**United International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (UIJMR)**
*An International Peer-Reviewed and Refereed Multidisciplinary Journal*
**ISSN: 3048-6726 | Impact Factor: 6.934 (SJIF)**
**Volume 3, Special Issue -IX, 2026; Website: www.uijmr.in**

# "GST and Intellectual Property Rights in Agriculture and Allied Sectors: A Legal Study on Agri-Inputs, Food Processing, and Rural Value Chains"

**Dr.N.Victoria,**
Academic Consultant, P.G. Department of Law, S.V. University, Tirupati,,
Ph.no: 9493697396; E.mail: victoria9440408711@gmail.com
DOI:10.37854/UIJMR.2026.3.3.9.573

**Abstract**

The Goods and Services Tax (GST) has transformed India's indirect taxation system by creating a unified tax structure. Although agriculture is largely exempt, allied activities such as agri-inputs, food processing, and rural value chains fall within the GST framework. Simultaneously, Intellectual Property Rights (IPR), including patents, trademarks, and geographical indications (GI), play a vital role in agricultural innovation and commercialization. This paper examines the interface between GST and IPR laws, focusing on their combined impact on agricultural inputs, food processing industries, and rural economic structures. It analyzes legal provisions, constitutional mandates, and judicial decisions to highlight challenges such as classification disputes, input tax credit restrictions, and compliance burdens. The study concludes with suggestions for harmonizing GST and IPR regimes to promote sustainable agricultural development.

The study adopts a doctrinal and analytical approach, supported by judicial interpretations, including landmark decisions such as Mohit Minerals Pvt. Ltd. v. Union of India, which clarified the scope of GST powers, and ITC Ltd. v. Commissioner of Central Excise, which remains relevant in classification disputes under GST. It also considers the constitutional framework under Articles 246A and 279A relating to GST governance.

The paper concludes that while GST has streamlined taxation, it poses significant legal and practical challenges in harmonizing with IPR protections in agriculture and allied sectors. A balanced approach is necessary to ensure **tax efficiency, innovation, and rural economic development.**

**Keywords:** Goods and Services Tax (GST), Intellectual Property Rights (IPR), Agricultural Inputs, Food Processing Industry, Rural Value Chains, Geographical Indications (GI), Patents and Trademarks, Input Tax Credit, Classification Disputes, Rural Economy

## 1. Introduction

Agriculture is the backbone of the Indian economy, contributing significantly to employment and rural livelihoods. Although primary agricultural activities are exempt from GST, allied sectors such as fertilizers, pesticides, seeds, food processing, and supply chains fall under its ambit.

At the same time, Intellectual Property Rights (IPR) have emerged as essential tools for protecting innovations in agriculture, including:

1. Patented seeds and biotechnology
2. Trademarks in food branding
3. Geographical Indications (GI) for regional products

The interaction between GST and IPR creates a complex legal framework affecting taxation, innovation, and market access.

## 2. Constitutional Framework of GST

The Goods and Services Tax (GST) was introduced through the Constitution (One Hundred and First Amendment) Act, 2016, transforming India's indirect taxation regime into a unified system. The constitutional foundation of GST is embedded in Articles 246A, 269A, and 279A of the Constitution of India.[1]

Article 246A confers concurrent taxing powers upon Parliament and State Legislatures, thereby deviating from the traditional division of legislative powers.[2] Article 269A governs inter-State trade and commerce, while Article 279A establishes the GST Council, which plays a pivotal role in recommending tax rates, exemptions, and model laws.[3]

The GST framework reflects the doctrine of cooperative federalism, balancing fiscal autonomy with national uniformity.

**Judicial Interpretation:**

In Union of India v. Mohit Minerals Pvt. Ltd.,[4] the Supreme Court held that the recommendations of the GST Council are not binding, thereby reaffirming the federal structure of the Constitution.

