

CHALLENGES TO PROTECTION OF INDUSTRIAL PROPERTY IN NIGERIA

OBASI PRINCESS UGOEZE^{1*}

^{1*} Obasi Princess Ugoeze, LLB BL, Post Graduate Scholar, Imo State University, Owerri.

* **Correspondence:** OBASI PRINCESS UGOEZE

*The authors declare
that no funding was
received for this work.*



Received: 09-October-2025

Accepted: 26-October-2025

Published: 29-October-2025

Copyright © 2025, Authors retain copyright. Licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY 4.0), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited. <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/> (CC BY 4.0 deed)

This article is published by **MSI Publishers** in **MSI Journal of Arts, Law and Justice (MSIJALJ)**

ISSN 3049-0839 (Online)

The journal is managed and published by MSI Publishers

Volume: 2, Issue: 10 (October-2025)

ABSTRACT: Industrial property, as a branch of intellectual property law, plays a pivotal role in fostering innovation, promoting fair competition, and protecting the commercial interests of creators and investors. In Nigeria, the framework for industrial property protection is largely outdated, fragmented, and poorly enforced. Despite Nigeria's accession to international treaties such as the TRIPS Agreement and the Paris Convention, challenges persist in legislation, administration, enforcement, and public awareness. This paper critically examines the challenges to industrial property protection in Nigeria, drawing comparisons with jurisdictions such as the United Kingdom and South Africa, and proffers recommendations for reform. The analysis demonstrates that unless Nigeria undertakes urgent legal and institutional reforms, the potential of industrial property to drive economic growth, industrialization, and innovation will remain largely unrealized.

1.0 INTRODUCTION

Industrial property protection is fundamental to the growth of modern economies. As a subcategory of intellectual property law, it encompasses patents, trademarks, industrial designs, and protection against unfair competition. These rights

encourage innovation by granting inventors and creators exclusive rights over their works, while simultaneously balancing the need for public access and competition.

In Nigeria, the legal regime governing industrial property is primarily regulated by two key statutes: the '*Patents and Designs Act*' and the '*Trade Marks Act*'. These statutes were enacted decades ago and have not undergone comprehensive reform to reflect contemporary realities of globalization, digitalization, and the knowledge economy. The enforcement of these rights has been hampered by outdated laws, institutional inefficiencies, weak judicial structures, and low awareness among stakeholders.

The Nigerian Constitution guarantees the protection of property rights, which extends to intellectual property, under *Section 44(1)* of the 1999 Constitution (as amended). However, the absence of a coordinated, modern intellectual property policy and a single dedicated IP office has created fragmentation, leaving enforcement to be shared between the *Commercial Law Department* of the Federal Ministry of Trade and Investment, the *Trademarks, Patents and Designs Registry*, and the *Standards Organisation of Nigeria*.

This paper reviews the conceptual framework of industrial property, identifies the challenges militating against its protection in Nigeria, compares Nigerian law with other jurisdictions, and proposes reforms.

2.0 Conceptual Framework of Industrial Property

2.1 Definition and Scope

The World Intellectual Property Organization defines industrial property to include patents for inventions, trademarks, industrial designs, geographical indications, and protection against unfair competition. The essence of industrial property is to grant exclusive rights over commercially valuable creations, thereby stimulating innovation and rewarding investment.

2.2 Categories of Industrial Property in Nigeria

In Nigeria, industrial property is broadly divided into three categories:

1. Patents and Utility Models: governed by the Patents and Designs Act 1971. A patent grants the inventor exclusive rights to exploit an invention for 20 years, provided it satisfies requirements of novelty, inventive step, and industrial applicability.
2. Trademarks: governed by the Trade Marks Act 1965, which protects distinctive signs identifying goods or services of one enterprise from those of others. Registration is valid for seven years and renewable every 14 years.
3. Industrial Designs: also governed by the Patents and Designs Act, which protects aesthetic aspects of products (shapes, patterns, configurations) that appeal to the eye and are industrially applicable.

2.3 Rationale for Protection

The rationale behind protection of industrial property includes;

Encouragement of innovation – inventors are incentivized by exclusive rights.

Promotion of fair competition – industrial property prevents counterfeiting and passing off.

