Intellectual Property Journal (I.P.J)
ISSN: 0824-7064
Indexed by ABDC Journal Quality List (A Category)

Patent Protection, Innovation and Access to Essential Medicines: A Case Study of the Aerovia–Medentis Patent Dispute

Lucien M. Hartwell[1]; Sofia N. Vestergaard[2]
[1] Professor of IP, Caldwell Institute of Law and Technology, Ireland
[2] Associate Professor of International Economic Law, University of Skeldale, Sweden

Corresponding Author: Lucien M. Hartwell

Submission: 18/12/2025 Acceptance: 29/03/2026 Publication: 31/05/2026

Abstract
Patent law is designed to encourage technological innovation by granting inventors temporary exclusive rights in exchange for public disclosure of inventions. In the pharmaceutical sector, however, patent exclusivity can generate significant tension between innovation incentives and access to essential medicines. This article examines that tension through a fictional case study involving Aerovia Therapeutics, a biotechnology company holding patents over a novel treatment for drug-resistant respiratory infections, and Medentis Generics, a pharmaceutical manufacturer seeking to introduce a lower-cost alternative. The dispute concerns patent validity, secondary patenting, licensing, compulsory access, research exceptions, and the boundaries between legitimate patent protection and strategies designed to prolong market exclusivity.

The study adopts a qualitative case-study methodology supported by hypothetical patent documents, licensing agreements, regulatory submissions, pricing records, corporate correspondence, and expert reports. The fictional dispute demonstrates that pharmaceutical patent conflicts cannot be assessed solely through the binary question of whether a patent is legally valid. Patent portfolios can contain multiple interconnected rights covering active compounds, formulations, manufacturing processes, delivery systems, and therapeutic applications. Such portfolios may create extended periods of practical market exclusivity even where individual patents are relatively narrow.

The article identifies four principal tensions. First, patent law must reward genuine pharmaceutical innovation without facilitating unjustified extension of monopoly rights. Second, generic manufacturers require sufficient legal certainty to conduct research and prepare market entry before patent expiry. Third, compulsory licensing and other public-interest mechanisms must remain credible without undermining incentives for private investment. Fourth, pricing and access considerations increasingly interact with conventional patent doctrines. The article proposes a balanced framework combining rigorous patent examination, stronger transparency

concerning patent portfolios, research-use safeguards, early generic entry mechanisms, voluntary licensing incentives, and narrowly tailored public-interest intervention.

Keywords: patent law; pharmaceutical patents; compulsory licensing; generic medicines; patent evergreening; innovation; access to medicines; intellectual property; biotechnology; case study

1. Introduction

Patent law occupies a distinctive position within the architecture of intellectual property. Unlike rights that primarily protect commercial identifiers or expressive works, patents are explicitly connected to technological innovation. The patent system grants inventors a period of exclusivity in return for disclosure of technical knowledge that eventually enters the public domain.

This bargain is particularly significant in the pharmaceutical industry.

Developing a new medicine may require substantial investment in scientific research, laboratory experimentation, clinical testing, regulatory approval, manufacturing infrastructure, and post-market surveillance. Patent protection can allow firms to recover these investments by preventing competitors from commercially exploiting the patented invention during the protected period.

At the same time, pharmaceutical patents can affect access to medicines. When a patented medicine has no effective therapeutic substitute, the patent holder may possess considerable market power. The resulting price may be unaffordable for certain patients, healthcare systems, or lower-income countries.

The resulting policy dilemma is frequently described as a conflict between innovation and access.

However, the relationship is more complicated. Weak patent protection may reduce incentives for pharmaceutical research, particularly where development costs are high and successful products must finance numerous unsuccessful research programmes. Excessively broad or strategically layered patent protection may, on the other hand, delay competition without generating equivalent additional innovation.

This article examines this tension through a fictional dispute between Aerovia Therapeutics and Medentis Generics.

Aerovia developed a fictional medicine known as **Aerozafen**, designed to treat severe drug-resistant respiratory infections. Following regulatory approval, the company obtained several patents covering different aspects of the product.

Medentis, a generic pharmaceutical manufacturer, subsequently announced its intention to introduce a lower-cost version. Aerovia responded with patent litigation, alleging that Medentis's proposed product would infringe several patents.

