American Journal of Psychiatric Rehabilitation

Expert Opinion Article

Intellectual Property and The Human Biological Material: Navigating Legal Ownership and Rights

Prof. Jyoti Bhakare[1]*, Ms. Siddha Kulkarni[2]

[1]*Director, School of Law, Savitribai Phule Pune University, Pune. Email – jyotibhakare@gmail.com
[2]Research scholar, Department of Law, Savitribai Phule Pune University, Pune.

Abstract:
The intersection of intellectual property (IP) and the human body presents a dynamic and evolving landscape, raising profound legal, ethical, and societal questions. This article explores the complexities of ownership, acquisition, and control over human body parts and genetic material, offering a multidisciplinary perspective that blends legal theory with real-world implications.
It begins by examining traditional concepts of property and how these frameworks apply when the subject matter is the human body. As biotechnological advances redefine what is possible, particularly in genetics, questions of who can own or control biological materials have become increasingly interesting. Genetic ownership is particularly contentious, with significant implications for research, innovation, and individual rights. The article further analyzes the notion of bodily ownership through jurisprudential, constitutional, and cultural lenses. Legal frameworks such as the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita and constitutional protections like Article 21 are discussed about bodily autonomy and integrity. The inquiry then extends to whether genetic material should be considered a body part, drawing on global conventions and scholarly debate.
Attention is also given to the commoditization of human body parts, ranging from organ trafficking and commercialized healthcare practices to cutting-edge technologies such as regenerative medicine and cyborg integration. The role of intellectual property rights in this context, particularly patents on human biological materials, is examined through landmark legal cases and pharmaceutical industry practices. Concluding with both national and international perspectives, the article offers recommendations for navigating this ethically sensitive and legally intricate terrain in an era of rapid scientific advancement.

Keywords: Property Rights, Body Ownership, IP Rights, Ethical Issues, Constitution of India

1. Introduction:

The concept of property forms the foundation of legal, economic, and social systems, granting individuals and entities the recognized right to possess, use, and transfer assets. Traditionally, property includes tangible items like land and belongings, as well as intangible assets such as intellectual property. However, applying this framework to human body parts and genetic material raises profound legal and ethical questions. As science progresses, our understanding of what counts as property and how such rights should be governed also undergoes a review.
Philosophical theories of property offer differing perspectives on ownership. Classical thinkers like John Locke proposed that property rights arise from labor when individuals mix their effort with resources, and they gain ownership. This labor theory forms a basis for arguments supporting bodily ownership. In contrast, modern theories view property as a social and legal construct, shaped by the context in which it operates. These theories bring into focus the broader implications of property rights for justice, equity, and human dignity, particularly when applied to the human body. A key to this conversation is the distinctions between ownership, acquisition, and possession. Ownership implies legal control and the ability to transfer or exclude others. Acquisition describes how ownership is gained through purchase, inheritance, or creation; while possession refers to actual control, regardless of legal rights. These concepts become especially complex when applied to body parts and genetic data, where ethics, law, and personal identity intersect.
Ownership of the human body has traditionally been seen as inalienable, tied inherently to autonomy, and protected by human rights principles. Yet the rise of biotechnology, organ donation systems, and genetic research challenges these assumptions. The commercialization of body parts and biological materials prompts difficult questions about consent, commodification, and dignity. Adding to this complexity is the issue of genetic ownership. As genetic data becomes a valuable tool in medicine and research, the debate around who owns that information intensifies. The patenting of genes has sparked controversy, raising concerns about access, equity, and the ethical limits of innovation.
This article aims to unpack these layered issues, drawing on legal, philosophical, and cultural insights. It contributes to the broader discourse on how society should responsibly balance individual rights,

public good, and technological progress in the context of bodily and genetic ownership.

2. Can Body Parts Be Owned?

The question of whether human body parts can be owned is a complex and nuanced issue, situated at the crossroads of law, ethics, and culture. It fundamentally challenges the boundaries between personhood and property, raising critical questions about autonomy, dignity, and the commodification of the human body.

