



# Jurisdictional Challenges in the Enforcement of Industrial Design Rights and Trade Secrets

Bing Chen\*

Department of Industrial Engineering, University of Northern Sumatra, Medan, Indonesia

## DESCRIPTION

The enforcement of industrial design rights and trade secrets presents significant jurisdictional challenges due to variations in legal frameworks, procedural rules and enforcement mechanisms across countries. Industrial design rights and trade secrets are two critical forms of Intellectual Property (IP) protection that cater to different aspects of innovation [1]. Industrial design rights safeguard the visual or ornamental aspects of a product, while trade secrets protect confidential business information that provides a competitive edge. Despite their importance, enforcing these rights consistently in a globalized economy is fraught with legal and practical obstacles [2].

Industrial design rights are typically obtained through a formal registration process with national or regional authorities, such as the United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO) or the European Union Intellectual Property Office (EUIPO). Registration grants the design owner exclusive rights to use, license, or sell the design for a specified period, often ranging from 10 to 25 years [3]. However, enforcement of these rights becomes challenging when infringement occurs across borders. Counterfeit or infringing products can be manufactured in one country and sold in another, often exploiting jurisdictions with weaker IP enforcement mechanisms. The complexity of international trade and e-commerce further complicates enforcement, as infringing products can move quickly across borders, making it difficult to trace and prosecute offenders effectively [4].

Additionally, differences in the scope and requirements for design protection across jurisdictions can create enforcement barriers. For instance, some countries require strict originality and novelty standards for design registration, while others may offer unregistered design protection for a limited period. These discrepancies can leave businesses vulnerable to infringement in regions where their designs are not adequately protected or recognized. Furthermore, the high costs and lengthy timelines associated with litigation in some jurisdictions can deter

businesses, particularly Small and Medium Enterprises (SMEs), from pursuing legal action against infringers [5].

Trade secrets, unlike industrial design rights, do not require formal registration but rely on the owner's ability to maintain secrecy. Legal protection for trade secrets is contingent on taking reasonable measures to safeguard confidential information, such as implementing non-disclosure agreements (NDAs) and restricting access to sensitive data [6]. However, enforcing trade secrets is inherently challenging due to the difficulty of proving misappropriation. Since trade secrets are not publicly disclosed, businesses must provide substantial evidence that their confidential information was unlawfully obtained or used. This can be particularly difficult in cases involving cross-border misappropriation, where evidence may be located in multiple jurisdictions with varying legal standards [7].

Jurisdictional differences in trade secret laws further complicate enforcement. While developed economies such as the United States, Japan and Germany have robust legal frameworks, including the Defend Trade Secrets Act (DTSA) and the EU Trade Secrets Directive, many developing countries lack comprehensive trade secret laws or enforcement mechanisms. In such jurisdictions, businesses face heightened risks of misappropriation with limited recourse for legal protection [8].

International treaties like the Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS) aim to harmonize IP protection standards globally, including industrial design rights and trade secrets. However, disparities in implementation and enforcement remain a significant challenge. Countries with weak legal infrastructure or insufficient resources often struggle to uphold the obligations outlined in such agreements, leaving businesses vulnerable to IP violations [9].

To address these jurisdictional challenges, companies must adopt proactive strategies, such as securing design protection in key markets, conducting IP audits and implementing robust internal safeguards for trade secrets. Additionally, businesses should engage in international collaboration and advocacy to promote

**Correspondence to:** Bing Chen, Department of Industrial Engineering, University of Northern Sumatra, Medan, Indonesia, E-mail: bingchen@99.com

**Received:** 01-Jun-2024, Manuscript No. IPR-25-28415; **Editor assigned:** 04-Jun-2024, Pre QC No. IPR-25-28415 (PQ); **Reviewed:** 18-Jun-2024, QC No. IPR-25-28415; **Revised:** 24-Jun-2024, Manuscript No. IPR-25-28415 (R); **Published:** 02-Jul-2024, DOI: 10.35248/2375-4516.24.12.260

**Citation:** Chen B (2024). Jurisdictional Challenges in the Enforcement of Industrial Design Rights and Trade Secrets. Intel Prop Rights. 12:260.

**Copyright:** © 2024 Chen B. This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

stronger enforcement mechanisms and harmonized legal standards [10].

## CONCLUSION

Jurisdictional challenges in the enforcement of industrial design rights and trade secrets highlight the complexities of protecting intellectual property in a globalized economy. The disparities in legal frameworks, enforcement mechanisms and procedural rules across jurisdictions require businesses to adopt a multifaceted approach to safeguard their IP assets effectively. By navigating these challenges strategically, businesses can better protect their innovations and maintain a competitive edge in an increasingly interconnected world.

## REFERENCES

1. Ridha AE, Matondang N, Sitepu MH. Pro-environmental behavior for small medium enterprise: a review. *IOP Conf Ser Mater Sci Eng.* 2020; 801(1): 01206.
2. Nwewi HN, Onwuka EM, Ogbotubo E. Entrepreneurial thinking and competitiveness in bakery industry in Delta State of Nigeria. *Int J Bus Res.* 2017;4(01):192-197.
3. Safariyani E, Taufiqurahman E. The influence of the circular economy on economic growth: Literature review. *J Bus Econ Res.* 2023;17(2):183-96.
4. Lee S, Kim CS. The effect of the franchises on local bakeries with high-dimensional controls. *J Econ Theory Econom.* 2023;34(2): 51-72.
5. Jeje K. Risk-taking and performance of small and medium-sized enterprises: lessons from Tanzanian bakeries. *J Econ Behav.* 2020;12(3):1-22.
6. Sagar Bhatt DR. Social media: Marketing strategies in hospitality industry. *Res Tour Hosp Manag.* 2022:61.
7. Chaudhry K. The impact of business intelligence implementation on information quality and marketing effectiveness of organizations. *Educ Adm: Theory Pract.* 2024;30(5):5166-87.
8. Ahmad Z, Hidhiir MH, Rahman MM. Impact of CSR disclosure on profitability and firm performance of Malaysian halal food companies. *Discov Sustain.* 2024;5(1):18.
9. Warraich UA, Dos Santos MJ. Sustaining family bakeries in Pakistan: The role of internal marketing and entrepreneurship. *Ecocycles.* 2024;10(1):37-48.
10. Krolak M, Gorska-Warsewicz H, Mądra-Sawicka M, Rejman K, Żakowska-Biemans S, Szlachciuk J, et al. Towards sustainable innovation in the bakery sector: An example of fibre-enriched bread. *Sustain.* 2022;14(5):2743.