Medentis challenged the validity of selected patents and argued that certain later patents represented attempts to extend protection beyond the underlying invention.

The dispute provides a useful analytical framework because it involves multiple dimensions of pharmaceutical patent law.

The principal research question is:

How can patent law maintain incentives for pharmaceutical innovation while preventing unjustified extensions of market exclusivity that restrict timely access to lower-cost medicines?

Four subsidiary questions are considered.

First, how should courts distinguish legitimate incremental innovation from strategic patent layering?

Second, what role should research and regulatory exceptions play in facilitating generic competition?

Third, under what circumstances can compulsory licensing or other public-interest mechanisms be justified?

Fourth, how can patent transparency improve competition without undermining legitimate commercial confidentiality?

2. Pharmaceutical Patents and the Innovation–Access Relationship

2.1 The patent bargain

The conventional patent bargain rests upon two principal elements: disclosure and exclusivity.

The inventor discloses sufficient technical information to enable the invention to be understood and, where appropriate, reproduced after the patent expires. In exchange, the inventor receives a temporary period during which competitors are restricted from commercially exploiting the protected invention.

The rationale is straightforward.

Without exclusivity, competitors might imitate an invention without bearing the research and development costs incurred by the original inventor. Anticipating such imitation, firms might reduce investment in research.

However, the patent bargain assumes that exclusivity remains connected to genuine inventive contribution.

The more significant question is therefore not whether pharmaceutical companies should receive patent protection, but whether the scope and duration of protection remain proportionate to the underlying innovation.

2.2 The complexity of pharmaceutical patent portfolios

A single medicine may be associated with multiple patents.

A patent portfolio can cover:

- the active pharmaceutical compound;
- crystalline forms;
- salts;

- formulations;
- manufacturing processes;
- dosage regimes;
- delivery systems;
- therapeutic uses;
- combinations with other medicines; and
- methods of administration.

These rights may expire at different times.
Consequently, the commercial life of a medicine may extend beyond the expiry of its foundational compound patent.
This creates the phenomenon commonly described as patent layering or evergreening.
Not every later patent represents improper behaviour.
A genuinely improved formulation may produce meaningful therapeutic benefits. A new delivery system may improve patient adherence. A manufacturing innovation may reduce environmental impact or production costs.
The legal challenge is distinguishing genuine incremental innovation from strategies that create additional exclusivity without corresponding technical advancement.

3. Methodology

This article employs a qualitative case-study methodology.
The fictional dispute was constructed to examine the interaction between patent doctrine, pharmaceutical competition, regulatory policy, and access considerations.
The case materials include hypothetical patent specifications, licensing agreements, regulatory records, pricing information, corporate correspondence, expert reports, and judicial submissions.
The analysis proceeds through doctrinal examination of patentability, infringement, validity, competition, and public-interest considerations.
All companies, individuals, institutions, patents, products, dates, figures, documents, and events described in this article are fictional.

4. The Aerovia–Medentis Dispute

4.1 Aerovia Therapeutics

Aerovia Therapeutics was a fictional biotechnology company established in 2022 in Dublin, Ireland.
The company focused on therapies for antimicrobial-resistant diseases.
Its principal product, Aerozafen, was developed as an oral treatment for severe respiratory infections caused by a fictional class of resistant pathogens.
Aerovia reported that the research programme began after several years of laboratory research.
The company obtained its principal compound patent in 2027.

A second patent relating to a crystalline formulation was granted in 2029.
A third patent concerning an extended-release delivery mechanism was granted in 2031.
A fourth patent concerning a particular dosing schedule was granted in 2032.
Aerovia argued that each patent reflected a separate technological contribution.

4.2 Medentis Generics

Medentis Generics was a fictional pharmaceutical manufacturer headquartered in Stockholm, Sweden.
The company specialised in lower-cost generic medicines.
In 2033, Medentis announced that it had developed a bioequivalent version of Aerozafen.
Medentis intended to begin commercial sales immediately after regulatory approval.
Aerovia initiated patent infringement proceedings.
Medentis responded with a counterclaim challenging the validity of three patents.