Jurisprudential Perspective

Traditionally, law separates "persons" from "property," treating the human body as inalienable—something that cannot be sold or transferred. This stems from the belief that the body is intimately tied to personal identity and dignity. However, advances in biotechnology and organ donation have complicated this notion. In *Moore v. Regents of the University of California* (1990), the U.S. court ruled that while individuals maintain rights over their bodily integrity, they may not own tissues once removed and commercially developed. This created a precedent for recognizing body parts as quasi-property under specific contexts.

Indian Legal and Constitutional Framework

In India, the **Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita (BNS)** and the **Transplantation of Human Organs and Tissues Act, 1994**, govern the legal use of human body parts. While body parts are not labeled as property, the law emphasizes consent, prohibits commercial transactions, and ensures respectful handling. **Article 21 of the Indian Constitution** guarantees the right to life and personal liberty, interpreted by courts to include bodily autonomy, privacy, and dignity. The landmark case, like *Common Cause v. Union of India* (2018), further reinforces the individual's right to control their body, particularly in medical contexts.

Cultural Dimensions

Cultural beliefs deeply influence perceptions of bodily ownership. In many societies, the human body is considered sacred, and actions like organ donation are viewed through religious or communal lenses. While some cultures celebrate donation as altruistic, others may approach it with skepticism or taboo. Culturally sensitive legal frameworks are essential to ensure laws resonate with societal values, promote trust, and uphold dignity. In conclusion, while legal systems stop short of fully endorsing ownership of body parts, they provide a careful, ethically grounded framework that respects autonomy, cultural diversity, and evolving biomedical realities.

3. Genetics and Body Parts

The integration of genetics into the conversation around the body parts raises important questions about the nature of biological information and how it relates to physical identity. Traditionally, body parts have been understood as tangible anatomical structures. However, advancements in genetics and biotechnology have prompted a rethinking of whether genetic material, though intangible, should be treated similarly.

International frameworks have begun addressing this issue. The **Universal Declaration on the Human Genome and Human Rights** (UNESCO, 1997) and the **Oviedo Convention** (Council of Europe, 1997) emphasize the importance of protecting genetic information, recognizing its profound connection to human identity and dignity. Still, neither document definitively classifies genetics as body parts, reflecting the evolving nature of global bioethical dialogue. Debates in this area remain dynamic. Supporters of equating genetics with body parts argue that genetic data is an intrinsic element of the human body, shaping health, traits, and identity. As such, it should receive the same legal and ethical protections as organs or tissues. Opponents, however, caution that genetic material differs fundamentally: it can be copied, shared, or stored indefinitely, challenging traditional notions of ownership and control. These complexities lead to concerns around consent, privacy, and data use, especially in the context of genetic testing and biobanking. Legal scholars increasingly advocate for bespoke legal frameworks that reflect the distinct nature of genetic information, while still upholding fundamental principles such as privacy, informed consent, and non-discrimination. Medical and scientific advances highlight the transformative potential of genetics in areas like personalized medicine and disease prevention. But these benefits must be balanced with ethical oversight and public education to ensure that genetic data is handled with care, transparency, and fairness.

In essence, the question of whether genetics should be classified as body parts remains open. What's clear is that as our understanding of human biology evolves, so too must our legal and ethical approaches. Crafting thoughtful, inclusive policies will be key to managing genetic information responsibly in the years ahead.

4. Commoditization of Human Body Parts:

The commoditization of human body parts presents a deeply complex and evolving challenge shaped by technological advances, market forces, and ethical concerns. One of the most troubling aspects is organ trafficking, often fueled by poverty, desperation, and global inequalities. Vulnerable individuals may be coerced or exploited into selling organs, raising

serious ethical and human rights issues. While international frameworks, such as the **UN Protocol to Prevent, Suppress and Punish Trafficking in Persons,** address organ trafficking, enforcement remains difficult, and comprehensive strategies are urgently needed to prevent exploitation and protect human dignity.

