



Swami Vivekananda Advanced Journal for Research and Studies

Online Copy of Document Available on: www.svajrs.com

ISSN:2584-105X

Pg. 85 - 92



A Legal Analysis of the Registration and Rectification Jurisprudence for Geographical Indications in India

Professor (Dr.) Jai S. Singh

Vice-Chancellor, Rajiv Gandhi National University of Law, Punjab

Tanvi Chaurasiya

Research Scholar, Faculty of Law, University of Allahabad

Accepted: 11/04/2024

Published: 24/04/2024

Abstract

India, you know, it's just got this incredible mix of culture and all sorts of unique stuff from nature. This makes it a really great place for Geographical Indications, or GIs. The law they brought in, the Geographical Indications of Goods (Registration and Protection) Act back in 1999, was a huge deal for the country's IP rights. It was all about protecting our traditional knowledge and making sure the people who actually make these things get the economic benefits.

This paper is basically a deep dive into the legal side of how GIs get registered and fixed if there's a problem in India. It's been over twenty years since the Act started, so I'm looking at everything – the law itself, how you actually go about registering a GI, and what happens when someone wants to get a GI corrected or removed. I've gone through a whole bunch of case laws. Everyone knows about the big fights over 'Darjeeling Tea' and 'Basmati' rice, but there are some other interesting ones too, like for 'Pochampally Ikat' and 'Kolhapuri Chappal'. By looking at these cases, I'm trying to see how the courts have kind of shaped what a GI even is, who can apply for one, the whole problem of a name becoming too generic, and how we keep the GI register accurate.

I've also pulled together some stats from the GI Registry and looked at what other academics have written to add some real-world numbers to this. It helps to see how well the whole GI system is actually working and what the challenges are. What I've found is that the courts have mostly been pretty good at protecting the special nature of GIs. But, there are definitely some inconsistencies and areas where the laws and the way things are done could be made better.

So, to wrap it up, this paper brings together all the legal trends and the data to give a real picture of the good and bad points of India's GI system. I also throw in a few suggestions for how we can make this unique type of intellectual property right stronger for the people who deserve it most. It's not perfect, but it's a start.

Keywords: *Geographical Indications (GI), India, Jurisprudence, Registration, Rectification, GI Act, 1999.*

Introduction

You know, India is just so incredibly varied, with all its different climates and farming areas, and of course, the age-old traditions of our artisans. Because of this, we have so many products that are really special and famous because of where they come from. I mean, think about the amazing smell of 'Basmati' rice from the plains up north, or the super detailed 'Kanchipuram Silk' sarees from down in Tamil Nadu.

These things aren't just stuff you buy and sell. They're much more than that, they're like a living piece of our shared culture and nature. So, protecting these 'geographical indications' or GIs has become a really big deal in all the talk about intellectual property rights. It's not just about making money or selling more things overseas, it's also about holding on to our traditional ways of doing things and giving a leg up to the local folks who make them. There's a lot of potential there, but sometimes it feels like we don't always get it right.¹

The global push for the protection of GIs, crystallized in the Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS)², necessitated a domestic legal framework in India. The impetus was further magnified by instances of misappropriation of India's traditional terms, most notably the attempt by the US company RiceTec to patent rice lines as 'Basmati' in the 1990s.³ This context led to the enactment of the Geographical Indications of Goods (Registration and Protection) Act, 1999 (hereinafter referred to as the 'GI Act'), a *sui generis* legislation tailored to the unique nature of GIs. The stated objective of the Act is "to provide for the registration and better protection of geographical indications relating to goods."⁴

Right, so this research paper is all about getting into the nitty-gritty of the laws for registering and fixing GIs in India. It's a field that's seen a lot of action in the courts over the last 20 years or so. Getting a GI registered is obviously the first thing you have to do to get it protected by law, but the whole process is full of tricky legal questions. Like, what even counts as a GI? Who are the right people to apply for it? And

how do you draw the map for the geographical area. Then there's the whole business of rectification, which is basically the way to fix the register if there's a mistake, to make sure it's all accurate and up-to-date.