Table 1. Principal Patents in the Fictional Dispute

Patent	Year	Subject Matter	Remaining Protection at Dispute
A-101	2027	Active compound	9 years
A-214	2029	Crystalline formulation	11 years
A-319	2031	Extended-release delivery	13 years
A-407	2032	Dosing schedule	14 years
A-455	2033	Combination therapy	15 years

The portfolio illustrates the strategic significance of patent timing.
Even though the original compound patent was filed earlier, later patents potentially extended practical barriers to market entry.

5. The Patent Validity Challenge

5.1 The compound patent

Medentis did not initially challenge the validity of the foundational compound patent.
Its legal strategy instead focused on the later patents.
The company argued that the crystalline formulation claimed in A-214 did not involve a sufficiently inventive technical step.
Aerovia argued that the formulation provided improved stability and enabled more efficient manufacturing.
Expert evidence became central to the dispute.
Aerovia's expert reported that the formulation reduced degradation by approximately 38% under specified storage conditions.

Medentis's expert accepted the improved stability but argued that the technical solution would have been obvious to a skilled pharmaceutical scientist.
The dispute therefore turned on the distinction between a useful improvement and an inventive improvement.

6. Patent Evergreening

Patent evergreening is a contested concept.
Critics use the term to describe strategies in which patent owners obtain successive rights over minor modifications of existing products.
Defenders argue that pharmaceutical innovation is often incremental and that improvements deserve protection where they satisfy ordinary patentability requirements.
The fictional Aerovia dispute demonstrates why the term itself is insufficient as a legal test.
A later patent should not be invalid merely because it relates to an existing medicine.
Instead, the relevant questions include:

1. Is the claimed invention novel?
2. Does it involve an inventive contribution?
3. Is the invention sufficiently disclosed?
4. Does it provide a technical advantage?
5. Would the claimed solution have been obvious?
6. Is the patent claim appropriately limited?

7. Evidence of Incremental Innovation

The court-appointed technical expert evaluated the four major patents according to novelty, inventive contribution, technical effect, and commercial significance.

Table 2. Hypothetical Expert Assessment

Patent	Novelty	Inventive Contribution	Technical Effect	Overall Assessment
A-101	High	High	Significant	Strong
A-214	High	Moderate	Significant	Borderline
A-319	High	High	Significant	Strong
A-407	Moderate	Low	Limited	Weak
A-455	High	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate

The assessment created a central distinction.
The extended-release delivery technology represented a substantial technical improvement. The dosing-schedule patent, by contrast, was found to provide relatively limited additional technical benefit.
The fictional court therefore treated the patents differently rather than evaluating the entire portfolio as one unit.

8. The Research Exception

Medentis argued that it needed to conduct testing before the expiry of Aerovia's foundational patent.

The purpose was to ensure that its generic medicine could enter the market immediately after lawful expiry.

Aerovia argued that commercial preparation before patent expiry undermined the exclusivity granted by the patent system.

The dispute raises an important distinction between research conducted to understand an invention and research conducted to prepare regulatory approval for post-expiry commercialisation.

A legal system that prohibits all pre-expiry testing could delay generic entry unnecessarily.

A system that permits unrestricted commercial preparation could substantially weaken patent exclusivity.

A carefully designed research exception can therefore serve both objectives.

9. Regulatory Approval and Patent Strategy

Pharmaceutical regulation and patent law operate through different institutional mechanisms.

Regulatory agencies determine whether medicines satisfy requirements concerning safety, efficacy, and quality.

Patent offices and courts determine whether inventions satisfy intellectual property requirements.

These systems can nevertheless interact.

A generic manufacturer may have completed regulatory development while remaining unable to enter the market because of patent protection.

The fictional Medentis case showed that the company had invested approximately €18.6 million in regulatory and manufacturing preparation before litigation began.

This investment created economic pressure.

If Medentis were forced to wait several additional years, its manufacturing facilities would remain underutilised.

If Medentis were permitted to launch prematurely and later found to infringe a valid patent, the company could face substantial liability.

10. Pricing and Access

Aerozafen was introduced at a fictional annual treatment cost of €11,400 per patient.

Medentis projected that its generic product could be sold at €2,900.

The difference created substantial implications for public healthcare systems.

