach as revealing it can eliminate the practical protection benefit that is being protected. What is meant by qualifying undisclosed information is covered by Article 39 of TRIPS, although the treaty should not be used as an alternative for finding domestic legal grounds and remedies (World Trade Organization [WTO], 1994). In Pakistan, a cursory look at statutory provisions, agreements and legal obligations is required to consider the nature of any particular valuable business fact in context rather than simply assuming that each and every valuable business fact is covered by a broad and all-encompassing standalone trade secrets law. Employers and commercial partners should have a clear definition of confidential information, restrict access to it, record any disclosures, and distinguish between information that is confidential and employees' general skills. For example, the protection of a confidential production formula will need different evidence than the protection of knowledge that is available in the industry. It also impacts contractual fairness if there are unnecessarily wide limitations, as these could make the employment contract unfair if they do not safeguard a legitimate secret. The suggested solution is to have a sensible information management and an adequate legal clause, both knowing that an agreement or a confidentiality label is not sufficient evidence of misuse.

What is compliance and why is it important to comply with international obligations? The International obligations and the meaning of compliance.

There are different instruments for international alignment. TRIPS establishes floors, and member states have the freedom to select implementation measures in their own legal systems, without mandating that they be the same. It is a tool for innovation, technology transfer, welfare and its principles also take into consideration public interest concerns. The Paris and Berne conventions are also part of the international framework relevant, but the participation in the treaty should be separated from the internal procedures of an applicant / claimant (WTO, 1994; WIPO, n.d.). Compliance should thus be considered, provision by provision: protected subject matter, procedures, safeguards. Similarly, a noncompliance allegation must specify the obligation that was breached, and the domestic deficiency. This requires the availability of up-to-date and easily accessible laws, as well as an analysis of implementation and evidence-based study of any practical challenges in Pakistan. It is more useful to make a general statement that national law meets or does not meet international standards than to make a general statement that it does or doesn't meet international standards with regard to particular requirements and their operation.

The case of Pakistan's joining the Madrid Protocol can be taken as an example of procedural access as opposed to substantive protection. WIPO records accession was deposited on 24 February 2021 and the Protocol came into force for Pakistan on 24 May 2021 (WIPO, 2021). The system allows for international trademark applications, but does not create an automatically valid international trademark. Protection continues to be reliant on specific authorities and the examination they use. The commercial issue for exporters is then which market(s) are worth protecting and what to do if people object to your protection, if you have to renew your rights in those markets, and if those markets are the ones where you have to keep an eye out. The convenience and continuing obligations of public assistance should be explained. Having a filing reference for a business and not being able to finance the needed follow-up has not equated to effective international protection. Market planning and budget assessment should be included in the training, along with the learning of the procedures. When it comes to firms being able to take the available route and transform it into a viable protection approach, rather than just a name, then it is useful in treaty participation.

Institutional capacity and enforcement procedures

No enforcement without evidence of the existence of a legitimate right and the act on which the enforcement is based being legally relevant, but rather the existence of a similarity with the benefit of another party. A claimant might require ownership documents, registration records, licences, dated creations and product samples, or technically informed comparisons. The elements of proof vary for each of the four types of copyright copying, trademark conflict, patent infringement, and misuse of confidential information. There is therefore a need to enhance the handling of evidence in a reform programme rather than just increase the volume of complaints. Iqbal (2024) presents civil and criminal aspects in Pakistan and Imdad et al. (2024) discuss capacity and awareness issues in comparison. These sources should be considered when designing institutions, but do not define the national average disposal time or the amount of infringement. There should be clear responsibilities regarding the registration offices, tribunals, investigative agencies and border authorities. Coordination should help to ensure that reference or exchange of information is carried out in a lawful manner, and that each administrative, judicial or criminal action is carried out independently.

Technical and commercial questions can be better addressed in such cases by providing for specialization of judges but specialization alone is not sufficient to make sure that the decision is correct and swift. The staffing of tribunals, access to case records, suitable expert assistance, and the process of concentrating the issue on material questions, are all necessary for stable tribunals. Parties must be aware of what needs to be established, when evidence should be presented and the relationship between the right invoked and the remedy awarded should be explained when decisions are made. Particularly, relief should be given special attention if it is granted before the final merits are decided upon, as an early order can have a significant impact on a business prior to the full merits. Safeguards ought to cover both ongoing breaches and disruptions and unsupported claims. A sensible solution would be to try to distinguish between questions of validity and questions of ownership, infringement and relief, where the distinction would serve to clarify. These suggestions are not based on a blanket assertion that all tribunals are failing at this time, but on the shape of the adjudication process. When evaluating, similar

cases of similar stages of litigation should be taken into consideration; a highly technical patent case is not a suitable case for evaluation using a very simple reproduction case.