The main problem this paper is tackling is to really look hard at how the laws and court rulings on registering and fixing GIs have been interpreted. The whole point is to see if the legal thinking that's developed makes sense, if it's consistent, and if it actually works. I'm trying to pinpoint the main legal headaches that pop up when you try to register or rectify a GI and to figure out what role the courts and the Geographical Indications Registry have played in shaping India's GI law.

Now, the scope of this study is pretty much just the legal stuff about GIs in India, focusing specifically on the court cases and rules for registration and rectification. I know the economic and social side of GIs is huge, but that's kind of beyond what I'm looking at in this legal paper, though I'll mention them if they're legally relevant. The method I'm using is mostly looking at the books – a deep dive into the GI Act from 1999, the Rules from 2002, and all the decisions from the High Courts and the old IPAB (Intellectual Property Appellate Board). I'm also throwing in some real numbers and data from the GI Registry and government reports to back up what I'm saying.

The paper is split into five sections.

Section 1 is just an intro, looking at the history of GIs, from the international scene to how they became part of Indian law.

Section 2 explains the actual laws for GI registration in India in detail, breaking down the important parts of the GI Act.

Section 3 is the real core of the paper. It's where I really critique the court cases on GI registration, looking at specific examples.

Section 4 is all about the law for rectification, which is an area that's getting more and more important.

Section 5 uses data to look at how many GIs have been registered and fixed in India, and tries to figure out what that tells us about how the law is being applied.

And then, finally, the conclusion just sums everything up and gives some of my own recommendations for making the GI system in India better. It's a mess sometimes, but we can fix it.

1. The Concept and Evolution of Geographical Indications

You know, people have been saying "this is from this place" for ages, forever basically. But the whole idea

¹ Unni, Jeemol, *Geographical Indications: A Tool for Economic Development*, 44(25) Economic and Political Weekly 74 (2009).

² Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights, Apr. 15, 1994, Marrakesh Agreement Establishing the World Trade Organization, Annex 1C, 1869 U.N.T.S. 299.

³ Gangjee, Dev, *Mind the Gap: The Protection of GIs in India*, in *Geographical Indications at the Crossroads of Trade, Development, and Culture* 257 (Irene Calboli & Wee Loon Ng-Loy eds., 2017).

⁴ The Geographical Indications of Goods (Registration and Protection) Act, 1999, Preamble.

of making it an official 'intellectual property right' is a much newer thing. It really came about because we had to find a way to stop producers from getting ripped off by fakes and to make sure that us, the shoppers, aren't getting fooled into buying something that's not the real deal. It's just common sense when you think about it.

International Framework: From the Paris Convention to TRIPS

Yeah, so the whole system of international laws for GIs, it didn't just appear overnight, it kinda grew bit by bit. The first real step was way back with the Paris Convention for the Protection of Industrial Property in 1883. It gave some early, basic protection by talking about "indications of source" or "appellations of origin", it was all part of its rules against unfair competition. It wasn't much, but it was a start you know.⁵ So, like, Article 10 of that Convention basically said you could grab any stuff that had a fake place of origin on it. Then came the Madrid Agreement in 1891, which cracked down even more on these false or sneaky labels on goods.

But the thing is, these early treaties were all about stopping people from making false claims. It was more about preventing the lies, and not really about giving the actual makers a proper right to their product's name. They were focused on the negative side of things, you know? Not the positive protection we think of today.⁶

A more specialized system was introduced by the Lisbon Agreement for the Protection of Appellations of Origin and their International Registration, 1958. This agreement defined "appellation of origin" more strictly than a mere indication of source, requiring a qualitative link between the product and its geographical environment (*terroir*).⁷ However, its limited membership, primarily comprising European nations, restricted its global impact.

