INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF LEGAL SCIENCE AND INNOVATION

[ISSN 2581-9453]

Volume 6 | Issue 5

2024

© 2024 International Journal of Legal Science and Innovation

Follow this and additional works at: https://www.ijlsi.com/

Under the aegis of VidhiAagaz – Inking Your Brain (https://www.vidhiaagaz.com)

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the International Journal of Legal Science and Innovation at VidhiAagaz. It has been accepted for inclusion in International Journal of Legal Science and Innovation after due review.

In case of **any suggestion or complaint**, please contact **Gyan@vidhiaagaz.com.**

To submit your Manuscript for Publication at **International Journal of Legal Science and Innovation**, kindly email your Manuscript at **editor.ijlsi@gmail.com.**

An Analysis Over Implementation of Doctrine of Exhaustion and Doctrine of Merger

NANDHAKISHORE M.[1]

ABSTRACT

The doctrines of merger and exhaustion play pivotal roles in legal frameworks, particularly in property law, contract law, and intellectual property rights (IPR). The doctrine of merger ensures that subordinate rights or court decisions are absorbed into superior ones, maintaining judicial hierarchy and consolidating ownership or contractual obligations. Conversely, the doctrine of exhaustion, or the first-sale doctrine, limits an IPR holder's control over a product after its first legitimate sale, enabling free resale and distribution. This paper offers a comprehensive analysis of these doctrines, exploring their practical application and challenges within Indian, U.S., and European contexts. Through case studies and judicial interpretations, it examines how these principles foster legal certainty while addressing issues such as intent, fraud, parallel imports, and digital marketplaces. The study also delves into evolving challenges in the application of these doctrines, such as complexities in cross-border trade, ambiguities in contract consolidation, and the impact of the digital economy. Ultimately, it highlights the importance of adapting these legal principles to address emerging needs and proposes reforms to enhance clarity and fairness in legal and commercial dealings.

***Keywords**: Merger, Exhaustion, Intellectual Property Rights, legal certainty.*

I. INTRODUCTION

The doctrines of **merger** and **exhaustion** play a crucial role in various branches of law, including property law, contract law, and intellectual property law. These legal principles aim to provide clarity and finality to transactions, ensuring smoother dealings between parties by establishing when rights are consolidated or extinguished. However, their **implementation** in real-world scenarios can be complex, as it requires a careful balancing of the interests of stakeholders involved.

The **doctrine of merger** arises primarily in property and contract law, where a lesser or subordinate right is absorbed into a superior right, such as when leasehold rights are merged

[1] Author is a student at , India.

© 2024. International Journal of Legal Science and Innovation [ISSN 2581-9453]

with ownership. The effectiveness of this doctrine often depends on **intent and legal provisions**, making its implementation subject to interpretation and judicial scrutiny.

On the other hand, the **doctrine of exhaustion**, also known as the **first-sale doctrine**, governs intellectual property by restricting the right of IP holders to control the resale or further distribution of goods after their first legitimate sale. This doctrine is particularly significant in copyright, trademark, and patent law, impacting areas such as **parallel imports, re-selling of branded products, and the digital marketplace**. Its application becomes even more complex with the rise of **digital products and cross-border trade**, raising questions about the scope and limitations of exhaustion.

This article explores how these doctrines are implemented in various legal frameworks, focusing on the **practical challenges and judicial developments**. A comparative analysis of their application across **India, the U.S., and the EU** will be provided to understand the differences in national and international approaches. Further, the discussion will cover **emerging issues**, such as the applicability of the exhaustion doctrine in the **digital era** and the complexities surrounding the **intent in merger cases**. The objective is to highlight the significance of these doctrines in ensuring legal certainty while identifying areas where reforms or adaptations may be required to meet the demands of a rapidly evolving legal and commercial landscape.

II. THE DOCTRINE OF MERGER

The **doctrine of merger** is a well-established common law principle that emphasizes the maintenance of a hierarchical structure within courts and tribunals. The core idea is that there cannot exist more than one operative order governing the same subject matter at the same time. As described by the **Supreme Court of India**:

"Where an appeal or revision is provided against an order passed by a court, tribunal or any other authority before a superior forum and such superior forum modifies, reverses or affirms the decision, the decision of the subordinate forum merges in the decision of the superior forum. The latter decision subsists and remains operative in the eye of the law."[2]

Thus, for the doctrine of merger to apply, three conditions must be met:

1. There must be a decision by a subordinate court or forum.
2. There must exist a right of appeal or revision, which has been exercised.