Table 3. Hypothetical Pricing Comparison

Product	Annual Treatment Cost	Relative Price
Aerovia Aerozafen	€11,400	100%
Medentis proposed generic	€2,900	25.4%
Alternative therapy A	€8,700	76.3%
Alternative therapy B	€6,900	60.5%

The pricing evidence was not used by the court to determine patent validity.
However, it became relevant to the broader public-interest analysis concerning access.
This distinction is important.
Patent law should not automatically invalidate a valid patent because a medicine is expensive.
At the same time, legal systems may legitimately consider exceptional public-interest mechanisms where access problems become severe.

11. Compulsory Licensing

One possible mechanism is compulsory licensing.
Under a compulsory licence, a government may authorise use of a patented invention without the patent owner's consent, subject to applicable legal conditions and compensation.
Such mechanisms are controversial.
From the perspective of patent owners, compulsory licensing can reduce the certainty of exclusivity.
From a public-interest perspective, it may provide a mechanism for addressing exceptional access problems.
The Aerovia dispute became particularly significant when a fictional public health authority reported that supplies of Aerozafen were insufficient for several regional hospitals.
The authority requested that Aerovia expand supply.
Aerovia offered to increase production but stated that manufacturing capacity could not be expanded immediately.
Medentis argued that compulsory licensing should be considered.
Aerovia responded that a compulsory licence would undermine the commercial incentives supporting the development of future antimicrobial treatments.

12. Voluntary Licensing

Before compulsory licensing was considered, the parties entered negotiations concerning a voluntary licence.

Aerovia proposed a tiered licensing system under which Medentis could manufacture Aerozafen for low-income markets while Aerovia retained exclusive commercial rights in higher-income markets.
Medentis rejected the proposal because it included geographic restrictions and minimum royalty payments.
The negotiations demonstrate the potential value of voluntary licensing as a middle ground.

Table 4. Hypothetical Licensing Proposals

Proposal	Territory	Royalty	Production Rights
Aerovia Proposal A	Selected countries	8%	Limited
Aerovia Proposal B	Low-income markets	3%	Expanded
Medentis Proposal	Global	1.5%	Broad
Mediated Proposal	Regional	2.5%	Broad with safeguards

The final mediated proposal provided Medentis with manufacturing rights in 22 countries, subject to quality controls and royalty payments.

13. The Court's Fictional Decision

The fictional court issued a divided decision.
The foundational compound patent was upheld.
The crystalline formulation patent was also upheld because expert evidence established a measurable technical advantage that was not readily predictable from the prior art.
The extended-release patent was upheld after evidence demonstrated improved therapeutic consistency.
However, the dosing-schedule patent was invalidated because the claimed dosing interval was considered an obvious optimisation rather than a sufficiently inventive contribution.
The court therefore rejected both parties' extreme positions.
Aerovia was not deprived of its principal patent rights.
Medentis was nevertheless permitted to prepare its generic product for market entry following expiry of the relevant enforceable patents.

14. Table 5. Summary of the Fictional Judicial Outcome

Issue	Court's Finding
Compound patent	Valid
Crystalline formulation	Valid
Extended-release system	Valid

Issue	Court's Finding
Dosing schedule	Invalid
Generic testing	Permitted within statutory limits
Immediate commercial launch	Prohibited while valid patents remain
Voluntary licence	Encouraged
Public-interest supply	Enhanced production ordered
Transparency	Limited portfolio disclosure required

The decision attempted to preserve the basic patent bargain while preventing an unnecessarily broad extension of exclusivity.

15. Discussion

15.1 Patent protection should remain innovation-sensitive

The case demonstrates that pharmaceutical innovation cannot be reduced to the creation of entirely new molecular compounds.

Innovation can also occur through formulation, delivery, manufacturing, and therapeutic optimisation.

A legal system that protects only new molecules could discourage valuable incremental research.

However, the opposite problem also exists.

If every minor modification receives independent protection, the cumulative effect may substantially delay competition.

Patent examination must therefore focus on substantive inventive contribution rather than merely formal novelty.

15.2 Patent portfolios require greater transparency

The fictional case demonstrated that neither regulators nor competitors initially possessed a complete picture of Aerovia's patent portfolio.

This created uncertainty.

A generic manufacturer must know which patents could potentially prevent market entry.

Greater transparency concerning patent ownership, claim scope, expiration dates, and licensing arrangements can therefore facilitate lawful competition.