Beyond illegal markets, **commodification also occurs within legitimate healthcare systems**. Services like direct-to-consumer genetic testing, elective cosmetic surgeries, and aggressive biomedical marketing have turned aspects of health into consumer goods. While such practices may empower patients, they also raise questions about profit-driven medicine. Ethical principles, such as beneficence, non-maleficence, and respect for autonomy, are vital in ensuring that patient care remains focused on well-being rather than commercial gain. **Emerging biotechnologies** like regenerative medicine, bio-printing, and tissue engineering offer new hope for treatment, but also raise concerns about ownership, access, and consent. As bioengineered organs and tissues become commercially viable, regulatory oversight must evolve to address these innovations responsibly. **Genetics and immunology** further blur the line between person and product. Personalized medicine and genetic testing services reveal the value of genetic data, yet issues such as data privacy, ownership, and potential discrimination persist. Laws like the **Genetic Information Nondiscrimination Act (GINA)** in the U.S. offer some protection, but regulatory gaps remain as technology outpaces legislation.

Finally, the rise of **cyborg technologies** from neural implants to advanced prosthetics challenges traditional notions of bodily integrity and identity. As human biology merges with machines, questions around ownership, autonomy, and equity in access grow increasingly urgent. In sum, addressing the commodification of the human body requires **interdisciplinary cooperation**, robust ethical standards, and inclusive public dialogue. We can ensure that these advancements serve the greater good only by balancing innovation with human dignity.

5. IPR Aspect on Ownership of the Human Body

Rationale Behind Patents

Patents are designed to incentivize innovation by granting inventors exclusive rights to their creations for a limited time. This encourages investment in new technologies by offering the potential for financial return. In the biomedical field, patents cover everything from drugs and therapies to diagnostic tools, many of which rely on materials derived from the human body. However, this practice raises ethical concerns, particularly when it comes to patenting elements like genes or tissues. Critics argue that such commercialization reduces the human body to a commodity, potentially undermining human dignity and autonomy.

The Role of the Pharmaceutical Industry

Pharmaceutical companies are major stakeholders in this space. Their business models often depend on securing patents to protect the results of costly research and development. Patents on genetic sequences and biologically derived treatments have contributed to breakthroughs in personalized medicine, where therapies are tailored to a person's genetic makeup. While this has led to medical progress, it has also sparked controversy. Patents can create monopolies that limit access to life-saving treatments, especially in lower-income countries. The balance between profit and public health is a recurring ethical dilemma in discussions of biomedical patents.

Detached Human Body Parts and Legal Complexity

The legal and ethical implications become even more complicated when considering body parts that have been removed and used for commercial or research purposes. A landmark case *Moore v. Regents of the University of California*, illustrated this tension. The court ruled that once tissues are removed, individuals may lose ownership rights, even if those tissues are later commercialized. While this ruling protects innovation, it also raises critical concerns about consent, exploitation, and the commodification of human biological material. This debate intensified following the *Human Genome Project*, which brought global attention to questions about who owns genetic information and who benefits from its use. As the collection and storage of biological materials become more common in both research and clinical settings, there is a growing need for clear legal and ethical standards to guide ownership, usage, and access.

Patentability of Life Forms

Key legal decisions have shaped the landscape of patent law as it applies to biological materials. In *Diamond v. Chakrabarty* (1980), the U.S. Supreme Court ruled that a genetically modified bacterium could be patented, setting a precedent for the patentability of living organisms. Later, in *Association for Molecular Pathology v. Myriad Genetics* (2013), the court clarified that naturally occurring genes cannot be patented, but synthetically created DNA (cDNA) can be. These rulings underscore the distinction between discoveries of nature and human-made inventions, a distinction that continues to influence how we treat human genetic material under IP law. Advances in

biotechnology—from the discovery of DNA's double helix to gene editing tools like CRISPR have fueled these legal and ethical debates. As we gain more power to modify life itself, questions around ownership, manipulation, and the long-term consequences of such technologies grow more urgent.

Ethical Challenges in the Genomic Era

The convergence of genetics and personalized medicine has introduced a host of ethical challenges. The ability to map an individual's entire genome offers new insights for disease prevention and treatment but also raises serious concerns about privacy, consent, and potential discrimination. For instance, what happens if employers or insurers misuse genetic data? How do we protect individuals from the emotional and psychological impact of learning about incurable genetic risks? CRISPR and other genome editing technologies offer incredible promise for treating genetic diseases—but also raise fears about unintended side effects, off-target mutations, and even the ethical implications of altering future generations through germline editing. While some argue these tools could eliminate hereditary illnesses, others worry they open the door to designing human traits, potentially widening social inequalities or even changing what it means to be human.