[2] ***Kunhayammed v. State of Kerala*** (2000) 6 SCC 359.

3. The superior forum must modify, reverse, or affirm the subordinate decision. The effect of this action is that the subordinate decision merges into the decision of the superior forum, which then becomes enforceable.

III. INDIAN COURTS AND THE DOCTRINE OF MERGER

One of the earliest Indian cases discussing this doctrine is **CIT v. Tejaji Farasram Kharawalla** (1953)[3], where the **Bombay High Court** held that when an appeal court passes an order, the original decision of the subordinate court ceases to exist and is merged into the appellate decision. Even if the appeal court merely confirms the original decision, it is the appellate decision that remains operative.

Similarly, in **CIT v. Amritlal Bhogilal & Co.** (1959)[4], the **Supreme Court** ruled that an appellate decision, whether confirming, modifying, or reversing the lower court's decision, becomes the enforceable order. This view was reiterated in **Shankar Ramchandra Abhyankar v. Krishnaji Dattatreya Bapat** (1969)[5], which outlined three conditions for the doctrine's applicability:

1. Appellate or revisional jurisdiction must have been exercised.
2. The jurisdiction must have followed proper notice issuance.
3. The matter must have been fully heard with both parties present.

Moreover, in **Gojer Bros. (P) Ltd. v. Ratan Lal Singh** (1974)[6], the **Supreme Court** ruled that there is no distinction between dismissing an appeal and reversing or modifying the lower court's judgment—the doctrine applies uniformly in all cases.

In **A.V. Papayya Sastry v. Govt. of A.P.** (2007)[7], the **Supreme Court** held that all orders passed by lower courts merge into the judgment of the superior court, which thereafter becomes the sole enforceable order.

(A) Exceptions to the Doctrine of Merger

Despite its broad application, the doctrine of merger does not apply universally. The **Supreme Court**, in **State of Madras v. Madurai Mills Co. Ltd.** (1967)[8], clarified that the doctrine's application depends on the scope of the appeal or revision, the jurisdiction exercised, and the

[3] ***CIT v. Tejaji Farasram Kharawalla***, 1953 SCC OnLine Bom 28.
[4] ***CIT v. Amritlal Bhogilal & Co.***, 1959 SCR 713.
[5] ***Shankar Ramchandra Abhyankar v. Krishnaji Dattatreya Bapat*** (1969) 2 SCC 74.
[6] ***Gojer Bros. (P) Ltd. v. Ratan Lal Singh*** (1974) 2 SCC 453.
[7] ***A.V. Papayya Sastry v. Govt. of A.P.*** (2007) 4 SCC 221.
[8] ***State of Madras v. Madurai Mills Co. Ltd.*** (1967) 1 SCR 732.

© 2024. International Journal of Legal Science and Innovation [ISSN 2581-9453]

statutory provisions governing such appellate or revisional authority.

Additionally, orders obtained through **fraud** cannot trigger the doctrine of merger, as held in **A.V. Papayya Sastry**. If fraud is established, the order is considered void and cannot be enforced.

(B) Doctrine of Merger and Special Leave Petitions

The application of the doctrine of merger to **special leave petitions** (SLPs) has been the subject of judicial scrutiny, given the unique nature of **Article 136** of the Constitution, which grants the **Supreme Court** extraordinary appellate jurisdiction. Special leave petitions allow bypassing of the normal hierarchy of appeals, subject to the Supreme Court's discretion.

In **Kunhayammed v. State of Kerala** (2000), the Court clarified the applicability of the doctrine of merger to SLPs, emphasizing that a dismissal of an SLP does not imply a merger of the lower court's order with the Supreme Court's order unless leave to appeal is granted and the appellate jurisdiction of the Supreme Court is invoked. A dismissal of the SLP without hearing on merits does not result in merger; it merely signifies the Court's refusal to exercise its jurisdiction.

The doctrine of merger is essential for maintaining judicial order and hierarchy. It establishes that the decision of a superior appellate or revisional court supersedes and absorbs the decision of a subordinate court. However, the doctrine is not rigid and is applied with regard to the scope of the appellate or revisional authority, as well as special circumstances like fraud. Its nuanced application in special leave petitions reflects the evolving nature of the Indian judicial system in interpreting this doctrine.

