

National Judicial Academy

P-1150: Conference for High Court Justices on Intellectual Property Rights (IPRs)
08th – 10th February, 2019

Programme Coordinator : Dr. Amit Mehrotra and Ms. Sonam Jain, Faculty

No. of Participants : 21

No. of forms received : 17

I. OVERALL				
PROPOSITION	To a great extent	To some extent	Not at all	Remarks
a. The objective of the Program was clear to me	88.24	11.76	-	1. Because of time schedule. 14. A very useful and informative session.
b. The subject matter of the program is useful and relevant to my work	70.59	29.41	-	13. My court has virtually no litigation on IPRs. 15. International treaty obligations lectures were obtuse.
c. Overall, I got benefited from attending this program	64.71	35.29	-	13. My court has virtually no litigation on IPRs.
d. I will use the new learning, skills, ideas and knowledge in my work	76.47	23.53	-	13. My court has virtually no litigation on IPRs.
e. Adequate time and opportunity was provided to participants to share experiences	76.47	17.65	5.88	9. Not enough time for interaction.
II. KNOWLEDGE				
PROPOSITION	To a great extent	To some extent	Not at all	Remarks
The program provided knowledge (or provided links / references to knowledge) which is:				
a. Useful to my work	41.18	58.82	-	

b. Comprehensive (relevant case laws, national laws, leading text / articles / comments by jurists)	50.00	50.00	-	-
c. Up to date	76.47	23.53	-	-
d. Related to Constitutional Vision of Justice	35.71	64.29	-	-
e. Related to international legal norms	46.67	53.33	-	15. Yes, but we enforce Indian laws only.
III. STRUCTURE OF THE PROGRAM				
PROPOSITION	Good	Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Remarks
a. The structure and sequence of the program was logical	70.59	29.41	-	-
b. The program was an adequate combination of the following methodologies viz.				
(i) Group discussion cleared many doubts	62.50	31.25	6.25	-
(ii) Case studies were relevant	68.75	25.00	6.25	-
(iii) Interactive sessions were fruitful	75.00	25.00	-	-
(iv) Audio Visual Aids were beneficial	75.00	18.75	6.25	-
IV SESSIONS WISE VETTING				
Parameters				
Session	Discussions in individual sessions were effectively organized		The Session theme was adequately addressed by the Resource Persons	
	Effective and Useful	Satisfactory	Effective and Useful	Satisfactory
1	69.23	30.77	55.56	44.44
2	76.92	23.08	77.78	22.22
3	69.23	30.77	62.50	37.50
4	73.33	26.67	54.55	45.45
5	71.43	28.57	63.64	36.36
6	73.33	26.67	54.55	45.45

7	86.67	13.33	81.82	18.18
8	93.33	6.67	81.82	18.18
V. PROGRAM MATERIALS				
PROPOSITION	To a great extent	To some extent	Not at all	Remarks
a. The Program material is useful and relevant	56.25	43.75	-	1. As some research works are included. 15. I do not understand the value of reproducing articles from foreign journals as we can enforce Indian laws only.
b. The content was updated. It reflected recent case laws/ current thinking/ research/ policy in the discussed area	62.50	37.50	-	-
c. The content was organized and easy to follow	50.00	50.00	-	-

VIII. GENERAL SUGGESTIONS	
a. Three most important learning achievements of this Programme	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 1. In depth study of the subject; 3. Efforts to dispose of the matter easily. 2. Participant did not comment. 3. Participant did not comment. 4. Participant did not comment. 5. Participant did not comment. 6. I have come to know the emerging legal trends. 7. New dimension and development of insight. 8. I have come across the basics of the intellectual property rights, related laws and how these are relevant for emerging issues of India in global perspective. 9. Generally useful programme. Cannot identify any learning achievements – but information on GI was particularly useful. 10. Recent trends; Case law; Problems. 11. Participant did not comment. 12. 1. Gave an overall perspective about the subject; 2. It is a specialized area which requires focus and the programme provided it; 3. Practical solutions to some problems. 13. Got insights into IPRs. Virtually no litigation in my State.

