

Kluwer Trademark Blog

Geographical Indications: India's PGI application for 'Basmati'

Devanshi Saxena (PhD student at University of Antwerp) and Surabhi Lal (Advocate (Dispute Resolution) practicing in New Delhi and a graduate of the University of Cambridge) · Tuesday, September 29th, 2020



On 11th September 2020, the European Commission (EC) [published](#) India's Protected Geographical Indication (PGI) application for 'Basmati' under EU [Regulation No. 1151/2012](#) (Regulation). While the origin of Basmati has been [contested](#) within India itself, there is opposition by other countries in the Indian subcontinent. Here we identify two critical issues that lead to wider debates in GI scholarship. First, how are GI claims for products with a cross-border origin resolved and what requirements will India need to fulfill? Second, what is India's objective for protecting Basmati in the EU market and whether GI protection is an adequate strategy for it.

'Basmati' has been a [registered GI](#) in India since 2016 but only seven states can affix the same to its produce. The origin of Basmati within India is controversial owing to Madhya Pradesh's persistent claim to be included as a producer, a claim that has been repeatedly [rejected](#). The reputation and origin of Basmati outside India is shared by Pakistan, a fact recognized in inter alia the EU's [2004 agreement](#) with India and Pakistan, APEDA's own observations in the '[Sir Basmati](#)' trademark dispute before the CJEU (APEDA is the registered proprietor of Basmati in India), and several scholarly works. In this light, proving that 'the geographical area' as per Article 8 of the Regulation is limited to India seems challenging. Another interesting ground relevant for the present dispute and possible opposition is Article 10 read in conjunction with Articles 5(2) and 7,

which require the applicant to establish appropriate linkage between the quality, reputation and other characteristics of the GI – here: Basmati – with its geographical origin. For countries seeking protection in multiple EU member states, one option is an application under Article 49 of the Regulation. This allows for more than one country (either EU or non-EU) to jointly apply for protection in the EU internal market. There are several [examples](#) of such cross-border products. However, diplomatic ties between these countries are stronger than those between India and Pakistan which makes filing a joint application in this case difficult. Efforts to initiate joint registration for Basmati since 2005 have [not yielded any effective results](#). In fact, there have been [counter moves](#) to challenge GI rights in both countries by producer organizations.

India's objectives of seeking protection in the EU market are easy to spot. The [bulk](#) of Indian Basmati's export goes to Iran, Saudi Arabia and other middle-eastern countries. Exports to the EU have been shrinking since 2017 due to their failure to meet stricter EU standards on pesticides. Given the perceived economic and socio-economic impacts of a GI registration [in general and in the EU](#), India like many other countries is lured by the possibility of receiving a fair price and increasing exports in the European market. However, it is worth questioning how well non-EU GI products do in the EU market. As of September 2020, only 35 GIs from non-EU countries are registered as compared to 3349 EU GIs as per the e-Ambrosia database (EU's GI Register). This is because the registration of Asian GIs in the EU is an [“uphill battle”](#) and requires countries to tackle prior trademark claims. That in turn is manageable if the producer organizations are active in defending their interests, e.g. APEDA's involvement in the [Sir Basmati](#) dispute. In fact, organized collective action (bottom-up approach) by the producers is a [key success factor](#) for GIs and [experts](#) recommend involvement of local communities in managing the GI.

The outcome of this case is interesting for those familiar with the challenges for GI products with cross-border origins. A [related example](#) is that of Pisco which is claimed internationally by both Chile and Peru. The EC has resolved these claims by protecting Pisco as a PGI (Peru) and as a PDO (Chile). Whether this can be a solution in case of Basmati as well is yet to be seen. Unfortunately, for the time being, a bilateral agreement between India and Pakistan resulting in a joint application as in the case of Chilean Pisco is off the table.

To make sure you do not miss out on regular updates from the Kluwer Trademark Blog, please [subscribe here](#).

Kluwer IP Law

The **2022 Future Ready Lawyer survey** showed that 79% of lawyers think that the importance of legal technology will increase for next year. With Kluwer IP Law you can navigate the increasingly global practice of IP law with specialized, local and cross-border information and tools from every preferred location. Are you, as an IP professional, ready for the future?

Learn how [Kluwer IP Law](#) can support you.

79% of the lawyers think that the importance of legal technology will increase for next year.

Drive change with Kluwer IP Law.

The master resource for Intellectual Property rights and registration.



2022 SURVEY REPORT
The Wolters Kluwer Future Ready Lawyer
Leading change



Experience how the renewed **Manual IP** enables you to work more efficiently



[Learn more →](#)



This entry was posted on Tuesday, September 29th, 2020 at 12:38 pm and is filed under [Case law](#), [India](#)

You can follow any responses to this entry through the [Comments \(RSS\)](#) feed. You can leave a response, or [trackback](#) from your own site.