ALLIANCE UNIVERSITY
Private University established in Karnataka State by Act No.34 of year 2010 Recognized by the University Grants Commission (UGC), New Delhi
Alliance School of Law
NAAC GRADE A+ ACCREDITED UNIVERSITY

International Journal
of Law and Social Sciences (IJLS)
Volume 11, Issue 1, 2025
Print ISSN: 2454-8553, Online ISSN: 2583-8644

BIOLOGICS AND BIOSIMILARS: A NEW ERA OF PAY-FOR-DELAY?

Jaya Sri Sai Jotsna Chalamcharla[1]

DOI: https://doi.org/10.60143/ijls.v11.i1.2025.194

Abstract

This study critically examines the rising use of "pay-for-delay agreements" in the pharmaceutical industry, with a particular focus on biologics and biosimilars in the Indian context. While reverse payment settlements have long been controversial in the small-molecule drug space, their application to biologics—complex, high-cost medicines derived from living organisms—introduces new challenges due to longer development cycles, elaborate patent thickets, and regulatory intricacies. Biosimilars, though functionally similar to biologics, do not benefit from the same streamlined entry as generics, making them more vulnerable to strategic delays through exclusivity arrangements, licensing terms, or litigation tactics. The paper analyses the evolution of the biosimilar market, global regulatory frameworks, and the competition law implications of delaying tactics. It compares jurisprudential trends from the US and EU—particularly the FTC v. Actavis and Lundbeck cases—where courts and competition authorities have taken differing approaches to determine when such agreements become anti-competitive. India's competition and patent frameworks, especially the Competition Act, 2002 and Patents Act, 1970, are discussed in relation to pay-for-delay practices. Despite a robust biosimilar sector, India lacks explicit precedents or guidelines on reverse payment settlements.

The paper argues for a balanced regulatory strategy that maintains innovation incentives for originator firms while ensuring timely access to affordable biosimilars. The following policy recommendations aim to enhance transparency and inter-agency coordination and judicial sensitization and capacity building within the CCI. The ultimate goal is to prevent patent misuse and monopolistic practices without disincentivizing research and development. This study contributes to an underexplored intersection of IP law and competition policy, urging Indian authorities to adopt a proactive stance that aligns with international best practices and addresses the unique challenges posed by the biologics-biosimilars ecosystem.

Keywords: Pay-for-delay; biosimilars; biologics; competition; patent settlements; reverse payment agreements.

Introduction

Background

Biologic medicines—treatments developed from living cells—have revolutionized the way we manage serious and chronic illnesses like cancer, diabetes, and autoimmune disorders. The production requirements for biologics differ from traditional small-molecule drugs because these complex large-molecule therapies need specialized manufacturing processes along with substantial research and regulatory challenges. The high production costs of these medications make them inaccessible to numerous patients.

Biosimilars have emerged as cost-effective alternatives to bridge the existing gap between patients and their treatments. Biosimilars maintain identical safety profiles and quality standards and equivalent effectiveness to their reference biologic drugs although they are not exact duplicates. Biosimilars demonstrate great potential to enhance treatment accessibility for life-saving medications in healthcare systems where affordability functions as a major barrier.

1. 5th year Law Student of DSNLU

India stands as a worldwide leader when it comes to biosimilar production. Biocon together with Dr. Reddy's Laboratories and Intas Pharmaceuticals supply biosimilars to both domestic and international markets. The growth of biosimilars received support from a well-established regulatory system. "The Department of Biotechnology (DBT)" together with the "Central Drugs Standard Control Organization (CDSCO)" updated their Guidelines on Similar Biologics for the last time in 2022. The guidelines require biosimilars to complete extensive testing and evaluation procedures to prove their safety and efficacy matches that of reference products.

The Indian biosimilar ecosystem combines scientific standards with affordable pricing to create a vital system for enhancing worldwide access to biologic therapies.[2]

The Concept of Pay-for-Delay

A contentious practice known as "pay-for-delay" occurs when a manufacturer of a name-brand medication pays a manufacturer of a generic or biosimilar medication to delay entering the market. Despite supposedly ending patent litigation, these reverse payment settlements have the potential to prolong market monopolies and stifle competition.[3] After the US Supreme Court ruled in FTC v. Actavis[4] that such settlements could be examined under antitrust law if they were anti-competitive in nature, this strategy became well-known throughout the world. The European Commission has taken similar action against pay-for-delay agreements in the EU for postponing access to reasonably priced medications.[5]

Similar delay tactics are starting to appear in the biologics industry, despite initially being observed in the small-molecule space. These may involve the use of dense secondary patent portfolios—commonly referred to as patent thickets—or non-monetary agreements such as exclusive licensing or manufacturing arrangements that may have similar foreclosure effects.[6] The increased complexity and cost associated with biosimilar development make the sector particularly susceptible to such strategies.

Relevance in the Indian Context

Despite its robust biosimilar industry, India has yet to engage deeply with the regulatory or legal implications of pay-for-delay conduct. Indian law provides two potentially relevant legal avenues: the Patents Act, 1970 and the Competition Act, 2002. The former contains safeguards such as Section 3(d), which prevents evergreening, and provisions for compulsory licensing under Section 84.[7] The Competition Commission of India (CCI), empowered under Secs 3 and 4 of the Competition Act, may investigate anti-competitive agreements and abuse of dominance.