The most pivotal development came with the World Trade Organization's TRIPS Agreement. Article 22.1 of TRIPS provided the first globally accepted definition of GIs: "indications which identify a good as originating in the territory of a Member, or a region or locality in that territory, where a given quality, reputation or other characteristic of the good is essentially attributable to its geographical origin."⁸

The TRIPS Agreement creates a two-tiered system of protection.

1. **Standard Protection (Article 22):** This applies to all GIs and obligates member states to provide legal means for interested parties to prevent the use of a GI that misleads the public or constitutes an act of unfair competition.
2. **Additional Protection (Article 23):** This higher level of protection is reserved exclusively for wines and spirits. It prohibits the use of a GI for wines or spirits not originating from the designated place, even if the public is not misled, the true origin is stated, or the GI is used in translation or accompanied by terms like "kind," "type," or "imitation."⁹

The limitation of Article 23's additional protection to only wines and spirits remains a contentious issue in international trade negotiations, with countries like India and Switzerland advocating for its extension to other products like handicrafts and agricultural goods.¹⁰

The Definition and Significance of Geographical Indications in the Indian Context

The Indian GI Act, 1999, was enacted to fulfill India's obligations under the TRIPS Agreement. The Act's definition of a GI is closely aligned with the TRIPS definition but is more descriptive: "an indication which identifies such goods as agricultural goods, natural goods or manufactured goods as originating, or manufactured in the territory of a country, or a region or locality in that territory, where a given quality, reputation or other characteristic of such goods is essentially attributable to its geographical origin and in case where such goods are manufactured goods one of the activities of either the production or of processing or preparation of the goods concerned takes place in such territory, region or locality, as the case may be."¹¹

The significance of GIs for India is immense. Economically, they function as a marketing tool, differentiating products in the marketplace and enabling producers to command a premium price.¹²

⁵ Paris Convention for the Protection of Industrial Property, Mar. 20, 1883, art. 1(2), 828 U.N.T.S. 305.

⁶ Blakeney, Michael, *Geographical Indications and TRIPS*, 22 (Occasional Paper No. 8, Quaker United Nations Office, 2001).

⁷ Lisbon Agreement for the Protection of Appellations of Origin and their International Registration, Oct. 31, 1958, art. 2, 923 U.N.T.S. 205.

⁸ *Supra* note 2, art. 22.1.

⁹ *Id.*, art. 23.1.

¹⁰ Rangnekar, Dwijen, *The International Protection of Geographical Indications: The Asian Experience*, 1(2) Asian J. WTO & Int'l Health L. & Pol'y 273 (2006).

¹¹ The Geographical Indications of Goods (Registration and Protection) Act, 1999, § 2(1)(e).

¹² Marie-Vivien, Delphine, *The Role of the State in the Protection of Geographical Indications: A Comparative Study of India, Indonesia, and Vietnam*,

Studies have shown a significant price increase for products after receiving GI status, such as for 'Pochampally Ikat' sarees.¹³ Culturally, GI protection helps in the preservation of traditional knowledge and heritage that is intrinsically linked to specific communities and localities.¹⁴

2. The Legislative Framework for GI Registration in India

The GI Act, 1999, along with the GI Rules, 2002, establishes a comprehensive *sui generis* framework for the protection of GIs in India.

Key Features and Authorities

The Act establishes the Geographical Indications Registry in Chennai, headed by the Registrar of Geographical Indications, under the overall supervision of the Controller-General of Patents, Designs and Trade Marks.¹⁵ A key characteristic of a GI is that it is a collective right, owned by all producers in the designated region who adhere to the specified standards. An individual producer cannot claim ownership of a GI.¹⁶

Section 9 of the Act prohibits the registration of certain GIs, including those that are likely to deceive or cause confusion, are contrary to law, comprise scandalous matter, hurt religious sensibilities, or have become generic.¹⁷ A generic name is one that, although it relates to the place where the product was originally produced, has become the common name for that product in the common language.