Evolving Legal and Medical Practices

As technologies advance, the focus has shifted from individual genes to entire genomes, giving rise to a multidisciplinary field that merges genetics with medicine. Innovations like high-resolution sequencing and single-cell analysis have allowed scientists to explore complex diseases more deeply than ever before. This progress has also driven the growth of direct-to-consumer genetic testing companies, which provide individuals with health risk assessments based on their DNA. While empowering, these services raise concerns about the accuracy of results, informed consent, and how the data is used or shared. With more researchers using genome editing tools like CRISPR, ethical considerations continue to evolve. Germline editing, in particular, is contentious because its effects can be passed to future generations. The debate reflects a broader question: where should we draw the line between treating disease and enhancing human capabilities?

Reassessing Ownership in the Age of Biotechnology

Ultimately, legal cases like *Moore* and *Myriad*, and precedents like *Diamond* v. *Chakrabarty*, highlight an ongoing struggle: how do we reconcile individual rights with commercial and scientific interests? The current legal frameworks provide limited recognition of personal ownership once biological materials leave the body, which has significant implications for consent and control. As science advances, so must the law. Regulatory frameworks must be regularly reviewed and refined to ensure they keep pace with rapid biotechnological developments. This includes protecting individuals' rights over their genetic data, ensuring equitable access to new treatments, and maintaining ethical boundaries in research and application. The potential to manipulate human genetics at an unprecedented scale brings both hope and responsibility. As we explore new frontiers in medicine, our systems of law and ethics must evolve with them, always centering the dignity, autonomy, and well-being of individuals.

6. International Scenario, Cases, Conventions, and Implications

The global discourse on human body part ownership is shaped by varying legal frameworks, ethical guidelines, and landmark cases. Ownership, particularly in the context of patents, differs significantly across countries, influenced by legal, ethical, and cultural perspectives. The U.S. has been more permissive in allowing patents on biotechnological innovations derived from human materials, while the European Union takes a more cautious approach, emphasizing moral and ethical concerns. In Asia, countries like Japan and South Korea impose stringent regulations on patenting human genetic materials, reflecting a similar caution. Meanwhile, developing nations often prioritize accessibility and affordability in biotechnological advancements, resisting stringent patent laws from developed countries.

1. Myriad Genetics (Australia) Pty Ltd v. D'Arcy (2015): The High Court of Australia mirrored the U.S. Supreme Court's decision by ruling against the patentability of isolated DNA sequences. This case emphasized that naturally occurring genetic sequences cannot be patented, reinforcing global skepticism about commodifying elements of the human body.

2. European Patent Office (EPO) Opposition Division Decision on the OncoMouse (1989): The granting of a patent for the genetically modified "OncoMouse" marked a significant milestone in biotechnological patents. The decision sparked ethical debates and opposition, particularly concerning the moral implications of patenting higher life forms.

3. International Stem Cell Corporation v. Comptroller General of Patents (2014): The CJEU ruled that organisms capable of developing into a human being cannot be patented. This decision underscores Europe's cautious approach toward the

ethical implications of biotechnological patents and their potential impact on human dignity.

1. Universal Declaration on the Human Genome and Human Rights (1997): This declaration, adopted by UNESCO, asserts that the human genome, in its natural state, should not be a source of financial profit. It emphasizes the importance of respecting human dignity and preventing the exploitation of genetic materials for commercial gain.
2. Convention on Human Rights and Biomedicine (Oviedo Convention, 1997): This Council of Europe convention prohibits financial gain from the human body and its parts. It sets forth comprehensive guidelines for ensuring that biomedical practices respect human rights and ethical standards.
3. World Health Organization (WHO) Guidelines: The WHO has issued guidelines to ensure the ethical procurement and use of human tissues and organs.