## 3. GST Framework in Agriculture and Allied Sectors – A Legal Analysis

Agriculture remains largely outside the ambit of GST, recognizing its socio-economic significance.[5] However, the taxation framework distinguishes between exempt agricultural produce and taxable agri-inputs and services.

Unprocessed agricultural goods such as fresh fruits, vegetables, and cereals are exempt, whereas inputs like fertilizers, pesticides, and machinery attract GST at varying rates.[6]

The Input Tax Credit (ITC) mechanism enables businesses engaged in food processing and agri-logistics to offset taxes paid on inputs.[7]

**Case Law:** In Safari Retreats Pvt. Ltd. v. Chief Commissioner of CGST,[8] the Orissa High Court emphasized the importance of ITC in avoiding cascading tax effects, indirectly benefiting infrastructure supporting agriculture.

**Analysis**: While exemptions protect farmers, taxation on inputs increases production costs, potentially affecting agricultural pricing and rural economies.

**4. Intellectual Property Rights in Agriculture**

The legal regime governing intellectual property in agriculture seeks to balance innovation with farmers' rights. Key legislations include the Patents Act, 1970, the Protection of Plant Varieties and Farmers' Rights Act, 2001 (PPVFR Act), and the Geographical Indications of Goods Act, 1999.[9]

India adopts a **sui generis system** for plant variety protection, recognizing both breeders' and farmers' rights.[10]

Examples:-

1. Basmati Rice (GI)
2. Darjeeling Tea (GI)

**Landmark Case:-** In Monsanto Technology LLC v. Nuziveedu Seeds Ltd.,[11] the Supreme Court addressed the conflict between patent protection and farmers' rights, highlighting regulatory control over seed technologies.

**Analysis:-** The Indian framework differs from Western regimes by prioritizing farmers' interests and biodiversity conservation.

**5. Interface Between GST and IPR**

The intersection between GST and IPR arises in the commercial exploitation of intellectual property. Under GST law, licensing of intellectual property is treated as a supply of services and is taxable.[12]

Royalty payments for the use of patents, trademarks, and technology are subject to GST. [13]

**Case Law**:- In *Commissioner of CGST v. Hero Motocorp Ltd.*,[14] the courts clarified the applicability of indirect taxes on royalty payments.

**Analysis:-** The classification of IPR transactions often leads to ambiguity, particularly in agriculture where technology transfer plays a crucial role.

**6. GST and Food Processing Industry**

The food processing industry is a significant contributor to India's economy and falls within the GST framework. The tax structure varies depending on the level of processing.[15]

1. Unprocessed food → Exempt
2. Processed and packaged food → Taxable

**Case Law**:- In Nestle India Ltd. v. State of Uttar Pradesh,[16] issues relating to classification and taxability of food products were examined.

**Analysis**:- GST promotes formalization but imposes compliance burdens on small and medium enterprises in the food processing sector.

**7. Rural Value Chains and GST**

GST impacts rural value chains by introducing transparency and facilitating seamless credit flow.[17] It integrates various stages of the supply chain, including production, storage, transportation, and distribution.

On the other hand, challenges such as digital illiteracy, compliance costs, and lack of awareness hinder its effective implementation in rural areas.[18]

**Analysis**:While GST modernizes supply chains, it risks marginalizing small farmers and informal sector participants.

**8. Judicial Approach**

The judiciary has adopted a pragmatic approach in interpreting GST laws, emphasizing fairness and economic efficiency.

Cases:

Union of India v. Mohit Minerals Pvt. Ltd.[19]

1. Safari Retreats Case[20]

Courts have consistently upheld principles such as avoidance of double taxation and substance over form.

**9. Legal Challenges**

The implementation of GST in agriculture and allied sectors raises several challenges:

1. Overlap between GST and IPR laws
2. Classification disputes
3. Compliance burden on small taxpayers
4. Taxation of agricultural innovation

These challenges necessitate a harmonized legal framework.