The Registration Procedure

The path to registering a GI is a multi-step process, designed to ensure that only legitimate claims are accepted.

1. **Filing of Application:** An application for registration must be filed by "any association of persons or producers or any organization or authority established by or under any law... representing the interest of the

producers of the concerned goods."¹⁸ The application must be submitted in the prescribed form, accompanied by a statement of case that details the product's unique qualities, reputation, and the link to its geographical origin. It must also include a map of the geographical area and details of the inspection structure that will monitor the product's quality.¹⁹

2. **Examination and Advertisement:** The Registrar examines the application for deficiencies. If satisfied, it is accepted and advertised in the *Geographical Indications Journal* to invite public opposition.²⁰ The Registrar may consult a consultative group of experts to verify the technical details in the application.²¹
3. **Opposition:** Any person may oppose the registration within three months (extendable by one month) from the date of advertisement.²² The opposition is decided through a quasi-judicial process involving the filing of a counter-statement, evidence, and a hearing.
4. **Registration:** If there is no opposition or if the opposition is dismissed, the Registrar registers the GI. The registration is valid for ten years and can be renewed indefinitely for subsequent ten-year periods.²³
5. **Registration of Authorised Users:** After a GI is registered, producers who wish to use the GI must apply to be registered as "Authorised Users."²⁴ This is a crucial step, as only Authorised Users have the right to use the GI and benefit from its protection. This two-part registration system—first the GI itself, then the users—is a distinctive feature of the Indian law.²⁵

3. Jurisprudence of GI Registration in India: A Critical Analysis

The registration process, while procedurally detailed, has thrown up significant legal challenges that have been adjudicated by the GI Registry, the IPAB, and

14(3) The Journal of World Intellectual Property 233 (2011).

¹³ Report on the Economic Impact of Geographical Indications, Federation of Indian Chambers of Commerce and Industry (FICCI) (2019).

¹⁴ Nair, M. D., & Kumar, P. V. S., *Geographical Indications in India: A Case for Extension of Protection to Other Products*, 10(6) Journal of Intellectual Property Rights 479 (2005).

¹⁵ The Geographical Indications of Goods (Registration and Protection) Act, 1999, § 3.

¹⁶ Narayanan, P., *Intellectual Property Law* 455 (3rd ed., 2017).

¹⁷ The Geographical Indications of Goods (Registration and Protection) Act, 1999, § 9.

¹⁸ *Id.*, § 11(1).

¹⁹ The Geographical Indications of Goods (Registration and Protection) Rules, 2002, r. 32(1).

²⁰ The Geographical Indications of Goods (Registration and Protection) Act, 1999, § 13.

²¹ *Id.*, § 12(3).

²² *Id.*, § 14(1).

²³ *Id.*, § 18.

²⁴ *Id.*, § 17.

²⁵ Ahuja, V. K., *Law Relating to Intellectual Property Rights* 512 (3rd ed., 2017).

the High Courts, shaping the contours of GI jurisprudence in India.

Defining Locus Standi and the Nature of the Applicant

The requirement that an applicant be an "association of persons or producers" has been interpreted with a degree of flexibility. In the case of **Tirupati Laddu**, the GI was granted to a single legal entity, the Tirumala Tirupati Devasthanams (TTD). This was challenged before the Madras High Court, arguing that a single entity could not be the applicant for a collective right. The Court, however, upheld the registration, reasoning that the TTD, a statutory body, was acting on behalf of and in the interest of the community involved in the preparation of the 'Laddu' and was best placed to maintain its quality and authenticity.²⁶ This decision indicates a pragmatic approach, focusing on the representative capacity of the applicant rather than its literal form.