These guidelines stress the importance of informed consent, non-commercialization, and equitable access to healthcare.
The international legal and ethical frameworks surrounding the ownership of human body parts carry several significant implications:
1. Ethical Standards: The prohibition of patenting human body parts in their natural state reinforces ethical standards that prioritize human dignity. This stance helps prevent the commodification of human life and ensures that biotechnological advancements align with fundamental human rights.
2. Innovation and Access: The varying approaches to patenting in different jurisdictions can significantly impact both innovation and access to medical treatments. While patents provide crucial incentives for innovation, they can also create barriers to accessing essential therapies, especially in economically disadvantaged regions. Policymakers must navigate this delicate balance to ensure that patents foster innovation without compromising public health.
3. Global Harmonization: The differences in legal frameworks across countries highlight the need for greater harmonization of international patent laws and ethical guidelines. Efforts by organizations like the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO) aim to create consistent standards that facilitate international collaboration and innovation while respecting ethical considerations.
4. Cultural Sensitivity: The diverse cultural perspectives on the ownership of human body parts underscore the importance of cultural sensitivity in formulating legal and ethical frameworks. Policies must respect cultural values and traditions to be effective and equitable, ensuring that they resonate with the populations they are meant to serve.
5. Public Trust and Transparency: Maintaining public trust is crucial in the biotechnological and medical fields. Transparency in the patenting process, ethical use of human body parts, and ensuring that public interests are safeguarded can foster trust and support for scientific advancements.
The international scenario regarding the ownership of human body parts is characterized by a complex interplay of legal, ethical, and cultural factors. Landmark cases and international conventions reflect the ongoing efforts to balance innovation with ethical standards, ensuring that advancements in biotechnology and medicine respect human dignity and promote equitable access to healthcare. As biotechnological capabilities continue to evolve, international collaboration and the harmonization of legal and ethical frameworks will be essential to address the challenges and opportunities presented by these advancements. The diverse approaches of different countries highlight the importance of a global dialogue that respects cultural sensitivities while striving for common ethical and legal standards that protect human dignity and foster scientific progress.

7. National Scenario: Indian Perspective on Ownership of Human Body Parts
India's approach to the ownership and use of human body parts is shaped by a complex blend of legal norms, ethical principles, and deep-rooted cultural values. As the country advances in medical science, it continues to uphold fundamental respect for human dignity and bodily autonomy, balancing innovation with individual rights. At the core of this framework is **Article 21 of the Indian Constitution**, which guarantees the right to life and personal liberty. Indian courts have interpreted this to include bodily integrity, dignity, privacy, and autonomy. This broad interpretation forms the basis for requiring informed consent in any medical intervention involving the human body, safeguarding individuals from exploitation and ensuring ethical medical practices.
While **the Indian Penal Code (IPC)** did not directly address ownership of body parts, it provided legal protection through provisions like **Section 297**, which criminalized acts that offend religious sentiments, including the desecration of human remains. Such provisions could be extended to regulate the respectful handling of body parts, highlighting the legal system's sensitivity to cultural and moral values. The **Transplantation of Human Organs and Tissues Act, 1994** serves as the primary legislation governing organ donation and transplantation. It lays out clear guidelines for the legal removal, storage, and transplantation of organs, emphasizing informed consent and prohibiting any commercial trade. The Act promotes altruistic donation and penalizes those involved in illegal

organ transactions, aiming to prevent exploitation and ensure ethical practices. Over the years, improved awareness campaigns, better infrastructure, and a growing donor registry have helped increase organ availability, but challenges remain.

India's legal philosophy strongly embraces individual autonomy, particularly regarding health decisions. The right to refuse medical treatment—even when such refusal may result in death—is recognized and protected. This legal stance is rooted in the concept of self-determination, where one's control over their body is seen as essential to personal dignity. The law also outlines how consent should be obtained, expressed, and respected, particularly in sensitive medical scenarios such as life-sustaining treatments. Despite progressive laws, organ donation rates in India remain low compared to global standards. Cultural taboos, religious beliefs, limited public awareness, and infrastructural gaps are key contributors to this shortfall. Many families are reluctant to consent to donation, often due to misinformation or emotional distress during critical moments.