Transparency does not require disclosure of confidential research strategies.

Rather, it concerns information necessary for market participants to understand the legal status of commercially important products.

16. The Role of Patent Offices

Patent offices play a critical role in preventing inappropriate extensions of monopoly rights.

The quality of examination becomes particularly important in pharmaceutical cases because small differences in claim scope may have substantial economic consequences.

Patent examiners should therefore have access to:

- relevant prior art;
- pharmaceutical databases;
- technical expertise;
- clinical evidence where relevant;
- formulation literature; and
- information concerning related patent applications.

The use of specialised examination teams may improve consistency.

17. Competition Policy

Patent law and competition law serve different purposes but may interact in pharmaceutical markets.

Patent law creates temporary exclusivity.

Competition law addresses conduct that may improperly restrict competition.

The existence of a patent should not itself be regarded as anticompetitive.

However, certain practices surrounding patent rights may raise competition concerns.

These could include:

- misleading patent representations;
- sham litigation;
- exclusionary agreements;
- anticompetitive licensing restrictions;
- strategic settlements; and
- coordinated conduct among competitors.

The case study does not suggest that every patent-extension strategy is anticompetitive.

Instead, it demonstrates the importance of examining the actual economic and legal conduct involved.

18. Access to Medicines and International Considerations

Pharmaceutical markets are geographically fragmented.

A medicine may be priced differently in different countries according to purchasing power, healthcare infrastructure, reimbursement policies, and regulatory requirements.

This creates opportunities for differential licensing.

A patent owner may retain strong commercial rights in wealthy markets while permitting lower-cost production in lower-income markets.

However, geographic restrictions can also create practical difficulties.

Parallel trade, supply shortages, and distribution restrictions can undermine the effectiveness of segmented licensing arrangements.
International coordination is therefore important.

19. Proposed Balanced Framework

The Aerovia–Medentis case supports a six-part framework.

First, strong protection for genuine inventions

Foundational inventions and significant technical improvements should receive meaningful protection.

Second, rigorous examination of secondary patents

Later patents should be assessed carefully for inventive contribution.

Third, early generic preparation

Generic manufacturers should be able to conduct lawful testing and regulatory preparation sufficiently before patent expiry.

Fourth, patent transparency

Commercially relevant patent information should be accessible in a clear and searchable form.

Fifth, voluntary licensing incentives

Patent owners should have incentives to enter licensing arrangements that expand access while preserving reasonable returns.

Sixth, exceptional public-interest intervention

Compulsory licensing or comparable mechanisms should remain available where serious public-interest circumstances justify intervention.

20. Policy Recommendations

The case study leads to several policy recommendations.
First, patent offices should strengthen examination of secondary pharmaceutical patents, particularly where claims concern minor modifications of established products.
Second, pharmaceutical patent databases should provide consolidated information concerning patent families associated with individual medicines.
Third, generic manufacturers should have clear statutory authority to conduct regulatory preparation before patent expiry, subject to appropriate safeguards.
Fourth, governments should encourage voluntary licensing agreements for medicines with significant public-health importance.
Fifth, compulsory licensing frameworks should remain legally available and procedurally predictable.
Sixth, patent owners receiving substantial public research funding should consider enhanced access commitments where appropriate.

Seventh, pharmaceutical companies should disclose sufficiently detailed information concerning relevant patent portfolios to enable lawful market planning.
Eighth, competition authorities should monitor conduct surrounding patent disputes where evidence suggests potential exclusionary strategies beyond legitimate patent enforcement.

21. Broader Implications for Intellectual Property Policy

The Aerovia–Medentis dispute illustrates a broader transformation in intellectual property policy.
Historically, patent debates often focused on the strength of individual rights.
Contemporary pharmaceutical disputes require greater attention to the structure of entire patent portfolios.
A single patent may be relatively narrow and reasonable, yet a sequence of patents may collectively create extensive commercial barriers.
This does not mean that sequential innovation should be prohibited.
Instead, the cumulative effect of patent rights should be understood without abandoning the principle that each patent must independently satisfy legal requirements.
The challenge is therefore one of institutional coordination.
Patent offices, courts, health regulators, competition authorities, and policymakers should not operate in complete isolation when pharmaceutical intellectual property has substantial consequences for public health.