In order to implement proportionate enforcement, it is essential to differentiate between civil dispute and act warrants criminal action. The criminal process should be based on the applicable offence and evidential requirements, not used as a default bargaining tool when there is a commercial dispute. The same care must be taken with border measures as with identification: officers must be able to differentiate between goods that have crossed the border illegally and those that are in circulation legally, and claimants should provide enough information to enable the goods to be identified. Partnership with right holders may enhance expertise but it should not be used to supplant due judgement. An unsafe product and an infringing product are analytically different categories, but may justify more regulatory action from a consumer safety point of view. If a medicine is produced locally and is generic, it does not mean that it is a 'counterfeit' if it is competing with a branded medicine. Those distinctions should be maintained in enforcement reporting to ensure that statistics do not lead to an inaccurate overall impression because of the mixing of unrelated conduct. The goal is to act reliably against legal violations, ensuring protection for traders, consumers and violations that exceed the asserted legal rights.

Digital markets and new technology

The speed, scale and evidential requirements of infringement are shifting with digital distribution. A copy of a work can be used across several accounts and online merchants can modify listings or employ other identifying codes after a complaint. The answer should include preservation of the items that were dated, verification of ownership, and requests for the items that were allegedly unlawful. Complaint procedures must be understood and there must be meaningful avenues for challenging mistakes. The quickness of the removal of the material should be matched by attention to the lawful use of quotation, criticism, licensed use, and mistaken identification. While it is possible for automation to assist in finding similarities, there is no such thing as a matching result confirming infringement. It may be more relevant for Pakistani creators and small businesses to have some concrete tips on contracts, platform records and preservation of evidence of piracy than another sweeping statement. Digital policy should also differentiate between copyright protection and product counterfeiting and impersonation, as these are different. Using a single procedure, without those distinctions, can lead to ineffective enforcement and the removal of legitimate activity.

There are other questions that arise with the use of AI in relation to training data, authorship, ownership, and similarity of output. This article here does not make any assumption that Pakistan has addressed such questions by a separate comprehensive legislation. Nor should foreign decisions be termed as decisions affecting Pakistani issues. A sensible reform process would review the current legal categories, consider issues that really are not being resolved by the law, and seek input from creators, researchers, technology companies and public institutions. Agreements should document what the contributors provide, the permissions, and how content created by the contributors can be utilized. When using external systems, organizations must also take steps to ensure that the data remains confidential and must keep records to review disputed outputs. The same care needs to be taken with traditional knowledge, as different ownership

models might not reflect traditional practices within the community. The WIPO 2024 treaty on genetic resources and traditional knowledge is an example of international concern about how to address this issue, but Pakistan has not ratified it nor implemented it at the national level (WIPO, 2024b). National proposals therefore need to provide an explanation of their own basis in law and involve affected communities rather than simply taking terms of protection on board without it being effective.

Public access and economic development by innovation

IP can be used to enable commercialization in so far as it can enable some assets to be identified and licensed, but it requires abilities beyond IP. A university invention requires technical development, partners, financial resources and a viable market but a registered brand requires production quality and distribution. WIPO (2024a) locates development in the innovation capabilities, which serves as a good starting point for an examination of these connections. Pakistan must therefore link legal aid with research support and business services instead of just expecting that registering will bring growth. Protection is also a condition for the relationship with foreign investment: investors take into account infrastructure, skills, regulatory reliability, and market opportunities. To establish a causal effect, research would have to be able to distinguish these influences. The policy implication is that IP needs to be brought into a broader development programme and that it is not necessary to make promises of every time the exclusivity increases it will draw investment. Assessment in a sector would better pinpoint where licensing, confidential know-how, or open collaboration is most helpful in the way of productive activity.

For universities and small businesses, participation costs can be the deciding factor on whether formally existing rights are usable or not. Help applicants to identify useful assets and consider options, and to predict maintenance and enforcement costs. The University requires agreements which define inventorship, ownership, publication, revenue sharing and responsibilities in the situation of external partners. Commercialisation offices need to evaluate if a proposed licence would further a viable project, and not simply assume that the number of patents is enough. If the business is smaller, it may be possible to offer them collective training, such as via chambers or professional associations, rather than each firm having a specialist counsel on board. Public interest protections are still needed. Doha Declaration supports public health and access to medicines in the interpretation of TRIPS (WTO, 2001). Pakistan may thus need to consider health-related alternatives, keeping in mind the autonomy of the government and implementation capacities. Institutional effectiveness requires protection of research incentives as well as access to research in accord with the law; this can only be measured in part by the number of exclusive rights.