Economic growth – stronger IP regulations attracts foreign investment, facilitates technology transfer, and stimulates local industrialization.

3.0 Challenges to Protection of Industrial Property in Nigeria

Despite the existence of statutory provisions and Nigeria's participation in international agreements, the country faces numerous challenges that hinder effective protection of industrial property. These challenges can be categorized into legal, institutional, enforcement, judicial, infrastructural, and socio-economic obstacles.

3.1 Outdated Legal Framework

The principal statutes governing industrial property in Nigeria for example, *The Patents and Designs Act 1971* and *the Trade Marks Act 1965* are largely obsolete. They have not been significantly amended to align with modern standards under the

Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights and other international best practices.

For instance, the Patents and Designs Act does not recognize utility models, plant varieties, or integrated circuits, all of which are recognized under TRIPS. Similarly, the Trade Marks Act fails to cover modern concepts such as service marks, certification marks, collective marks, and non-traditional marks (for example, sound, smell, or 3D marks).

3.2 Fragmented Institutional Structure

Industrial property administration in Nigeria is dispersed among different agencies. The Trademarks, Patents and Designs Registry operates under the Commercial Law Department of the Federal Ministry of Trade and Investment, but there is no centralized Intellectual Property Office. This leads to duplication of roles, delays in registration, inefficiency, and lack of a comprehensive IP database.

3.3 Weak Enforcement Mechanisms

Even where rights are registered, enforcement is problematic. Agencies such as the Standards Organisation of Nigeria, the National Agency for Food and Drug Administration and Control, and the Nigerian Copyright Commission play roles in IP protection, but coordination is weak. Border control enforcement under the Nigeria Customs Service is inadequate, allowing importation of counterfeit goods.

Moreover, police officers are often ill-trained in intellectual property enforcement, resulting in poor investigation and prosecution of offenders.

3.4 Judicial Inefficiency

The Nigerian judiciary faces challenges of delayed trials, lack of expertise in IP law, and procedural bottlenecks. Many judges are not specialized in intellectual property, leading to inconsistent and sometimes erroneous judgments. The absence of specialized IP courts compounds the problem, as cases are lumped together with general commercial disputes, prolonging resolution.

3.5 Infrastructural and Technological Deficiencies

Nigeria lacks a functional, digitized IP registry. Applications for patents, trademarks, and designs are often processed manually, leading to bureaucratic delays and loss of records. While WIPO has introduced the WIPO IPAS (Industrial Property Automation System) in some African countries, Nigeria is yet to fully adopt such systems. Thus undermining investor confidence and discourages international filings.

3.6 Low Public Awareness and Education

A significant proportion of Nigerian businesses, especially small and medium enterprises, are unaware of the importance of protecting industrial property. Many rely on informal means of protecting their innovations, making them vulnerable to exploitation. Additionally, tertiary institutions and research centers often lack structured IP policies to commercialize inventions, leading to brain drain and underutilization of innovations.

3.7 Economic and Political Challenges

The high cost of registration, coupled with economic instability, discourages inventors and businesses from seeking industrial property protection. Corruption and political interference also weaken regulatory bodies, undermining the enforcement of IP rights.

3.8 Inadequate International Integration

Although Nigeria is a signatory to key international treaties such as the Paris Convention (1883) and TRIPS Agreement (1994), it has not domesticated these treaties into local law, as required by Section 12 of the 1999 Constitution. This creates a gap between Nigeria's international obligations and domestic implementation, weakening enforceability of treaty provisions in local courts.

3.9 Counterfeiting and Piracy

Nigeria is plagued with issues concerning counterfeit goods, ranging from pharmaceuticals to consumer products. Reports by WIPO and NAFDAC show that

counterfeit drugs alone account for significant health and economic risks in Nigeria. The weak enforcement framework and porous borders contribute to this menace.

3.10 Lack of Political Will for Reform

Finally, successive governments have paid lip service to industrial property reform. Draft bills such as the Industrial Property Commission Bill and the Intellectual Property Policy and Strategy have stagnated at the National Assembly for years. Without the political will to enact comprehensive reform, Nigeria's industrial property system will remain ineffective.