22. Limitations

The principal limitation of this article is its fictional nature.
The Aerovia–Medentis dispute is not based on an actual court proceeding. The companies, medicine, patents, prices, expert evidence, judicial decision, and numerical information were constructed solely for analytical purposes.
The article also simplifies pharmaceutical development.
Actual pharmaceutical innovation involves complex regulatory, scientific, clinical, manufacturing, and commercial processes that cannot be fully represented through a single case study.
Furthermore, patent law differs considerably across jurisdictions.
Consequently, the framework proposed here should be interpreted as a conceptual model rather than as a statement of universally applicable law.
Future research should examine actual pharmaceutical patent litigation across multiple jurisdictions and evaluate the empirical relationship between patent protection, investment in research and development, generic entry, and medicine prices.

23. Conclusion

Pharmaceutical patent law exists at the intersection of innovation policy, commercial competition, and public health.

The fictional Aerovia–Medentis dispute demonstrates why none of these interests can be considered in isolation.

Aerovia's foundational invention deserved meaningful patent protection. Without a reasonable prospect of recovering research and development investment, firms may have fewer incentives to invest in high-risk therapeutic research.

At the same time, the existence of a valid foundational patent does not automatically justify every subsequent patent claim relating to the same medicine.

The distinction between genuine incremental innovation and strategic patent layering is therefore important.

The case further demonstrates the significance of generic competition.

Generic manufacturers require sufficient legal certainty to undertake research, testing, manufacturing preparation, and regulatory applications before patents expire. Without such mechanisms, competition may be delayed even after the underlying patent monopoly has legally ended.

Voluntary licensing provides an additional mechanism for reconciling commercial incentives with access. Where voluntary arrangements fail and exceptional public-interest circumstances arise, compulsory licensing can provide a further safeguard.

The broader lesson is that effective pharmaceutical intellectual property policy should not seek either maximum patent protection or minimum patent protection.

The objective should instead be **optimal protection**.

Such protection should reward genuine innovation, discourage unjustified extensions of exclusivity, facilitate predictable generic entry, and preserve mechanisms for addressing serious public-health needs.

Patent law remains an important incentive for pharmaceutical innovation. Its legitimacy, however, depends partly upon maintaining a credible relationship between the scope of exclusivity and the magnitude of the inventive contribution.

The Aerovia–Medentis case therefore supports a balanced model based on rigorous examination, patent transparency, lawful research preparation, voluntary licensing, and carefully controlled public-interest intervention.

References

1. Bently, L., Sherman, B., Gangjee, D., & Johnson, P. (2018). *Intellectual Property Law*. Oxford University Press.
2. Correa, C. M. (2020). *Guide for the Granting of Compulsory Licences and Government Use of Pharmaceutical Patents*. South Centre.
3. Drahos, P. (2016). *The Global Governance of Knowledge: Patent Offices and Their Clients*. Cambridge University Press.

4. Gervais, D. J. (2012). The TRIPS agreement: Drafting history and analysis. *Sweet & Maxwell*.
5. Kapczynski, A., & Park, C. (2014). The global health crisis and the limits of patent law. *Journal of Law, Medicine & Ethics*, 42, 1–15.
6. Love, J. P. (2019). Recent developments in compulsory licensing and access to medicines. *Journal of Intellectual Property Law & Practice*, 14, 1–12.
7. Maskus, K. E. (2000). *Intellectual Property Rights in the Global Economy*. Institute for International Economics.
8. Sell, S. K. (2003). *Private Power, Public Law: The Globalization of Intellectual Property Rights*. Cambridge University Press.
9. WIPO. (2024). *World Intellectual Property Indicators*. World Intellectual Property Organization.
10. World Health Organization. (2021). *Promoting Access to Medical Technologies and Innovation*. WHO Press.
11. World Trade Organization. (1994). *Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights*. WTO.
12. World Trade Organization. (2001). *Declaration on the TRIPS Agreement and Public Health*. WTO.

Declarations

Conflict of Interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest.
Funding: No external funding was received for this fictional sample article.
Ethical Approval: Ethical approval was not required because all persons, organisations, institutions, documents, events, patents, medicines, prices, and proceedings described in this article are fictional.