It is important to consider technology transfer agreements as access to protected technology does not imply access to the information necessary for effective use. Manufacture may be allowed under a licence but training, technical information, quality control and improvement might not be covered. The Pakistani entities who enter these kinds of dealings should determine the help they need, the market where they can sell the property, the length of the obligations and the treatment of the locally created improvement. Dispute provisions should be realistic also for the parties who have limited capacity to fund international proceedings.

Smaller companies might be able to use public support to work through these conditions before signing up. This recommendation has intellectual property linked to productive learning, that is, to the ability to use an asset, but also to engage in sustainable activity. If such an agreement does not address implementation, then that technology may be commercially unusable. Evaluation should then seek to identify what skills and processes are developed as well as what locally retained skills are as a result of an arrangement, in addition to documenting the presence of a licence.

Legitimacy of protection is also determined by its affordability. Enforcement alone, though, might not resolve the underlying demand if lawful access is inconvenient or too costly for intended users. This does not mean that unauthorized copying is legal, but it does indicate that viable solutions will feature practical licensing and distribution frameworks. Permission-based models might be considered by publishers, education and creatives that are defined by audiences and uses, with terms that are clear and administration is manageable. Researchers need to differentiate between willingness to comply, and the ability to secure permission; because different barriers can be addressed through different interventions. For a rights owner who has been seeing frequent infringement, it could help to be better served with access channels and with law. On the other hand, institutions buying licences must have systems to respect their limits and to keep some records. Policy would have to take into account these relationships, but without turning an explanation of behavior into a justification for it.

Prioritize for reform and review; and inspect and evaluate the performance of the reforms.

First reform priority is access to legal information. An authoritative collection should be set out to distinguish the principal statutes, amendments, implementing rules, commencement instruments and procedural guidance to enable users to find the rules applicable to their situation. Requirements for Registration services should be clearly stated and the result of the exam should be communicated to the applicants in understandable terms. Training needs should be tailored to specific business and creator decisions made, such as disclosure risks, ownership agreements, selecting a brand, licensing and record keeping. Sustained support of judicial capacity should be provided through technical education, suitable expert assistance and regular publication of reasoned judgments. They are not interchangeable: awareness campaigns can lead to an increase in applications, but if there isn't enough processing power then the result is frustration; enforcement action without ownership records can lead to an increase in disagreements. Reform should, therefore, consolidate the interconnections among information, administration, evidence, and adjudication, rather than view each as a stand-alone institutional initiative.

Evaluation should involve the use of measures that expose the operation of the system for various user groups. Processing times, reasons for refusal, abandonment and maintenance patterns should be included with application totals. Judicial reporting should differentiate between case categories, judicial stages, settlements, appeals and time required for enforcement of final orders. Use of accessible aggregate information may be used to support accountability, while avoiding disclosure of confidential data or identification of protected individuals. Along with the growth of registrations, economic assessment should include a look at licensing activity and commercialization results, and the experience of smaller companies. This evidence may help

determine the cause of the delay, whether it is staffing issues, incomplete applications, the technical nature of the application, or the conduct of the application. It would also provide a baseline that would be used to measure reforms. Consultation with organized right holders is not the only consultation that should be made; consultation with other actors in the system, including defendants, users, and community producers, should be included as policies impact people who are not part of the organized right holders on a regular basis. A balanced evaluation framework would allow for keeping effective measures in place, modifying ineffective measures and for providing justification for additional spending through clear needs.

The process of institutional coordination should be established in a formal way, recognising responsibility at each stage of a complaint. Do not simply pass on a file without specifying a reason or action requested; instead, include who it is being referred to, what information is being passed, what action should be taken, and which authority is making the referral. Training and review on a shared basis may lead to better terminology and evidence handling and periodic review may help identify repeated referral errors. These should be undertaken with confidentiality and to avoid unnecessary duplication in investigations. They ought to also clearly inform the users of the progress made and give an explanation if the matter is beyond their reach of the agency. The proposals are not based on the premise that establishing a new institution can resolve existing problems, but rather involves manageable administrative commitments. The evidence of good coordination is that the complaint is taken to the right decision maker with useful information — not several agencies noting the same activity.

Conclusion

IP regime in Pakistan has been developed and refined by the mechanism of inheritance, statutory amendments and institutionalization. The other policy issue is how to articulate that frame in a coherent, accessible and responsive manner to legitimate protection needs. The need to distinguish between legal categories, administrative and judicial functions, proportionate remedies and evidence-based assessment are highlighted in this article. Domestic capacity is the limit on how far obligations and procedural opportunities can be translated into effective protection, while international participation provides the obligations and procedural opportunities. Reliable records and targeted responses are not only requirements of ownership, validity, proof and fairness, but more so, that need exists in digital markets and emerging technologies. The linking of intellectual property to productive capabilities should be integrated with the public interest safeguards in development policy. The recommended path is then one of gradual institutional strengthening, not assuming that an increase in exclusive rights will solve all the problems. Future studies could be conducted on administrative and judicial documents to evaluate the present proposals and determine the impact of reform on creators, businesses, consumers and the general public.