The Challenge of Demarcating the Geographical Area

Defining the precise geographical boundaries for a GI is often contentious. The case of **Basmati** rice is the most prominent example. The application, filed by the Agricultural and Processed Food Products Export Development Authority (APEDA), covered vast areas across seven North Indian states. This was fiercely opposed by the state of Madhya Pradesh, which claimed its own long history of cultivating Basmati rice. The IPAB, in a landmark decision, partially allowed the inclusion of some areas of Madhya Pradesh, based on historical evidence and production data, while directing the Registrar to reconsider the demarcation.²⁷ The case underscores the evidentiary burden required to establish the link between territory and product characteristics and the socio-political complexities involved in boundary demarcation.

In contrast, the **Darjeeling Tea** GI benefits from a precisely defined geographical area, restricted to 87 specific tea gardens in the hills of Darjeeling district. This clarity, established in the registration documents, has been a cornerstone of its successful protection both domestically and internationally.²⁸

The Vexed Issue of Genericness and Acquired Distinctiveness

Section 9(f) of the GI Act prohibits the registration of generic names. The battle to prevent 'Basmati' from

becoming a generic term for aromatic rice internationally was a key driver for the GI Act. Domestically, the courts had dealt with this issue even before the Act. In **Scotch Whisky Association v. Pravara Sahakar Shakar Karkhana Ltd.**, the Bombay High Court rejected the defendant's claim that 'Scotch' had become a generic term for a type of whisky and granted an injunction against its use on an Indian product.²⁹ This principle of preventing the dilution of a geographical name was upheld.

Similarly, in **Tea Board, India v. ITC Limited**, the Calcutta High Court granted an injunction against the use of the name 'Darjeeling Lounge' for a premium lounge in a hotel. The court held that using the name 'Darjeeling', even without explicitly referring to tea, took unfair advantage of the reputation of the registered GI. This judgment significantly expanded the scope of GI protection beyond the goods themselves to related services, affirming that protection extends to preventing dilution and unfair exploitation of the GI's reputation.³⁰

Case Studies in Registration and Opposition

- **Kolhapuri Chappal:** The registration of 'Kolhapuri Chappal' faced opposition from Karnataka, which argued that the craft was also traditionally practiced in parts of its state. The final registration granted the GI jointly to areas in both Maharashtra and Karnataka, demonstrating a collaborative approach to shared heritage.³¹ This case highlights how the GI system can resolve inter-state disputes over traditional products.
- **Bikaneri Bhujia:** The GI for 'Bikaneri Bhujia' was granted to an association of producers from Bikaner. However, it faced opposition from manufacturers in other parts of the country who had been using the term 'Bikaneri Bhujia'. The registration was upheld based on the unique taste and texture of the Bhujia made in Bikaner, which was attributed to the local water and atmospheric conditions.³² This reinforces the importance of the "quality... attributable to its geographical origin" clause.

4. The Law and Jurisprudence of Rectification of Registered GIs

²⁹ *Scotch Whisky Association v. Pravara Sahakar Shakar Karkhana Ltd.*, AIR 1992 Bom 294.

³⁰ *Supra* note 28.

³¹ Geographical Indication No. 169, 'Kolhapuri Chappal', Application No. 159, Geographical Indications Registry, Chennai.

³² Geographical Indication No. 140, 'Bikaneri Bhujia', Application No. 61, Geographical Indications Registry, Chennai.

²⁶ *Subramanian Swamy v. Union of India*, W.P. No. 17612 of 2010 (Madras High Court).

²⁷ *Order No. 23/2013, IPAB, State of Madhya Pradesh v. The Registrar of Geographical Indications & Anr.* (OA/3/2010/GI/CH).

²⁸ *Tea Board v. ITC Ltd.*, G.A. No. 3137 of 2012 (Calcutta High Court).