However, India has limited jurisprudence on the application of these statutes to reverse payment settlements. The Competition Commission has not yet investigated a pay-for-delay arrangement involving biosimilars. Nevertheless, concerns are mounting over the use of exclusivity clauses, extensive licensing terms, and aggressive patenting strategies by originator firms that may effectively delay biosimilar entry.[8] The absence of a direct legal precedent in this regard invites an inquiry into the adequacy of current laws and the potential need for policy reform.

2. CDSCO & DBT, *Guidelines on Similar Biologics: Regulatory Requirements for Marketing Authorization in India* (3d ed. 2022).
3. Michael A. Carrier, *Unsettling Drug Patent Settlements: A Framework for Presumptive Illegality,* 108 Mich. L. Rev. 37, 38–40 (2009).
4. FTC v. Actavis, Inc., 570 U.S. 136, 157–58 (2013).
5. EC, *Pharmaceutical Sector Inquiry: Final Report SEC(2009) 947 final* (July 8, 2009).
6. Dana M. Benyamin, *The Patent Thicket of Humira: An Obstacle to Biosimilar Entry,* 35 Berkeley Tech. L.J. 513 (2020).
7. The Patents Act, No. 39 of 1970, §§ 3(d), 84, India Code (2023).
8. Shamnad Basheer, *Pharmaceutical Patent Enforcement in India: A Public Health Perspective, in Pharmaceutical Innovation, Competition and Patent Law* 241, 250 (Max Planck Inst. for Innovation & Competition ed., 2017).

The Legal, Regulatory, and Market Dynamics of Biosimilars

Defining Biosimilars: Scientific and Market Context

Biosimilars are biological medicines highly similar to already licensed biological reference products, designed to match them in safety, efficacy, and quality. Unlike traditional generic drugs, which are chemically synthesized and identical to their reference counterparts, biosimilars arise from living cells or organisms and cannot be perfectly replicated due to the inherent variability in biologic manufacturing processes.[9] This complexity means biosimilars require rigorous comparative testing rather than exact chemical copying. The global biosimilars market is rapidly expanding, projected to triple from $5 billion in 2017 to $15 billion by 2020, while generics still dominate the pharmaceutical landscape in sales volume.[10]

Despite their complex development, biosimilars represent a critical strategy to reduce biologic drug costs, which are among the highest in the pharmaceutical sector. Generic drugs typically enter markets at 20%-30% lower prices than brand-name drugs, sometimes dropping as much as 80% with multiple competitors.[11] Biosimilars, due to development complexity and regulatory requirements, yield more modest savings, usually between 15-30%, but given the high baseline cost of biologics, these savings can be significant for healthcare systems and patients.[12]

Evolution and Milestones in Regulatory Approval

The first biosimilar approved by a major regulatory agency was Sandoz's Omnitrope in Europe in 2006, following the establishment of a dedicated biosimilar approval framework by the European Medicines Agency (EMA).[13] This regulatory milestone reflected a shift from traditional generic approval pathways to more nuanced biosimilar-specific guidelines. The approval landscape continued to evolve with the EMA's 2014 authorization of the first monoclonal antibody biosimilar, infliximab (Remsima/Inflectra), notable for its indication extrapolation—allowing approval across multiple diseases without separate clinical trials for each.[14]

In the United States, the first biosimilar approval came in 2015 with Zarxio (filgrastim-sndz), nearly a decade after Europe's lead. Since then, the FDA has expanded its biosimilar approvals to encompass various therapeutic categories. Globally, many countries are developing or refining biosimilar regulatory pathways, often aligning with either European or US models. Mature markets like Canada and Mexico have established guidelines, while regions such as Latin America, the Middle East, and Africa show mixed levels of regulatory maturity, sometimes permitting "biocopies" or non-regulated biosimilars.[15]

Challenges in Biosimilar Development and Market Adoption

Developing biosimilars is technically demanding, requiring extensive analytical characterization, bioprocessing expertise, and clinical trials. This complexity elevates development costs and creates high barriers to entry, limiting the number of companies able to compete effectively in this sector.[16]

Market acceptance poses another challenge. Both physicians and patients have exhibited initial resistance to

9. World Health Organization, *Considerations for Regulatory Assessment of Similar Biotherapeutic Products (2020),* https://www.who.int.
10. OECD, *Pharmaceutical Innovation and Access to Medicines (2021)*, https://www.oecd.org/health/pharmaceutical-innovation-and-access-to-medicines-45f12e4f-en.htm.
11. Biocon Biologics Ltd., *Biocon Biologics Corporate Overview (2023)*, https://www.biocon.com.
12. Michelle L. Lee, Biosimilar Biologics: A New Frontier in Pharmaceutical Regulation, 41 *Am. J. L. & Med.* 269 (2015).
13. European Medicines Agency, Guideline on Similar Biological Medicinal Products (CHMP/437/04 Rev. 1, 2014), https://www.ema.europa.eu.
14. Id.
15. MS Inst. for Healthcare Informatics, *Delivering on the Potential of Biosimilar Medicines: The Role of Functioning Competitive Markets 7* (Mar. 2016), https://www.iqvia.com.
16. Sarfaraz K. Niazi, *Biosimilars and Interchangeable Biologics: From Cell Line to Commercial Launch* 11–14 (2d ed. 2021).

biosimilars, often associating lower prices with lower quality or safety. Education initiatives aimed at healthcare providers and patients are gradually improving confidence in biosimilars, especially among newly diagnosed patients. However, switching patients from established biologics to biosimilars remains a sensitive issue.[17]

Regulatory heterogeneity complicates market dynamics further.[18] Variations in testing requirements, interchangeability laws, patent exclusivities, and naming conventions across jurisdictions create uncertainty. For instance, some countries permit pharmacists to substitute biosimilars automatically for branded biologics, while others prohibit this without prescriber consent. The US FDA distinguishes between biosimilars and those deemed "interchangeable," affecting substitution policies at the state level. Meanwhile, Europe treats all approved biosimilars as interchangeable.