References

- Allauddin, H., & Anwar, Z. (2022). Critical analysis of patent laws in Pakistan since independence. *Qlantic Journal of Social Sciences*, 3(2), 24–31.
<https://doi.org/10.55737/qjss.194663773>
- Copyright Ordinance, 1962 (Ordinance No. XXXIV of 1962) (Pakistan).
<https://www.wipo.int/wipolex/en/legislation/details/3482>
- Geographical Indications (Registration and Protection) Act, 2020 (Act No. XVIII of 2020) (Pakistan). <https://www.wipo.int/wipolex/en/legislation/details/20045>
- Imdad, A., Haider, M. A., & Murtiza, G. (2024). A comparative analysis of intellectual property rights enforcement mechanisms in Pakistan and Germany: Challenges and best practices. *Annals of Human and Social Sciences*, 5(1), 634–645.
[https://doi.org/10.35484/ahss.2024\(5-I\)57](https://doi.org/10.35484/ahss.2024(5-I)57)
- Intellectual Property Organization of Pakistan Act, 2012 (Act No. XXII of 2012) (Pakistan).
<https://www.wipo.int/wipolex/en/legislation/details/13679>
- Iqbal, S. (2024, September 11). *The protection of intellectual property rights in Pakistan*. International Bar Association. <https://www.ibanet.org/the-protection-of-IP-rights-in-Pakistan>
- Murtiza, G. (2017). Intellectual property: Public understanding and awareness. *Pakistan Social Sciences Review*, 1(1), 147–155. [https://doi.org/10.35484/pssr.2017\(1-I\)12](https://doi.org/10.35484/pssr.2017(1-I)12)
- Patents (Amendment) Ordinance, 2002 (Ordinance No. XCV of 2002) (Pakistan).
<https://www.wipo.int/wipolex/en/legislation/details/15810>
- Patents Ordinance, 2000 (Ordinance No. LXI of 2000) (Pakistan) (as amended by the Patents [Amendment] Ordinance, 2002). <https://www.wipo.int/wipolex/en/text/584071>
- Registered Designs Ordinance, 2000 (Ordinance No. XLV of 2000) (Pakistan).
<https://www.wipo.int/wipolex/en/legislation/details/3480>
- Registered Layout-Designs of Integrated Circuits Ordinance, 2000 (Ordinance No. XLIX of 2000) (Pakistan). <https://www.wipo.int/wipolex/en/text/189019>
- Sakakibara, M., & Branstetter, L. (1999). *Do stronger patents induce more innovation? Evidence from the 1988 Japanese patent law reforms* (NBER Working Paper No. 7066). National Bureau of Economic Research. <https://doi.org/10.3386/w7066>
- Trade Marks Ordinance, 2001 (Ordinance No. XIX of 2001) (Pakistan).
<https://www.wipo.int/wipolex/en/legislation/details/3479>
- Trade Marks Rules, 2004 (Pakistan). <https://wipolex-res.wipo.int/edocs/lexdocs/laws/en/pk/pk014en.html>
- World Intellectual Property Organization. (n.d.). *WIPO Lex member profile Pakistan*.
<https://www.wipo.int/wipolex/en/treaties/members/profile/PK>

- World Intellectual Property Organization. (2021, February 24). *The Islamic Republic of Pakistan joins the Madrid System*. https://www.wipo.int/en/web/madrid-system/w/news/2021/news_0005
- World Intellectual Property Organization. (2024a). *World intellectual property report 2024: Making innovation policy work for development*. <https://www.wipo.int/web-publications/world-intellectual-property-report-2024/en/index.html>
- World Intellectual Property Organization. (2024b). *WIPO treaty on intellectual property, genetic resources and associated traditional knowledge*. <https://www.wipo.int/en/web/traditional-knowledge/wipo-treaty-on-ip-gr-and-associated-tk>
- World Trade Organization. (1994). *Agreement on trade-related aspects of intellectual property rights*. https://www.wto.org/english/docs_e/legal_e/27-trips.pdf
- World Trade Organization. (2001, November 14). *Declaration on the TRIPS agreement and public health (WT/MIN(01)/DEC/2)*. https://www.wto.org/english/thewto_e/minist_e/min01_e/mindecl_trips_e.htm