IV. IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DOCTRINE OF MERGER

1. In Property Law

The doctrine of merger is frequently applied in property transactions, particularly in scenarios involving the consolidation of different types of interests such as leasehold and freehold rights.

Merger of Leasehold and Freehold:

When a person holding a leasehold interest in a property also acquires the freehold of the same property, the leasehold interest often merges with the freehold, resulting in the lease being extinguished. However, this merger occurs only if there is no contrary intention expressed by the parties involved.[9]

[9] Goldman, Barry M. and Berghel, Victoria Smouse (1983) "Common Law Doctrine of Merger: The Exceptions

Global and Indian Property Frameworks:

India: Under Indian property law, Section 111(d) of the *Transfer of Property Act, 1882* discusses how leases can terminate upon merger. It states that the lease is extinguished when the lessee becomes the absolute owner.

United Kingdom: The principle is similarly applied under English property law, where equity may prevent a merger if it serves the interests of fairness (e.g., preventing unjust enrichment).

USA: Some states in the US also recognize the merger of estates but apply exceptions where merger would contradict the parties' intention or create inequitable results.

2. In Contract Law

In contract law, the doctrine of merger applies when a lesser contractual right or obligation merges into a more comprehensive or higher obligation, leaving the original right unenforceable.

Novation and Consolidation of Contracts:

Novation: If two parties agree to replace an old contract with a new one, the original contract ceases to have effect, merging into the new contractual obligation.

Consolidation: When multiple related contracts are merged into a single agreement, the individual contracts are extinguished, and only the consolidated agreement remains enforceable.

Example: If a borrower and a lender renegotiate a loan agreement, consolidating multiple smaller obligations into one larger loan, the original individual loans cease.

3. Judicial Enforcement of the Doctrine

Courts enforce the doctrine of merger to ensure legal certainty and prevent contradictory orders from existing simultaneously. Key judicial decisions highlight the principle's role across various domains.

India: In *Gojer Bros. (P) Ltd. v. Ratan Lal Singh (1974) 2 SCC 453*, the Supreme Court reiterated that when an appellate court affirms or modifies a lower court's decision, the original order ceases to exist independently.

Global Case Laws:

In *CIT v. Amritlal Bhogilal & Co.* (India), the Supreme Court held that even when the appellate

Are the Rule," University of Baltimore Law Review: Vol. 13: Iss. 1, Article 3. Available at: http://scholarworks.law.ubalt.edu/ublr/vol13/iss1/3

court confirms a lower court's decision, the merged order that remains enforceable is the one passed by the appellate court.

In English law, similar enforcement principles ensure that decisions by appellate courts supersede lower court judgments, streamlining the application of judicial orders.

Challenges in Practical Application

Despite its utility, applying the doctrine of merger can be complex, especially when intent or scope is unclear.

Ambiguities in Determining Intent:

A significant challenge arises when it is unclear whether the parties intended for a merger to occur. For instance, if a leaseholder purchases the freehold, courts must determine whether the parties intended the lease to merge with the freehold or remain intact for some specific reason.

Disputes over Whether a Merger Occurred:

Contractual Context: Disputes may arise if one party argues that obligations from a prior contract were extinguished by a merger, while the other insists that some obligations still survive independently.

Judicial Orders: Litigants may disagree over whether a lower court's decision has been entirely subsumed under the superior court's order, particularly if the appellate judgment is ambiguous or incomplete. This creates room for further legal contention.

By applying the doctrine of merger, courts and legal frameworks aim to simplify and consolidate legal relationships, ensuring consistency and finality. However, the doctrine's practical utility is occasionally hampered by uncertainties surrounding intent, jurisdictional scope, and equitable considerations.

V. DOCTRINE OF EXHAUSTION

The Doctrine of Exhaustion of Intellectual Property Rights (IPR), also known as the Doctrine of First Sale, refers to the principle that once an intellectual property-protected good (like a patented product, trademarked item, or copyrighted material) has been sold by the owner or with their consent, the IPR owner loses control over further distribution of that particular item. This doctrine ensures that the IP holder cannot prevent or restrict subsequent resale, rental, or redistribution of the product.