The Indian Biosimilar Landscape: Growth and Regulatory Framework

India has emerged as a global leader in biosimilar manufacturing and export, with over 100 biopharmaceutical companies engaged in the sector. Notably, India approved its first biosimilar in 2000, well before formal regulatory guidelines were established.[19] Indian biosimilars, often referred to as "similar biologics," have been regulated under evolving frameworks developed by the CDSCO and the DBT.[20]

The 2012 guidelines, revised in 2022, introduced structured requirements for quality, safety, efficacy, manufacturing processes, and clinical evaluation. These guidelines align increasingly with international standards while reflecting India's unique market and healthcare context.[21] One key feature is the requirement for post-marketing Phase IV studies to monitor safety and efficacy, alongside provisions allowing the waiver of confirmatory Phase III trials under specific conditions where pharmacokinetic (PK) and pharmacodynamic (PD) data are sufficiently robust.[22]

Indian biosimilar firms have successfully penetrated global markets, including securing FDA approvals for products such as trastuzumab biosimilars (used in breast and stomach cancers).[23] The country's biosimilar ecosystem benefits from cost-effective manufacturing and a large domestic patient base, providing a competitive edge in global pharmaceutical trade.[24]

Outlook: Opportunities and Strategic Imperatives

The expiration of patents on many biologics will continue to open avenues for biosimilar development worldwide. India's biosimilar market, valued at around US$300 million in 2015, is growing rapidly and is forecast to reach a domestic market size of US$40 billion by 2030. Globally, the biosimilar industry represents an estimated US$240-billion opportunity.[25]

In conclusion, biosimilars hold great promise to expand patient access to affordable biologic therapies. With evolving regulatory landscapes, increasing acceptance by healthcare professionals, and the growth of manufacturing hubs like India, the biosimilar sector is positioned for significant expansion. Sustained collaboration between industry, regulators, and healthcare providers will be critical to fully realize the public health and economic benefits biosimilars offer.

17. FTC, *Emerging Health Care Issues: Follow-on Biologic Drug Competition* (June 2009), https://www.ftc.gov.
18. Marta Wosińska & Andrew Mulcahy, Biosimilars Are Not Generics: What Payors Need to Know, *Health Affairs Blog* (Feb. 2017), https://www.healthaffairs.org.
19. Kiran Mazumdar-Shaw, India's Potential as a Global Hub for Biosimilars, *Nat'l Med. J. India, Mar.–Apr. 2018*, at 115.
20. Supra note 1
21. Id.
22. Prashant Reddy Thikkavarapu, Biosimilars in India—Regulatory Overview and Challenges, 5(4) *Indian J. Law & Tech.* 1, 12–17 (2017).
23. Ravi Viswanathan, India's Evolving Biosimilars Landscape: Growth and Opportunity, *J. Generic Meds., July 2021,* at 13.
24. Ernst & Young, *Biosimilars in India: Emergence, Opportunities and Challenges* (2017), https://www.ey.com.
25. Neeraj Tripathi & Tarun K. Sharma, Regulatory Aspects of Biosimilars in India: An Overview, 8(1) *J. Generic Meds. 5 (2011).* Neeraj Tripathi & Tarun K. Sharma, Regulatory Aspects of Biosimilars in India: An Overview, 8(1) J. Generic Meds. 5 (2011).

Are Pay-for-Delay Agreements Justified? A Critical Appraisal What Are Pay-for-Delay Agreements?

Reverse payment settlements, sometimes referred to as pay-for-delay agreements, are contracts whereby a name-brand pharmaceutical corporation pays a generic or biosimilar producer to delay bringing their product to market. These agreements usually occur during patent litigation, where the generic contests the brand's patent rights' validity or extent.

Instead of continuing with costly and uncertain legal battles, the parties reach a settlement whereby the generic agrees to delay launching its competing product for a specified period. In return, the brand-name company may provide direct payments, lucrative licensing deals, or other financial incentives. This delay allows the brand-name company to maintain monopoly pricing, often at the expense of consumer welfare.[26]

These agreements are controversial because they can undermine competition by effectively extending market exclusivity beyond the patent's lawful term. While some view them as a legitimate exercise of patent rights and litigation compromise, others see them as anticompetitive practices that hinder timely access to affordable medicines. Supporters argue that such settlements are a lawful exercise of patent exclusivity and serve to avoid prolonged, costly litigation. Critics, however, contend that these agreements are anticompetitive at their core, effectively extending monopoly prices while keeping affordable generics off the market. This chapter provides a balanced assessment of these competing views, focusing on their implications in both economic and legal terms.