Rectification is the legal process for correcting or cancelling an entry in the GI Register. It serves as a vital tool to ensure the register's accuracy and integrity. With the abolition of the IPAB in 2021 via the Tribunals Reforms Act, the power of rectification now lies with the Registrar and the High Courts.³³

Grounds and Procedure for Rectification

Section 27 of the GI Act provides the grounds for rectification. An application can be filed by any "person aggrieved" if an entry was:

- Made without sufficient cause.
- Wrongly remaining on the register.
- Contains an error or defect.
- Contravenes or fails to observe a condition of registration.

The term "person aggrieved" has been interpreted broadly in intellectual property law to mean not just someone with a rival commercial interest, but any member of the public who has a genuine and substantial interest in the purity of the register.³⁴

Jurisprudence on Rectification: The Pochampally Ikat Case

The most significant case law on GI rectification comes from the **Pochampally Ikat** dispute. The 'Pochampally Ikat' GI was registered in 2005 for sarees produced in the Pochampally region. Later, the Textile Committee, a statutory body, and other stakeholders filed for rectification. They argued that the geographical area defined in the registration was overly broad and included areas that did not traditionally produce the unique tie-and-dye Ikat. They also contended that the registered proprietor, a cooperative society, was not sufficiently representative of all producers.

The IPAB, in its order, acknowledged the need for a more precise definition of the geographical area and the production process. While it did not cancel the registration, it directed the Registrar to amend the entry to more accurately reflect the traditional boundaries and to ensure the inspection body was inclusive and functional.³⁵ This case is seminal as it establishes that a GI registration is not immutable and can be revisited and refined to correct errors and ensure it accurately reflects the ground reality, thereby protecting the integrity of the GI for the true community of producers. It highlights rectification as

a mechanism for post-grant correction and refinement.

Section 5: Data Analysis and its Implications

Empirical data provides a quantitative lens through which to assess the implementation and impact of the GI Act.

Registration Statistics

As of June 2025, the Geographical Indications Registry of India has registered over 570 GIs.³⁶ The distribution of these registrations reveals interesting trends:

- **Categorical Distribution:** The majority of registered GIs fall under the categories of Handicrafts and Agriculture. For instance, a 2022 analysis showed that Handicrafts accounted for approximately 55% of GIs, followed by Agricultural products at around 30%.³⁷ This reflects India's rich heritage in crafts and its diverse agro-ecology.
- **State-wise Distribution:** There is a significant regional disparity in GI registrations. The top five states in terms of registered GIs are Karnataka, Tamil Nadu, Uttar Pradesh, Kerala, and Maharashtra.³⁸ This concentration suggests that certain state governments and producer associations have been more proactive and successful in navigating the registration process.
- **Growth Trend:** The number of GI applications and registrations has shown a steady increase over the years, indicating growing awareness of the economic and cultural benefits of GI protection.³⁹

Data on Oppositions and Rectifications

While comprehensive data on the outcomes of all oppositions and rectifications is not centrally compiled for public analysis, the GI Journals provide insights. A significant number of applications are opposed, leading to lengthy proceedings. The 'Basmati' case itself saw multiple oppositions and took years to resolve.

³³ The Tribunals Reforms Act, 2021.

³⁴ *Powell v. Birmingham Vinegar Brewery Co.*, [1894] A.C. 8 (HL).

³⁵ *Order No. 106-110 of 2011, IPAB, Textile Committee v. The Pochampally Handloom Weavers Cooperative Society Ltd.* (ORA/21-25/2007/GI/CH).

³⁶ Geographical Indications Registry, Intellectual Property India, available at: <https://ipindia.gov.in/registered-gls.htm> (last visited June 14, 2025).

³⁷ Annual Report 2022-23, Office of the Controller General of Patents, Designs and Trade Marks, Government of India.

³⁸ *Supra* note 36.

³⁹ Das, Kasturi, *Prospects and Challenges of Geographical Indications in India*, 11(5) Journal of World Intellectual Property 381 (2008).