Addressing this gap is crucial. The growing need for organs far outpaces supply, leading to long waiting lists and preventable deaths. Strategies like presumed consent models, improved donor identification systems, and community education initiatives are being explored as ways to boost donation rates. Enhancing transparency, public trust, and support mechanisms for donor families could also improve outcomes. Moreover, India must continue to improve logistical and medical infrastructure, including organ retrieval, storage, and transport systems, to maximize successful transplantations. An emphasis on training healthcare professionals, refining legal protocols, and streamlining coordination between hospitals and transplant authorities will be essential for progress.

In conclusion, India's stance on the ownership and use of human body parts reflects a thoughtful integration of law, ethics, and culture. While the country has made significant strides in regulating organ donation and respecting bodily autonomy, it must continue to evolve in response to growing medical demands and ethical challenges. Strengthening awareness, improving infrastructure, and fostering culturally sensitive legal reforms will be key to saving more lives and promoting dignity and equity in healthcare.

8. Conclusion

The ownership of human body parts is a complex issue requiring a balanced approach that considers legal, ethical, cultural, and scientific perspectives. While property theories offer a framework, their application to the human body must carefully weigh individual rights, dignity, and societal values. National and international legal frameworks, including those in the U.S., Europe, and India, are vital in defining ownership boundaries and regulating ethical practices. Landmark cases, conventions, and ethical guidelines further influence the discourse, providing direction for policymakers, healthcare professionals, and researchers. Moving forward, global collaboration is essential to align standards, promote ethical research, and ensure equitable healthcare access. Public awareness, education, and strong regulatory oversight are key to navigating the complexities of body part ownership while safeguarding human rights and ethical principles. Harmonizing international standards requires dialogue through organizations such as the WHO and WIPO, aiming to establish global ethical and legal norms for body part ownership. This includes developing guidelines that respect cultural differences while upholding universal ethical values. Strengthening national laws is crucial, particularly to address biotechnologies' impact on body part ownership, ensuring clear definitions of genetic materials, organs, and body parts, alongside ethical safeguards to prevent exploitation and ensure informed consent.

Ethical research and innovation are also paramount, with funding dedicated to exploring new medical technologies while preserving human dignity. Public education campaigns can inform individuals about body part ownership's ethical implications and the significance of organ donation. Additionally, ensuring informed consent helps individuals understand their rights and choices in medical procedures. Strengthening regulatory oversight is vital, with healthcare institutions empowered to review research, clinical practices, and transplant procedures. International collaboration fosters ethical practices and sharing of best practices in biotechnology and medical ethics. Facilitating knowledge exchange among professionals and policymakers will further promote a more ethical and legally sound approach to human body part ownership. By embracing these measures, societies can navigate the challenges posed by biotechnology advances while respecting human dignity and safeguarding individual autonomy.

References:

1. Moore v. Regents of the University of California, 793 P.2d 479 (Cal. 1990).
2. Parliament of India. (1994). The Transplantation of Human Organs and Tissues Act, 1994.
3. Shroff S. Legal and ethical aspects of organ donation and transplantation. Indian J Urol. 2009 Jul; 25(3):348-55. doi: 10.4103/0970-1591. 56203. PMID: 19881131; PMCID: PMC2779960.