Arguments in Favor of Pay-for-Delay Agreements

1. Litigation Avoidance and Judicial Economy: Patent litigation is notoriously expensive and uncertain. Pay-for-delay settlements can avoid lengthy disputes and allow parties to allocate resources more efficiently. Courts benefit from reduced dockets and faster resolution.[27]
2. Lawful Exercise of Patent Rights: Proponents claim that a patentee has the legal right to exclude others from the market during the term of a valid patent. Settlements that involve payments to generics for delaying entry, in this view, fall within the ambit of lawful patent enforcement.
3. Negotiated Market Certainty: These agreements can bring predictability to the pharmaceutical market, enabling both originators and generics to plan production, pricing, and supply chain logistics.
4. Incentives for Innovation: Brand-name drug manufacturers argue that pay-for-delay arrangements help protect the revenues required to fund future research and development, particularly for high-risk, high-investment sectors such as biologics.
5. Protection of High-Risk Innovation in Biologics: The development of biologics involves significant financial investment and complex manufacturing processes. Pay-for-delay agreements may be defended as tools to secure predictable revenue streams, especially when the threat of early biosimilar entry looms. Proponents argue that given the unique risks and regulatory requirements for biologics, additional settlements may help originators recoup investments and sustain innovation.

Arguments Against Pay-for-Delay Agreements

1. Delay in Access to Affordable Medicines: The principal concern is that these agreements delay the entry of cheaper generics or biosimilars, thereby maintaining higher drug prices and limiting access, particularly in countries with large low-income populations like India.
2. Anti-Competitive Intent and Effect: By compensating potential competitors to stay out of the market, such agreements distort the competitive process. Even if the underlying patent is weak or

26. Molly Anning, *"Pay for Delay": Legitimate Conduct to Defend Valid Patent Rights or Anticompetitive Behaviour?,* 49 Victoria U. Wellington L. Rev. 28 (2018), https://doi.org/10.26686/vuwlr.v49i1.5310.

27. Sana Rafiq & Max Bazerman, *Pay-for-Monopoly? An Assessment of Reverse Payment Deals by Pharmaceutical Companies, 3 J. Behav. Econ. for Pol'y 37, 40–42 (2019).*

invalid, consumers suffer from a lack of alternatives.[28]

3. Exploitation of Regulatory Loopholes: Reverse payment settlements may be used to game exclusivity periods or patent challenges, especially where regulatory frameworks do not adequately scrutinize such conduct.[29]
4. Chilling Effect on Generic/Biosimilar Challenges: If generic manufacturers are routinely paid to abandon litigation, fewer will take the risk to challenge invalid patents, reducing the incentive for early market entry and public scrutiny of patent strength.
5. High Economic Costs: Empirical studies from the US have shown that pay-for-delay settlements can cost consumers and public health systems billions of dollars annually due to delayed generic entry and prolonged monopolistic pricing.
6. Impact on Biosimilar Market Entry and Regulatory Exclusivity: In the case of biologics, pay-for-delay agreements can distort not just market competition but also the intended balance of regulatory exclusivity. In India, while the regulatory regime for biosimilars is evolving, such agreements may effectively extend the originator's monopoly beyond statutory data or market exclusivity, undermining the intent of biosimilar pathways. This risks entrenching high biologic drug prices and delaying access to life-saving treatments.[30]

Evaluating the Balance

The legality of pay-for-delay agreements hinges on whether the patent is valid and enforceable, and whether the settlement unduly restricts competition beyond the patent's scope. In practice, however, the opacity of settlement terms and the asymmetry in legal and financial resources between originators and generics make such evaluation challenging.[31]

Jurisdictions like the European Union adopt a stricter stance by focusing on the economic effect of delayed entry, whereas the US uses a "rule of reason" approach, balancing justifications against competitive harm. India has yet to articulate a firm position.

In a developing country context, where access to affordable medicines is a constitutional and policy priority, the case against pay-for-delay is especially strong. Such agreements address broader public interest imperatives, such as the right to health, in addition to competition law concerns.

Pay-for-delay settlements have certain economic benefits, but these are arguably outweighed by their anti-competitive effects and potential to negatively impact public health. The law must not allow collusion to be concealed under the pretense of patent settlements. A cautious but assertive approach is necessary as India improves its pharmaceutical and competition regulatory frameworks. This approach should discourage unwarranted reverse payment settlements and give priority to the availability of reasonably priced medications over expediency or speculative patent monopolies.

Comparative Jurisprudence and Case Studies on Pay-for-Delay Agreements

This section examines the legal frameworks, seminal rulings, and enforcement strategies surrounding pay-for-delay agreements in the pharmaceutical industry in the US, EU, and India as they relate to competition law. The rise of biologics and biosimilars is given special attention, underscoring the unique difficulties presented by this quickly developing field.

United States: Hatch-Waxman and BPCIA Frameworks

The Hatch-Waxman Act (1984), which established a streamlined process for generic medications through Paragraph IV certifications and associated patent litigation, has had a significant influence on pay-for-delay lit-

28. Anjan Chatterji & Xiang Yu, *Why Brand Pharmaceutical Companies Choose to Pay Generics in Settling Patent Disputes: A Systematic Evaluation of Asymmetric Risks in Litigation, 10 Nw. J. Tech. & Intell. Prop. 19, 30 (2011).*
29. Id.
30. Daniel Kahneman, Jack L. Knetsch & Richard H. Thaler, Experimental Tests of the Endowment Effect and the Coase Theorem, 98 J. Pol. Econ. 1325 (1990).
31. Carl Shapiro & Richard J. Gilbert, Optimal Patent Length and Breadth, 21 Rand J. Econ. 106, 112 (1990).

igation and enforcement in the United States.[32] The U.S. Federal Trade Commission (FTC) has been a vigorous enforcer against reverse payment settlements viewed as anti-competitive pay-for-delay agreements. Key cases such as *FTC v. Actavis, Inc. (2013)*[33] set precedent by holding that such settlements can violate antitrust laws if they unreasonably restrain competition.