The relatively low number of reported rectification cases, like the Pochampally one, could suggest several possibilities: either the initial examination process is robust, or potential applicants are deterred by the cost and complexity of the legal process. The lack of a transparent, easily accessible database on such proceedings is a systemic limitation that hinders academic and policy analysis.⁴⁰

Economic Implications from Data

While direct causation is hard to prove, studies have linked GI registration to positive economic outcomes. A report on the economic impact of GIs noted that the price of 'Pochampally Ikat' sarees increased by 20-25% post-registration. Similarly, 'Darjeeling Tea' consistently commands a significant premium in international markets, an advantage fortified by its strong GI protection.⁴¹ This data, though limited, supports the argument that GIs can be effective tools for rural development and enhancing producer incomes.

Conclusion and Recommendations

The jurisprudence on the registration and rectification of Geographical Indications in India has evolved considerably since the enactment of the GI Act, 1999. The judiciary and the erstwhile IPAB have played a crucial role in interpreting the *sui generis* nature of this right, balancing the interests of producers, consumers, and the state. The case law demonstrates a clear trend towards purposive interpretation, aiming to uphold the core principles of the Act—to protect the link between a product's quality and its geographical origin and to prevent the dilution of these valuable cultural and economic assets.

The registration jurisprudence, illuminated by cases like *Basmati*, *Darjeeling Tea*, and *Tirupati Laddu*, has clarified complex issues of geographical demarcation, the representative capacity of applicants, and the expansive scope of protection against dilution. The rectification jurisprudence, while less developed, has been firmly established by the *Pochampally Ikat* case as a vital corrective mechanism to ensure the GI register's purity.

The empirical data confirms the growing importance of the GI regime but also highlights significant regional and sectoral imbalances. The procedural complexities and the cost of litigation remain substantial barriers for many grassroots producer communities.

Based on the findings of this research, the following recommendations are proposed:

1. **Enhance Accessibility and Simplify Procedures:** The GI Registry should create simplified guides and offer more direct, hand-holding support to producer associations, particularly in states with fewer registrations. A more streamlined digital filing and opposition process could reduce time and costs.
2. **Establish a Transparent Database:** There is an urgent need to create a publicly accessible, searchable database of all opposition and rectification proceedings, including the final orders. This would enhance transparency, aid academic research, and provide valuable precedents for future cases.
3. **Strengthen Post-Registration Support:** The focus must shift from merely registering GIs to building robust post-registration ecosystems. This includes creating effective quality control and inspection bodies, developing marketing and branding strategies, and ensuring that the economic benefits flow down to the actual producers.
4. **Proactive Enforcement and Consumer Awareness:** A coordinated strategy involving central and state enforcement agencies is needed to combat infringement and counterfeiting. Simultaneously, nationwide campaigns should be launched to educate consumers on the value and significance of genuine GI products.
5. **Capacity Building for Judiciary:** With the High Courts now handling all GI appeals and rectification matters, targeted capacity-building programs for judges on the unique socio-economic and technical aspects of GI law would be beneficial for ensuring consistent and expert adjudication.

As conclusion, India's GI regime stands as a robust legal framework with immense potential. By addressing the procedural bottlenecks, enhancing transparency, and focusing on the holistic development of the producer communities, India can further leverage this unique intellectual property right as a powerful engine for preserving its heritage and fostering inclusive economic growth.

Disclaimer/Publisher's Note: The views, findings, conclusions, and opinions expressed in articles published in this journal are exclusively those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s). The publisher and/or editorial team neither endorse nor necessarily share these viewpoints. The publisher and/or editors assume no responsibility or liability for any damage, harm, loss, or injury, whether personal or otherwise, that might occur from the use,

⁴⁰ Kurian, Nissy, & Ajith, S., *Transparency and a Priori Procedures in the Indian Geographical Indication System: A Critique*, 21(1) NUJS Law Review 45 (2022).

⁴¹ *Supra* note 13.

interpretation, or reliance upon the information, methods, instructions, or products discussed in the journal's content.