4. Article 21 of the Constitution of India, 1949.
5. Garg, R. (2022, September 23). *Common Cause v. Union of India : case analysis - iPleaders*. https://blog.ipleaders.in/common-cause-v-nion-of-india-case-analysis/ last visited on 18th April 2025
6. **Universal Declaration on the Human Genome and Human Rights**. UNESCO, 1997. Available at: UNESCO
7. **Convention on Human Rights and Biomedicine (Oviedo Convention)**. Council of Europe, 1997. Available at: Council of Europe
8. Chadwick, R. & Levitt, M., & Shickle, Darren. (2014). The Right to Know and the Right Not to Know: Genetic Privacy and Responsibility. 10.1017/CBO9781139875981.
9. Rothstein MA. Genetic exceptionalism and legislative pragmatism. J Law Med Ethics. 2007 Summer;35(2 Suppl):59-65. doi: 10.1111/j.1748-720X.2007.00154.x. PMID: 17543059.
10. **United Nations Protocol to Prevent, Suppress and Punish Trafficking in Persons, Especially Women and Children**, supplementing the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime. (2000). Available at: UNODC
11. Ayanoğlu, F. B., Elçin, A. E., & Elçin, Y. M. (2020). Bioethical issues in genome editing by CRISPR-Cas9 technology. TURKISH JOURNAL OF BIOLOGY, 44(2), 110. https://doi.org/10.3906/biy-1912-52
12. Benner, S. A., & Sismour, A. M. (2005). Synthetic biology [Review of Synthetic biology]. Nature Reviews Genetics, 6(7), 533. Nature Portfolio. https://doi.org/10.1038/nrg1637
    Brown, N., Faulkner, A., Kent, J., & Michael, M. (2006). Regulating Hybrids: 'Making a Mess' and 'Cleaning Up' in Tissue Engineering and Transpecies Transplantation. Social Theory & Health, 4(1), 1. https://doi.org/10.1057/palgrave.sth.8700062
13. Carroll, D. (2017). Genome Editing: Past, Present, and Future. PubMed, 90(4), 653. https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/29259529
14. Chapman, S., & Sherman, B. (2018). Finding a Place for Agriculture in Intellectual Property Law. Deleted Journal, 49(7), 759. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40319-018-0753-8
15. Davis, D. J., & Yeddula, S. G. R. (2024). CRISPR Advancements for Human Health. PubMed, 121(2), 170. https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/38694604
16. Healy, L. (2017). Acquisition and Reception of Primary Tissues, Cells, or Other Biological Specimens [Review of Acquisition and Reception of Primary Tissues, Cells, or Other Biological Specimens]. Methods in Molecular Biology, 17. Springer Science+Business Media. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4939-6921-0_3
17. Human Genome Editing. (2017). In National Academies Press eBooks. https://doi.org/10.17226/24623
18. Ishii, T. (2015). Germ line genome editing in clinics: the approaches, objectives and global society [Review of Germ line genome editing in clinics: the approaches, objectives and global society]. Briefings in Functional Genomics, 16(1), 46. Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/bfgp/elv053
19. Knoppers, B. M., & Beauvais, M. J. S. (2021). Three decades of genetic privacy: a metaphoric journey [Review of Three decades of genetic privacy: a metaphoric journey]. Human Molecular Genetics, 30. Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/hmg/ddab164
20. Li, G., Li, X., Zhuang, S., Wang, L., Zhu, Y., Chen, Y., Sun, W., Wu, Z., Zhou, Z., Chen, J., Huang, X., Wang, J., Li, D., Li, W., Wang, H., & Wei, W. (2022). Gene editing and its applications in biomedicine [Review of Gene editing and its applications in biomedicine]. Science China Life Sciences, 65(4), 660. Springer Science+Business Media. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11427-021-2057-0
21. Ormond, K. E., & Cho, M. K. (2014). Translating Personalized Medicine Using New Genetic Technologies in Clinical Practice: The Ethical Issues. Personalized Medicine, 11(2), 211. https://doi.org/10.2217/pme.13.104
22. Passarge, E. (2021). Origins of human genetics. A personal perspective [Review of Origins of human genetics. A personal perspective]. European Journal of Human Genetics, 29(7), 1038. Springer Nature. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41431-020-00785-7
23. Ruiz, A. N. (2012). Plants genetic manipulation an approach from intellectual property [Review of Plants genetic manipulation an approach from intellectual property]. Frontiers in Bioscience-Elite, 2, 408. Frontiers Media. https://doi.org/10.2741/e624
24. Scott, S. A., Abul-Husn, N. S., Obeng, A. O., Sanderson, S. C., & Gottesman, O. (2014). Implementation and utilization of genetic testing in personalized medicine [Review of Implementation and utilization of genetic testing in personalized medicine]. Pharmacogenomics and Personalized Medicine, 227. Dove Medical Press. https://doi.org/10.2147/pgpm.s48887
25. Shiffrin, S. V. (2017). Intellectual Property (p. 653). https://doi.org/10.1002/9781405177245.ch36
26. Song, J. (2021). Ethical adaptation and legal regulation of modern technology. Cultures of Science, 4(3), 169. https://doi.org/10.1177/20966083211053085
27. Wrigley, A., & Newson, A. J. (2015). Genome editing poses ethical problems that we cannot