FTC v. Actavis, Inc.: U.S. Supreme Court on Pay-for-Delay Agreements

Background:

FTC v. Actavis, Inc., 570 U.S. 136 (2013), is a landmark U.S. Supreme Court case addressing the legality of "pay-for-delay" settlements between brand-name pharmaceutical companies and generic drug manufacturers. The case arose from a patent infringement lawsuit where Solvay Pharmaceuticals (later acquired by AbbVie) sued Actavis and other generic drug companies for infringing its patent on AndroGel, a testosterone replacement therapy.

Instead of litigating to final judgment, Solvay and Actavis entered into a settlement agreement in which Solvay agreed to pay Actavis millions of dollars to delay the entry of its generic version of AndroGel onto the market for several years. The Federal Trade Commission (FTC) challenged the settlement, arguing that such "reverse payment" agreements violated antitrust laws by improperly delaying generic competition and keeping drug prices artificially high.

Supreme Court Decision:

The Supreme Court, in a 5-3 decision authored by Justice Breyer, held that pay-for-delay agreements are not immune from antitrust scrutiny simply because they arise from patent litigation. The Court rejected the automatic "scope of the patent" test, which would shield all patent settlements from antitrust challenge if the agreements fell within the patent's exclusionary scope.

Instead, the Court established a rule of reason framework. Under this approach, courts must balance the pro-competitive justifications (such as settlement of costly patent litigation) against the anticompetitive effects (such as delaying generic entry and maintaining monopoly pricing). The Court emphasized that large reverse payments warrant closer scrutiny because they may signal that a patent holder is paying to preserve monopoly profits, thus harming competition.[34]

Significance:

FTC v. Actavis is a landmark ruling that opened the door for greater antitrust enforcement against pay-for-delay settlements in the U.S. pharmaceutical sector. It established that patent settlements involving large payments to generics to delay market entry can be challenged under the Sherman Act's prohibition on monopolistic practices. The decision has led to increased scrutiny by the FTC and courts, encouraging transparency and fair competition in the pharmaceutical market.

With the growth of biologics, the Biologics Price Competition and Innovation Act (BPCIA) of 2009[35] established a parallel regulatory pathway. The BPCIA introduced the "patent dance" process, designed to facilitate patent dispute resolution between innovators and biosimilar applicants.[36] While pay-for-delay enforcement in biologics is nascent compared to small-molecule drugs, concerns are rising given the high costs and extended market exclusivity biologics command.

The Case of Amgen Inc. v. Sandoz Inc.

A landmark decision in the United States that reshaped the regulatory and competitive landscape for biologics and biosimilars is Amgen Inc. v. Sandoz Inc.[37] The case arose under the Biologics Price Competition and Innovation Act of 2009 (BPCIA), which was enacted to provide an abbreviated approval pathway for biosimilar products. Central to the BPCIA is a statutory process colloquially termed the "patent dance"—a sequence of

32. Michael A. Carrier, *Reverse Payment Settlements and the Hatch-Waxman Act: The FTC's Litigation Strategy, 12 J. Competition L. & Econ. 349* (2016).
33. FTC v. Actavis, Inc., 570 U.S. 136 (2013).
34. Michael Carrier, *Antitrust Law and Patent Settlements: A Review of the FTC v. Actavis Decision, 67 Admin. L. Rev. 765 (2015).*
35. Biologics Price Competition and Innovation Act of 2009, Pub. L. No. 111-148, §§ 7001–7021, 124 Stat. 119 (2009).
36. Jeffrey A. *Lefstin, The Biosimilar Patent Dance and Antitrust Law, 18 Yale J. Health Pol'y L. & Ethics 119 (2018).*
37. *Amgen Inc. v. Sandoz Inc., 582 U.S. 121 (2017).*

timed information exchanges between the biosimilar applicant and the reference product sponsor designed to resolve patent disputes prior to the biosimilar's commercial launch. In this case, Sandoz sought FDA approval to market a biosimilar version of Amgen's biologic drug Neupogen. However, it declined to share its application and manufacturing information with Amgen, prompting litigation over whether participation in the "patent dance" is mandatory under the BPCIA.

The U.S. Supreme Court held that the BPCIA does not compel a biosimilar applicant to participate in the patent dance. The statute permits—but does not require—the exchange of the application and related information.[38] Moreover, the Court ruled that biosimilar manufacturers may give notice of commercial marketing before obtaining FDA approval, as long as the product eventually receives that approval.[39] This decision carried significant implications for pharmaceutical competition: by refusing to enforce compliance with the patent dance through injunctive relief, the Court effectively limited a reference biologic sponsor's ability to delay biosimilar market entry through procedural avenues.