	<p>14. 1. A new subject to learn about; 2. Difficulties in implementation in courts; 3. Knowledge of 4 acts.</p> <p>15. I got some idea of IPR, their administration under enforcement. Less idea of legislation. It would have been a great help if each act dealing with individual type of IPR would have been explained in detail to help understand the different types of infringement and remedies available.</p> <p>16. 1. Awareness of latest trends in the subject; 2. Recapitulation of subject. 3. Exposure to different aspects.</p> <p>17. Resolving intellectual property disputes via commercial courts and ADR; Role of judiciary in effective enforcement of intellectual property rights & emerging issues on IP regimes.</p>
<p>b. Which part of the Programme did you find most useful and why</p>	<p>1. Session 6: Jurisdictional Issues in Trademark, Copyright & Patent Disputes.</p> <p>2. Participant did not comment.</p> <p>3. Participant did not comment.</p> <p>4. Participant did not comment.</p> <p>5. Participant did not comment.</p> <p>6. Discussion on the practical problems by the resource persons.</p> <p>7. Actual session & interaction.</p> <p>8. Session 7: Resolving Intellectual Property Disputes via. Commercial Courts and ADRs and Session 8: Role of the Judiciary in effective Enforcement of Intellectual Property Rights.</p> <p>9. Generally useful programme. Cannot identify any learning achievements – but information on GI was particularly useful.</p> <p>10. Interaction.</p> <p>11. Participant did not comment.</p> <p>12. The practical solutions to problems and effective enforcement. Ultimately court orders must be effectively enforced.</p> <p>13. To know about the real world of counterfeiting and infringement of trademarks and its impact.</p> <p>14. Session 7: Resolving Intellectual Property Disputes via. Commercial Courts and ADRs and Session 8: Role of the Judiciary in effective Enforcement of Intellectual Property Rights.</p> <p>15. Participant did not comment.</p> <p>16. Session 8: Role of the Judiciary in effective Enforcement of Intellectual Property Rights.</p> <p>17. All programme.</p>
<p>c. Which part of the Programme did you find least useful and why</p>	<p>1. Session 4: India's IP-related Treaty Obligations</p> <p>2. Participant did not comment.</p> <p>3. Participant did not comment.</p> <p>4. Participant did not comment.</p> <p>5. Participant did not comment.</p> <p>6. Academic discussion.</p>

	<p>7. Participant did not comment.</p> <p>8. No, every part was useful.</p> <p>9. Generally useful programme. Cannot identify any learning achievements – but information on GI was particularly useful.</p> <p>10. Government work details; Repetition in some cases; Provisions – basic + too much emphasis on Delhi High Court.</p> <p>11. Participant did not comment.</p> <p>12. NA.</p> <p>13. Interaction obligation & treaties obligations & dispute resolution. It was informative but may not be very useful in handling cases by Honorable courts.</p> <p>14. Session 1: Intellectual Property Rights: Genesis, Benefits & Importance.</p> <p>15. Treaty obligations.</p> <p>16. Session 2: Intellectual Property Rights Regime in India: Government Policies.</p> <p>17. Nil.</p>
<p>d. Kindly make any suggestions you may have on how NJA may serve you better and make its programmes more effective</p>	<p>1. Each session must be confined to a specific topic instead of multiple topics.</p> <p>2. Participant did not comment.</p> <p>3. Participant did not comment.</p> <p>4. Participant did not comment.</p> <p>5. Participant did not comment.</p> <p>6. Participant did not comment.</p> <p>7. Participant did not comment.</p> <p>8. Participant did not comment.</p> <p>9. May be useful to consider a mechanism to prevent repetition of content by different resource person.</p> <p>10. More interaction or development in various high court.</p> <p>11. Participant did not comment.</p> <p>12. The structure as it is very satisfactory.</p> <p>13. Participant did not comment.</p> <p>14. Arrange more frequent programmes.</p> <p>15. The subject and history of legislation in India should be explained more than international aspects.</p> <p>16. Resource persons should be mostly retired judges, advocates who are experts in the field reducing the role of academics to minimum levels possible.</p> <p>17. Participant did not comment.</p>