(A) Origins and Legal Basis

The doctrine traces its origins to 19th-century case law, such as Bloomer v. McQuewan

(1853)[10] in the U.S., where the distinction between patent licenses and outright sales was recognized. The principle was further refined in Adams v. Burke (1870s)[11] and adopted by the UK courts in Betts v. Willmot[12].

On the global stage, Article 6 of the TRIPS Agreement (Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights) leaves the issue of IPR exhaustion to the discretion of member states, meaning countries are free to allow or restrict parallel imports based on national laws.

(B) Types of IPR Exhaustion

1. National Exhaustion:

IPRs are exhausted only within the domestic market after the first authorized sale.

Example: In the U.S., the resale of goods incorporating IP is allowed only within the U.S. after the initial sale.

2. International Exhaustion:

Once a product is legally sold anywhere in the world, the IPR owner cannot restrict its resale across borders.

India follows international exhaustion, as demonstrated in Kapil Wadhwa & Ors. v. Samsung Electronics Co. Ltd.,[13] where the court allowed parallel imports without trademark infringement.

3. Regional Exhaustion:

After a product is sold within a region (e.g., European Economic Area, EEA), it can freely move within that region.

The UK follows regional exhaustion, meaning goods marketed in the EEA cannot be blocked from resale across member states based on IPRs.

(C) Application of Exhaustion Doctrine in Different IPR Domains

1. Exhaustion of Trademark Rights

Case Study: Kapil Wadhwa v. Samsung Electronics Co. Ltd.

The Delhi High Court upheld the principle of international exhaustion, allowing the resale of imported Samsung printers. However, the court required the sellers to prominently display that these imported products were not covered by the original manufacturer's warranty.

[10] **U.S. Reports**: Bloomer v. McQuewan et al., 55 U.S. (14 How.) 539
[11] U.S. Reports: Adams v. Burke, 84 U.S. 17 Wall. 453 (1873
[12] Betts v. Willmot LR 6 Ch App 239
[13] Kapil Wadhwa & Ors. v. Samsung Electronics Co. Ltd.194 (2012) DLT 23

Relevant Law: Sections 29(6)(b) and 30(3) of the Trade Marks Act, 1999 permit resale of trademarked goods as long as the condition of the goods remains unchanged.

2. Exhaustion of Patent Rights

India recognizes international exhaustion of patents under Section 107-A(b) of the Patents Act, 1970. Once a patented product is legally sold anywhere in the world, the patent holder cannot block its resale in India.

Practical Example: If a patented drug is sold in Europe by the patent owner, the same product can be imported into India without constituting a patent infringement.

3. Exhaustion of Copyright

Judicial Position:

In Penguin Books Ltd. v. India Book Distributors, the Delhi High Court initially ruled that importing American editions of Penguin's books without authorization amounted to secondary infringement. However, Section 14(ii) of the Copyright Act, 1957 (amended in 1995) recognizes international exhaustion by stating that copyright is exhausted once the book is in circulation.

However, the court in Warner Bros. v. Santosh V.G. refused to extend this principle to DVDs imported from the U.S., limiting their use only to authorized regions.

(D) Challenges in Applying the Doctrine of Exhaustion

1. Ambiguities in Intent: Disputes often arise over whether the original sale intended to exhaust IPRs across borders, especially in international transactions.

2. Harm to Brand Reputation: Parallel imports can hurt the goodwill of IP holders if the imported products are of lower quality or if they bypass authorized distribution channels.

3. Judicial Inconsistency: Courts sometimes differ in applying the doctrine across different types of IPRs. For example, Indian courts are more inclined toward international exhaustion for trademarks but are cautious regarding copyrights.

VI. CHALLENGES IN IMPLEMENTATION

The practical application of both the Doctrine of Merger and the Doctrine of Exhaustion presents distinct hurdles. In property and contract law, the Doctrine of Merger often leads to disputes about the intent behind merging rights or estates. Determining whether a leasehold interest has merged into a freehold or if contractual rights have been absorbed by new

obligations (e.g., novation) can be challenging, especially when the parties' intentions are unclear. Legal disputes arise when parties disagree on whether the merger has been completed, often requiring courts to intervene and interpret the underlying contracts or deeds.