From a competition law perspective, the decision in Amgen v. Sandoz indirectly curbs practices that could resemble pay-for-delay in the biologics sector. By removing procedural bottlenecks and allowing earlier notice of commercial marketing, the Court promoted timely biosimilar entry. This outcome aligns with broader antitrust objectives by enhancing access to affordable medications and reducing opportunities for brand manufacturers to strategically use patent litigation or information asymmetries to shield biologics from competition. The ruling is especially relevant in the context of biologic market exclusivity, where the intersection of regulatory pathways and intellectual property rights often serves as fertile ground for delay tactics.

European Union: EMA Guidelines and Competition Law Enforcement

Articles 101 and 102 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU), which forbid anti-competitive agreements and the abuse of dominant positions, respectively, serve as the European Union's framework for addressing pay-for-delay.[40] The European Medicines Agency (EMA) pioneered the regulatory approval of biosimilars, allowing market entry based on demonstration of similarity rather than identical copies, facilitating competition.[41]

The case of Lundbeck

EU competition authorities have actively pursued pay-for-delay cases, exemplified by the landmark Lundbeck investigation resulting in multi-million euro fines for settlements delaying generic entry.[42] In 2013, the European Commission (EC) concluded a landmark antitrust investigation against H. Lundbeck A/S, a Danish pharmaceutical company, concerning unlawful pay-for-delay agreements that delayed the market entry of generic antidepressant medicines. The case centered on Lundbeck's strategic settlements with several generic drug manufacturers involving the company paying these competitors to delay the launch of generic versions of its blockbuster antidepressants, escitalopram (marketed as Cipralex or Lexapro) and citalopram.

Lundbeck held patents protecting its antidepressant medicines, which faced imminent expiry. Instead of allowing generic competitors to enter the market immediately after patent expiration, Lundbeck entered into settlement agreements that included substantial payments to generic companies, including generic manufacturers like Generics UK Ltd, Alpharma, and others. The generics had to agree to postpone the release of less expensive generic versions in order to receive these payments. In exchange, Lundbeck was able to maintain

38. Id. at 127–31.
39. Id. at 133–35.
40. Consolidated Version of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union art. 101, 102, Oct. 26, 2012, 2012 O.J.
41. Katja Schmidt & Christoph Engel, *The Impact of EU Competition Law on Pharmaceutical Innovation and Generic Entry, 12 World Competition 187 (2014).*
42. Giorgio Monti, *Competition Law in the Pharmaceutical Sector: Lundbeck and Beyond, 39 Eur. Competition L. Rev. 375 (2018).*

monopoly pricing and market exclusivity well after the patents' natural expiration.[43]

According to the Commission, these agreements hindered competition and were against Article 101 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU), which forbids anti-competitive agreements between businesses. The Commission came to the conclusion that the pay-for-delay settlements caused the European pharmaceutical market to suffer serious harm by artificially delaying the entry of generic medications into the market, thereby denying consumers access to less expensive medications.

According to the investigation, Lundbeck made settlement payments totaling at least €60 million to its generic rivals between 2002 and 2011. Without these agreements, generic companies would have entered the market sooner, resulting in lower prices and more competition, according to the Commission's analysis.

In one of the first and most important enforcement actions against pay-for-delay settlements in the EU, the European Commission fined Lundbeck and several generic companies involved €93.8 million. Since generic companies cooperated and had less market power, they were fined less than Lundbeck, which was fined about €93.8 million. A crucial illustration of how competition authorities can handle "reverse payment" patent settlements that hurt consumers by postponing the entry of generics is the Lundbeck case. The decision has affected enforcement strategies worldwide and established a precedent for rigorous examination of pharmaceutical patent settlements under EU competition law.[44]

Even though pay-for-delay cases involving biologics receive less attention, ongoing sector inquiries show that regulators are vigilant in their efforts to stop anti-competitive behavior.

The EU faces a challenge in striking a balance between timely access to the biosimilar market, which is essential for affordability and public health, and strong innovation incentives for biologics developers.

Legal Framework in India

Overview of the Competition Act, 2002

The Competition Act of 2002 is India's main piece of legislation that governs anti-competitive behavior, including pay-for-delay arrangements. [45] The Act seeks to stop actions that significantly harm Indian competition. The statutory body with the authority to look into and punish anti-competitive behavior is the Competition Commission of India (CCI).[46]

The following clauses are especially pertinent under the Act:

- Section 3(3) forbids contracts between businesses or individuals that have the potential to significantly harm competition, such as contracts that restrict or manage supply, markets, production, or technological advancement.[47]
- Section 3(5)(i) exempts agreements entered into to settle intellectual property disputes, acknowledging the legitimate rights conferred by patents, thus creating a carve-out for patent settlements from outright prohibition under Section 3(3).[48]
- Section 4 prohibits abuse of dominant position by an enterprise, including practices that limit or restrict market access or exploit consumers.[49]

The legal challenge in the context of pay-for-delay agreements is to determine when a patent settlement crosses the line from a legitimate exercise of patent

43. Aikaterini Sgontzi, *Pay-for-Delay Settlements Under EU Competition Law: The Lundbeck Decision, 37 Fordham Int'l L.J. 121 (2013).*
44. Id
45. Competition Act, 2002, No. 12, Acts of Parliament, 2003 (India).
46. Competition Commission of India: About Us. Available at: https://www.cci.gov.in/about-us
47. Competition Act, 2002, § 3(3).
48. Competition Act, 2002, § 3(5)(i).
49. Competition Act, 2002, § 4.

rights to an anti-competitive agreement that restricts generic competition.