4.0 Comparative Perspectives on Industrial Property Protection

4.1 United Kingdom

The UK has a **robust and modern intellectual property system** aligned with both EU and international standards. Industrial property rights are regulated under several statutes:

Patents Act 1977 (as amended), which incorporates TRIPS provisions, establishes clear procedures for patentability, and provides for utility models and employee inventions.

Trade Marks Act 1994, which reflects international developments by recognizing service marks, certification marks, collective marks, and even non-traditional marks (sounds, colors, shapes).

Designs Act 1949 and the **Registered Designs Regulations 2001**, which protect both aesthetic and functional designs.

The **UK Intellectual Property Office** provides a centralized and digitized registry system that is efficient, transparent, and investor-friendly. It also has a well-developed dispute resolution system, including the **Intellectual Property Enterprise Court**, which specializes in IP disputes and provides expedited trials.

This system shows a sharp contrast to Nigeria's outdated statutes, fragmented institutions, and lack of specialized IP courts.

4.2 South Africa

South Africa's industrial property system is considered one of the most advanced in Africa. There are certain key statutes which set them apart, they include;

Patents Act 1978, which is compliant with TRIPS and allows for patent protection of biotechnological innovations, pharmaceuticals, and plant varieties.

Trade Marks Act 1993, which recognizes service marks, collective marks, and well-known marks in accordance with the Paris Convention.

Designs Act 1993, which distinguishes between aesthetic and functional designs, a distinction absent in Nigeria's law.

The **Companies and Intellectual Property Commission** provides an efficient online system for registration of patents, trademarks, and designs. South Africa is also a member of the **Patent Cooperation Treaty**, enabling streamlined international patent applications, whereas Nigeria is not yet a member.

South Africa also boasts specialized IP divisions within its High Courts, ensuring that judicial officers with expertise handle complex IP disputes. This level of specialization is lacking in Nigeria.

4.3 International Standards (TRIPS and WIPO Frameworks)

The **TRIPS Agreement (1994)** sets minimum standards for industrial property protection, including patentability requirements, trademark rights, design protection, and enforcement mechanisms. Member states are expected to provide effective enforcement procedures, deterrent remedies, and border measures. Nigeria, though a member of the WTO, has not fully aligned its domestic laws with TRIPS provisions.

The **World Intellectual Property Organization** also provides frameworks through treaties such as:

The **Paris Convention for the Protection of Industrial Property (1883)**, which Nigeria has signed but inconsistently applied.

The **Patent Cooperation Treaty (1970)**, which Nigeria has not acceded to, limiting Nigerian inventors from accessing international patent protection efficiently.

The **Hague Agreement Concerning the International Registration of Industrial Designs (1925)**, which Nigeria has yet to adopt, thereby excluding Nigerian designers from simplified international design protection.

Compared to the UK and South Africa, Nigeria lags behind in both the adoption of international treaties and the modernization of its legal and institutional frameworks.

5.0 Conclusion

The protection of industrial property in Nigeria faces multifaceted challenges ranging from outdated laws to weak enforcement and lack of international integration.

For Nigeria to successfully foster innovation, attract foreign investment, and build a knowledge-based economy, its industrial property regime must undergo urgent reform. With the right reforms, Nigeria can transform its industrial property system into a tool for sustainable economic growth, and adequately cater to the needs of its creative intellectuals.

6.0 Recommendations

6.1 Legislative Reforms:

A Consolidated Industrial Property Act should be enacted to replace the fragmented, antiquated statutes (Patents and Designs Act 1971; Trademarks Act 1965) with a single, modern Industrial Property Act that: (a) incorporates TRIPS-compliant patent, trademark and design provisions. Also, Key International Instruments and treaties should be domesticated and incorporated into our local laws. Domestication should also be accompanied by enabling regulations that make treaty mechanisms accessible to Nigerian applicants.

6.2 Institutional & Administrative Reforms:

An Autonomous Nigerian Intellectual Property Office should be established, and the current Registry transformed into an autonomous, corporatized NIPO with financial

independence, professional staffing, and a governing board including private-sector and academic representatives. NIPO should consolidate patent, trademark, and design functions and act as Nigeria's single point of contact for WIPO related matters. Another administrative reform that'll improve the IP system in Nigeria, is Implementing a complete e-filing, examination and publication system with searchable online registers for patents, trademarks, and designs. With these digital records, corruption will be reduced and commercial transactions sped up.