In the context of the Doctrine of Exhaustion in intellectual property (IP) law, conflicts emerge due to the varied treatment of national, regional, and international exhaustion. For example, countries like India follow international exhaustion for trademarks, while others such as the U.S. restrict exhaustion to national borders. These differences create challenges in global trade, as businesses encounter conflicting rules on whether goods sold abroad can be imported freely without infringing IP rights. The situation becomes more complex with digital goods and services, where licensing models often restrict ownership, creating regulatory gaps on how exhaustion applies to software, e-books, or streaming content.

Judicial interpretations of both doctrines also vary significantly across jurisdictions, adding to the complexity. For instance, courts may adopt different standards for determining whether a merger has occurred or whether parallel imports infringe IP rights. Such divergence makes compliance difficult for businesses operating internationally and may result in fragmented market practices that stifle commerce and innovation.

VII. RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Clarifying Intent through Documentation : Legal frameworks should emphasize the importance of clear documentation regarding the intent of parties in property transactions and contract mergers to avoid disputes.

2. Harmonization of Exhaustion Regimes: Harmonizing national and international exhaustion regimes would provide greater clarity and predictability for businesses engaging in cross-border trade.

3. Adapting to the Digital Economy: Legislators and courts need to develop guidelines for applying the exhaustion doctrine to digital goods, balancing consumer rights with IP protections.

4. Balancing Interests in Parallel Imports: Regulations should aim to protect consumers from inferior-quality parallel imports while allowing fair competition in the marketplace.

VIII. CONCLUSION

The implementation of the doctrines of Merger and Exhaustion requires thoughtful legal strategies to overcome existing challenges. In property and contract law, clearer contractual provisions and guidelines on determining merger intent could reduce disputes. In IP law,

harmonizing international frameworks to manage exhaustion across borders is essential to balance the interests of IP holders, consumers, and businesses. Moreover, the rise of digital commerce calls for updating legal frameworks to address the unique issues surrounding intangible goods. As commerce, technology, and market practices evolve, it is crucial for legal systems to provide clarity and consistency, ensuring these doctrines adapt effectively to modern realities while maintaining fairness and predictability.

*****

© 2024. International Journal of Legal Science and Innovation [ISSN 2581-9453]

IX. REFERENCES

(A) Journals referred:

- Goldman, Barry M. and Berghel, Victoria Smouse (1983) "Common Law Doctrine of Merger: The Exceptions Are the Rule," University of Baltimore Law Review: Vol. 13: Iss. 1, Article 3. Available at: http://scholarworks.law.ubalt.edu/ublr/vol13/iss1/3
- Priya Adlakha, Shilpi Saurav Sharan, [The Viewpoint] The Doctrine of Exhaustion of IPRs in India https://www.barandbench.com/law-firms/view-point/the-doctrine-of-exhaustion-of-iprs-in-india
- Satyam Tandon, THE DOCTRINE OF MERGER – IN THE CONTEXT OF THE LAW OF CONTEMPT, January 11, 2023 https://satyamtandon.com/blog/the-doctrine-of-merger-in-the-context-of-the-law-of-contempt1/
- Doctrine of Exhaustion of IPRs Through Indian Lens, https://lawbhoomi.com/doctrine-of-exhaustion-of-iprs-through-indian-lens/#:~:text=This%20forbids%20the%20IP%20owner,dispute%20within%20the%20domestic%20market.

(B) Case laws referred

- **Kunhayammed v. State of Kerala** (2000) 6 SCC 359.
- **CIT v. Tejaji Farasram Kharawalla**, 1953 SCC OnLine Bom 28.
- **CIT v. Amritlal Bhogilal & Co.**, 1959 SCR 713.
- **Shankar Ramchandra Abhyankar v. Krishnaji Dattatreya Bapat** (1969) 2 SCC 74.
- **Gojer Bros. (P) Ltd. v. Ratan Lal Singh** (1974) 2 SCC 453.
- **A.V. Papayya Sastry v. Govt. of A.P.** (2007) 4 SCC 221.
- **State of Madras v. Madurai Mills Co. Ltd.** (1967) 1 SCR 732.
- **U.S. Reports**: Bloomer v. McQuewan et al., 55 U.S. (14 How.) 539
- U.S. Reports: Adams *v. Burke, 84 U.S. 17 Wall. 453 (1873*)

*****