ignore. https://ses.library.usyd.edu.au/handle/2123/13063

28. Bolcato, M., Fassina, G., Sanavio, M., & Aprile, A. (2020). The new Italian law 219/2017: an extraordinary clinical tool in internal medicine. Italian Journal of Medicine. https://doi.org/10.4081/itjm.2020.1280
29. Cebeci, F., Sucu, G., & Karazeybek, E. (2011). The Roles of Nurses to Augment Organ Donation and Transplantation: A Survey of Nursing Students. Transplantation Proceedings, 43(2), 412. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.transproceed.2011.01.048
30. Chan, T. W., & Ho, C. W.-L. (2017). A Ten-Year Retrospective Analysis of Consent for the Donation of Residual Human Tissue in a Singapore Healthcare Institution: Reflections on Governance. Asian Bioethics Review, 9(4), 335. https://doi.org/10.1007/s41649-017-0040-x
31. Chhablani, N., Choudhari, S. G., Gaidhane, A., & Zahiruddin, Q. S. (2021). Revisiting Organ Donation – Voyage from Death, Donation, Transportation to Organ Transplantation. International Journal of Current Research and Review, 13(10), 147. https://doi.org/10.31782/ijcrr.2021.131029
32. Hall, B., & Parkin, M. S. (2016). UK policy initiatives and the effect on increasing organ donation. British Journal of Nursing, 25(6), 307. https://doi.org/10.12968/bjon.2016.25.6.307
33. Intellectual Property and the Human Body: Navigating Ownership and Rights. (n.d.). Irving, M., Tong, A., Jan, S., Cass, A., Rose, J. M., Chadban, S., Allen, R., Craig, J. C., Wong, G., & Howard, K. (2011). Factors that influence the decision to be an organ donor: a systematic review of the qualitative literature [Review of Factors that influence the decision to be an organ donor: a systematic review of the qualitative literature]. Nephrology Dialysis Transplantation, 27(6), 2526. Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/ndt/gfr683
34. Jabri, G., Sandokji, A., Alzughaibi, N., & Alsehli, I. (2016). Awareness, Beliefs and Barriers of Organ Donation among Saudis in Madinah City, Saudi Arabia. Journal of Health Education Research & Development, 4(3). https://doi.org/10.4172/2380-5439.1000187
35. Johar, N. S., & India, U. O. (2018). Navtej Singh Johar vs Union Of India Ministry Of Law And . Katari, R., Tamburrini, R., Edgar, L., & Orlando, G. (2017). Converging Organ Transplantation Towards Regenerative Medicine. In Elsevier eBooks (p. 757). Elsevier BV. https://doi.org/10.1016/b978-0-12-801734-0.00054-0
36. Li, D., Hawley, Z., & Schnier, K. E. (2013). Increasing organ donation via changes in the default choice or allocation rule. Journal of Health Economics, 32(6), 1117. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhealeco.2013.09.007
37. Saidi, R. F., & Kenari, S. K. H. (2014). Challenges of organ shortage for transplantation: solutions and opportunities. PubMed, 5(3), 87. https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/25184029
38. Sauthier, N., Bouchakri, R., Carrier, F. M., Sauthier, M., Mullie, L., Cardinal, H., Fortin, M., Lahrichi, N., & Chassé, M. (2023). Automated screening of potential organ donors using a temporal machine learning model. Scientific Reports, 13(1). https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-023-35270-w
39. Sayyari, A. A., & Shaheen, F. A. M. (1999). Strategies for increasing transplantation: the Saudi experience. Transplantation Proceedings, 31(8), 3278. https://doi.org/10.1016/s0041-1345(99)00723-x
40. Suguitan, G. A., Cabanayan-Casasola, C. B., Danguilan, R. A., & Jaro, J. M. A. (2014). Outcome of Referrals for Deceased Organ Donation to the Government Organ Procurement Organization. Transplantation Proceedings, 46(4), 1074. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.transproceed.2014.01.005
41. Swaminathan, G. R. (2019). Arunkumar vs The Inspector General of Registration. Thornton, V. (2018). The role of altruism in an organ donation policy. Ethics Medicine and Public Health, 6, 44. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jemep.2018.07.004