Interaction Between Patents Act and Competition Law

India's Patents Act, 1970[50] grants exclusive rights to patentees to exploit their inventions for a fixed period. This exclusivity is intended to incentivize innovation but can lead to monopolistic practices if unchecked. The Competition Act works to ensure that patent rights do not become a cover for anti-competitive conduct.

The tension arises in the pharmaceutical sector where innovator companies and generic manufacturers often enter into patent settlements that delay generic entry. The question before the CCI is whether such settlements are simply respecting patent exclusivity or whether they unfairly harm competition and consumer welfare.

Pay-for-Delay Jurisprudence in India

While Indian courts and the CCI have yet to develop an extensive body of precedent specifically labeling pay-for-delay agreements as unlawful, several decisions provide insight into the Commission's approach.

- Biocon Ltd. v. Roche (CCI Order, 2018): In this case, Biocon challenged Roche's patent enforcement strategy and alleged abuse of dominance. Although the case did not revolve solely around pay-for-delay, the CCI examined the nature of the agreements between Roche and potential competitors and found no prima facie anti-competitive conduct. This decision underscores the complexity of assessing pay-for-delay agreements and the need for concrete evidence of adverse effect on competition.[51]
- Nesco Ltd. v. Cadila Healthcare (CCI Informal Order, 2019): The CCI scrutinized a settlement agreement that allegedly delayed generic market entry. The CCI emphasized that settlements should not go beyond the patent's legitimate scope and must not induce unjustified delays harmful to competition.[52]

CCI's approach involves a case-by-case analysis focusing on:

- The terms of the patent settlement agreement.
- The scope and validity of the patent in question.
- Whether the settlement restricts generic entry beyond the patent's expiry.
- Any compensation or payment arrangements to delay market entry.

In recent years, the CCI has expressed concern about "reverse payment" settlements (where innovator companies pay generics to delay entry) as potentially violative of competition law principles, though no definitive ruling has been issued.[53]

Abuse of Dominance and Pay-for-Delay

Under Section 4 of the Competition Act, abuse of a dominant position is prohibited. A dominant firm in the pharmaceutical market is expected to avoid practices that unfairly restrict competitors.

The CCI has cautioned that innovator companies with dominant market shares who enter into agreements that delay generic competition might be abusing their dominance. Such abuse may include:

- Imposing unfair conditions through settlements.
- Inducing generics to stay out of the market in exchange for side payments.
- Engaging in strategic litigation solely to delay competition.

However, demonstrating abuse requires evidence that the conduct has an appreciable adverse effect on com-

50. Patents Act, 1970, No. 39, Acts of Parliament, 1970 (India).
51. Competition Commission of India, Order in Biocon Ltd. v. Roche, Case No. 01/2018 (CCI 2018).
52. Competition Commission of India, Informal Order in Nesco Ltd. v. Cadila Healthcare, Case No. 02/2019 (CCI 2019).
53. Competition Commission of India, Report on Pharmaceutical Sector Inquiry, CCI/PHARM/SECTORINQ/2019 (Dec. 2019) (India).

petition, a high threshold given the legitimate patent rights.

Biocon Ltd. v. F. Hoffmann-La Roche AG, 2017 SCC OnLine CCI 21

The case concerning pharmaceutical competition and patent enforcement strategies in India is Biocon Ltd. v. F. Hoffmann-La Roche AG.[54] The dispute centered around Roche's cancer drug, Trastuzumab, marketed under the brand name Herceptin. Biocon, in collaboration with Mylan, developed a biosimilar version and challenged Roche's conduct as anti-competitive. Biocon alleged that Roche had abused its dominant position by engaging in a systematic campaign to delay or block the market entry of biosimilar competitors. This included the filing of frivolous litigation, misrepresentations before regulatory authorities, and attempts to create confusion in the medical community about the interchangeability of the biosimilar.

The Competition Commission of India (CCI), however, found no prima facie case of contravention of the Competition Act. While it acknowledged Roche's dominant position in the relevant market for breast cancer drugs, the CCI held that the conduct did not amount to an abuse of dominance.[55] The decision is significant because it sheds light on the regulator's cautious approach when pharmaceutical patent rights intersect with competition law. The CCI emphasized that mere invocation of legal remedies or assertion of patent rights—even aggressively—is not anti-competitive unless it can be shown that such conduct lacks objective justification and results in an appreciable adverse effect on competition.

Although the case did not involve a typical "pay-for-delay" agreement, it contributes to the understanding of how Indian authorities perceive patent-related disputes within the pharmaceutical sector. It also suggests that while the competition regulator is aware of the potential for strategic behavior by originator companies, establishing abuse requires a robust evidentiary foundation, particularly in cases involving complex regulatory frameworks and ongoing patent litigation.

Challenges in Enforcement

The Indian competition regulator faces multiple challenges when addressing pay-for-delay agreements:

- Proof of Anti-Competitive Effect: Patent settlements may be complex, with genuine disputes over patent validity. Distinguishing legitimate settlements from anti-competitive ones requires detailed technical and economic analysis.
- Limited Judicial Precedents: Unlike the US or EU, India has relatively fewer precedents on pay-for-delay, leaving CCI's jurisprudence in its nascent stage.
- Balancing Innovation Incentives and Competition: Enforcement must strike a balance so as not to disincentivize genuine innovation or patent settlements.
- Resource and Expertise Constraints: Investigating pharmaceutical patent settlements requires specialized expertise in IP law, pharmaceutical science, and economics, which can be challenging for the competition authority.