6.3 Judicial & Dispute-Resolution Reforms

Specialized IP Divisions / Courts should be established and designated Intellectual Property Divisions created within the Federal High Court (or a specialized IP Tribunal) empowered to hear IP disputes with expedited procedures, case-management rules, and technical assessor support. Fast-track procedures (summary judgment, early neutral evaluation) should be available for clear-cut infringement cases to reduce delay and cost.

6.4 Engage in Regional & International Cooperation

Pursue accession to the Madrid Protocol and Hague Agreement, deepen collaboration with ARIPO/OAPI where useful, and negotiate mutual recognition agreements for enforcement with major trading partners. Support capacity building via WIPO cooperation programs.

6.5 Data & Transparency Initiative

Mandate publication of registry statistics (filings, grants, oppositions, pendency) and enforcement dashboards (seizures, prosecutions, convictions) to enable evidence-based policy and attract investors as well.

References

1. Cap P2, Laws of the Federation of Nigeria 2004.
2. Cap T13, LFN 2004.
3. Constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria, 1999 (as amended), *Section 44(1)*.

4. World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO), *What is Intellectual Property?* (WIPO Publication No. 450(E), 2020)
5. Patents and Designs Act, Cap P2, Laws of the Federation of Nigeria 2004, *Sections 1–3*
6. Trade Marks Act, Cap T13, Laws of the Federation of Nigeria 2004, *Section 5*
7. Patents and Designs Act, Cap P2, LFN 2004, *Section 12*
8. Adejoke Oyewunmi, *Intellectual Property Law in Nigeria* (NIALS Press, 2015) 45
9. TRIPS Agreement, Annex 1C of the Marrakesh Agreement Establishing the World Trade Organization, 1994, arts. 27–29
10. Keret Betram, “Modern Challenges of Trademark Protection in Nigeria” (2019) *Nigerian Law Journal* Vol. 23, 56.
11. J. O. Asein, *Introduction to Intellectual Property Law* (Ababa Press, 2012) 88
12. Chukwuma Okoli, “IP Enforcement in Nigeria: Problems and Prospects” (2018) 10 *Journal of Business Law* 115.
13. Sunday A. Fagbemi, “The Role of the Judiciary in the Protection of Intellectual Property Rights in Nigeria” (2020) *Nigerian Law and Practice Journal* 2(1) 37.
14. WIPO, *Industrial Property Automation Systems (IPAS)*, available at: <https://www.wipo.int> (accessed 18 Aug 2025).
15. Adebambo Adewopo, “Public Awareness and Intellectual Property Protection in Nigeria” (2017) *NIALS Journal of IP* 5(2) 19.
16. O O Oyelade, “Industrial Property Protection and Economic Development in Nigeria” (2019) 14 *African Journal of International and Comparative Law* 220.
17. NAFDAC, “Counterfeit Drugs in Nigeria: Challenges and Efforts” (Policy Report, 2021).
18. Federal Ministry of Trade and Investment, *Draft National Intellectual Property Policy and Strategy for Nigeria* (2019).

19. Patents Act 1977 (UK), c. 37.
20. Trade Marks Act 1994 (UK), c. 26.
21. Intellectual Property Enterprise Court (IPEC), available at: <https://www.gov.uk/courts-tribunals/intellectual-property-enterprise-court>. (accessed 19 Aug 2025).
22. Patents Act 1978 (South Africa), No. 57 of 1978.
23. Trade Marks Act 1993 (South Africa), No. 194 of 1993.
24. Companies and Intellectual Property Commission (CIPC), available at: <https://www.cipc.co.za>. (accessed 19 Aug 2025).
25. WIPO, “Contracting Parties to the PCT,” available at: https://www.wipo.int/treaties/en/ShowResults.jsp?treaty_id=6. (accessed 19 Aug 2025).
26. TRIPS Agreement, *articles. 41–61*.
27. Paris Convention for the Protection of Industrial Property, 1883.
28. Patent Cooperation Treaty (PCT), 1970
29. Hague Agreement Concerning the International Registration of Industrial Designs, 1925