**10. Suggestions and Reforms**

- Simplification of GST procedures for farmers
- Rationalization of tax rates on agri-inputs
- Harmonization of GST with IPR laws
- Promotion of GI-tagged products
- Capacity building and awareness programs in rural areas

## 11. Conclusion

The introduction of the Goods and Services Tax has marked a significant shift in India's indirect taxation system by creating a unified and transparent tax structure. While agriculture continues to enjoy substantial exemptions, the taxation of agri-inputs, food processing, and allied activities has brought the sector partially within the GST framework. At the same time, the evolving regime of intellectual property rights in agriculture seeks to promote innovation, protect plant varieties, and enhance the commercial value of agricultural products. However, the coexistence of these two frameworks has created both opportunities and complexities in legal and economic terms.

The interface between GST and intellectual property rights reveals several challenges, particularly in the areas of classification, taxation of royalties, and regulation of agri-biotechnology. Judicial pronouncements such as Union of India v. Mohit Minerals Pvt. Ltd. *and* Monsanto Technology LLC v. Nuziveedu Seeds Ltd. demonstrate the judiciary's role in maintaining a balance between federal principles, economic policy, and farmers' rights. Despite these efforts, issues such as compliance burdens on small farmers, lack of awareness, and overlapping legal provisions continue to hinder the effective implementation of GST in rural and agricultural sectors.

In conclusion, a harmonized and farmer-centric legal approach is essential to ensure that taxation does not impede agricultural growth or innovation. Rationalizing GST rates on agri-inputs, simplifying compliance mechanisms, and aligning GST provisions with intellectual property laws can significantly strengthen rural value chains. Ultimately, an integrated framework that balances fiscal efficiency with social equity will contribute to sustainable agricultural development and inclusive economic growth in India.

## References

*Union of India v. Mohit Minerals Pvt. Ltd.*, (2022) 4 SCC 561.

Central Goods and Services Tax Act, 2017, § 2(52).

GST Rate Notifications, Government of India (2017).

Central Goods and Services Tax Act, 2017, § 16.

*Safari Retreats Pvt. Ltd. v. Chief Commissioner of CGST*, 2019 SCC OnLine Ori 66.

Patents Act, 1970; Protection of Plant Varieties and Farmers' Rights Act, 2001; Geographical Indications of Goods (Registration and Protection) Act, 1999.

Protection of Plant Varieties and Farmers' Rights Act, 2001.

*Monsanto Technology LLC v. Nuziveedu Seeds Ltd.*, (2019) 3 SCC 381.
Central Goods and Services Tax Act, 2017, Schedule II.
GST Council Clarifications on Intellectual Property Rights (IPR) Services.
*Commissioner of CGST v. Hero MotoCorp Ltd.* (2019).
GST Tariff Schedule (Food Products).
*Nestlé India Ltd. v. State of Uttar Pradesh* (2018).
GST Council Reports on Supply Chain Integration.
Ministry of Rural Development Reports on GST Implementation.
*Union of India v. Mohit Minerals Pvt. Ltd.*, supra note 4.
*Safari Retreats Pvt. Ltd. v. Chief Commissioner of CGST*, supra note 8.

**Bibliography**

**Constitutional Provisions**

Constitution of India, art. 246A.
Constitution of India, art. 279A.

**Statutes**

Central Goods and Services Tax Act, 2017.
Patents Act, 1970.
Trade Marks Act, 1999.
Geographical Indications of Goods (Registration and Protection) Act, 1999.
Protection of Plant Varieties and Farmers' Rights Act, 2001.

**Cases**

*Mohit Minerals Pvt. Ltd. v. Union of India*, 2022 SCC OnLine SC 657.
*ITC Ltd. v. Commissioner of Central Excise*, (2004) 7 SCC 591.
*Monsanto Technology LLC v. Nuziveedu Seeds Ltd.*, (2019) 3 SCC 381.
*Safari Retreats Pvt. Ltd. v. Chief Commissioner of CGST*, 2019 SCC OnLine Ori 66.