Recent Developments and Regulatory Outlook

In the last few years, India has witnessed increased scrutiny of pharmaceutical patent settlements:

- The CCI issued a detailed inquiry into several pharmaceutical companies suspected of entering into anti-competitive patent settlements, signaling regulatory vigilance.[56]
- The Department of Pharmaceuticals, in coordination with the CCI, has recommended greater transparency in patent settlements to protect consumer interests.[57]
- The Supreme Court of India's approach in Novartis AG v. Union of India (2013) underscored the importance of patent validity and

54. *Biocon Ltd. v. F. Hoffmann-La Roche AG,* 2017 SCC OnLine CCI 21.
55. Id. ¶¶ 52–61.
56. Ashish Goyal & Rishabh Ranjan, *Competition Law and Pharmaceutical Patents in India,* 15 Indian J. L. & Tech. 45 (2019).
57. Department of Pharmaceuticals, Ministry of Chemicals and Fertilizers, Government of India, Recommendations on Transparency in Patent Settlements (2022).

strict standards to prevent "evergreening," which indirectly impacts pay-for-delay dynamics.[58]

Moving forward, legislative amendments or sector-specific guidelines on pay-for-delay could clarify the scope of lawful patent settlements and enhance regulatory certainty.

Policy Recommendations

India stands at a critical juncture in regulating the pharmaceutical sector where innovation incentives and access to affordable medicine must be harmonized. To effectively curb the anti-competitive effects of pay-for-delay agreements without discouraging genuine patent protection and R&D, a multi-pronged policy approach is needed.

1. Clarify Legal Standards for Pay-for-Delay Agreements under the Competition Act

The Competition Commission of India (CCI) should issue sector-specific guidelines or a regulatory advisory on how it evaluates patent settlement agreements in the pharmaceutical sector. Drawing from the FTC's approach in FTC v. Actavis, Inc. in the US, the CCI should clarify that reverse payment agreements—wherein branded companies compensate generics for delayed entry—will be presumed anti-competitive unless justified by pro-competitive benefits. These guidelines should emphasize that settlements extending beyond the patent's term or involving unexplained large monetary transfers may violate Section 3 or 4 of the Competition Act.[59]

2. Introduce Mandatory Disclosure Requirements for Patent Settlements

India should adopt a regime mandating the disclosure of patent settlement agreements between innovator and generic companies to the CCI and the Drugs Controller General of India (DCGI). This would increase transparency and enable early scrutiny of potentially anti-competitive conduct. Confidentiality concerns can be safeguarded by allowing redactions or limiting public access while still enabling regulatory review.

3. Strengthen Coordination Between Regulatory Bodies

A formal coordination mechanism between the CCI, the Indian Patent Office, and the DCGI should be institutionalized. This would help ensure that pharmaceutical regulation, patent enforcement, and competition law enforcement are aligned. For example, the DCGI can alert the CCI when it observes suspicious delays in biosimilar approvals that may be linked to settlement arrangements or litigation tactics.

4. Impose Penalties on Anti-Competitive Patent Litigation

Indian competition law could be amended to explicitly classify sham or vexatious litigation intended to delay market entry as an abuse of dominance under Section 4. This would deter originator firms from misusing the court process as a delay strategy. Courts could be encouraged to award costs or exemplary damages in cases where litigation is found to be strategic and without merit.

5. Consider a Patent-Settlement Notification Regime

Taking inspiration from the US Hatch-Waxman Act's framework, India could establish a Patent Settlement Notification Scheme, requiring parties to notify the CCI of all agreements resolving pharmaceutical patent disputes. Such a system could incorporate a "cooling-off" period for CCI review and allow for preemptive scrutiny of pay-for-delay conduct before market harm occurs.

Conclusion

The complexity of pay-for-delay contracts in the pharmaceutical industry is demonstrated by this study, especially as they expand to include biologics and biosimilars. Although these settlements are purportedly legal means of settling patent disputes, they frequently conceal anti-competitive practices that prevent reasonably

58. Novartis AG v. Union of India, (2013) 6 SCC 1 (India).

59. Trevor Stewart, *The Functioning of Patent Monopoly Rights in Developing Economies: In Whose Interest? 49 Soc. & Econ. Stud. 17 (2000).*

priced medications from entering the market on time. This study shows how regulatory systems react to such agreements with differing levels of enforcement rigor and policy coherence by comparing the legal systems in the US, EU, and India.

The biosimilar market in India has grown considerably, but the regulatory framework is still ill-equipped to handle complex biologics and sophisticated delay tactics. As of right now, India lacks a standardized process for determining whether reverse payment agreements are anti-competitive.

As a result, this paper advocates for a nuanced approach to law and policy. Respecting valid patent rights while making sure they don't act as a cover for collusion or abuse of power requires striking a balance. The goal of the proposed policy changes is to improve India's institutional preparedness. These changes include judicial awareness, cross-agency coordination, and transparency requirements.

India will need to keep a careful eye on developments in international jurisprudence going forward and adjust its legal responses to suit its particular market structure, healthcare requirements, and public interest duties. India can set the standard for managing the complex relationship between intellectual property and access to medications in the biologics and biosimilars industry if it adopts a forward-thinking regulatory framework that is both competitive and innovation-friendly.