ISSN (O): 2584-2196

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF LEGAL AFFAIRS AND EXPLORATION

Volume 3 | Issue 6

2025

Website: www.ijlae.com

Email: editor@ijlae.com

Volume 3 | Issue 6 International Journal of Legal Affairs and Exploration
ISSN (O): 2584-2196

THE IMPACT OF TYING AND BUNDLING AGREEMENTS THROGH COPYRIGHT AND TRADEMARK RIGHT ON COMPETITION

Shreya Singh & Akash Kumar

Department of Law, JIMS EMTC (GGSIPU)

ABSTRACT

Tying and bundling tactics, when supported by copyright and trademark protections, pose serious issues under competition law. Intellectual property creates monopoly power over creative works and brand identifiers, but this monopoly can be used by dominant companies to make purchase of one good a condition of access to another, or to force acceptance of bundled goods. Such behavior can erect entry barriers, exclude competitors, and decrease consumer choice, especially in technology markets where trademarks and copyright are gateways to necessary platforms, content, or brand environments.

Legal remedies differ by jurisdiction In US, the courts have moved away from an absolute per se prohibition on tying to a rule-of-reason standard, with evidence of anticompetitive harm and market power. Eastman Kodak-type cases[1] demonstrate how companies can use dependence in aftermarkets to injure competition. The European Union, on the other hand, has approached the issue more interventionist, considering tying by market leaders as an abuse according to Article 102. The high-profile *Microsoft Corp v Commission*[2] and *Google Android*[3] cases illustrate how bundling protected software and services can close out competition and entrench market leadership.

Meanwhile, tying and bundling can create efficiencies in the form of lower transaction costs, compatibility, and consumer convenience. The legal and economic effects of tying and bundling through copyright and trademark rights on competition are analyzed in this paper. The ways in which these practices create market inefficiency and harm consumer well-being, as well as how they can improve product integration and innovation, are discussed.

Keywords: Tying, Bundling, Trademark, Monopoly, Dominant, Anticompetitive, Intellectual Property

---

[1] *Eastman Kodak Co v Image Technical Services Inc*, 504 US 451 (1992)
[2] *Microsoft Corp v Commission*, Case T-201/04, [2007] ECR II-3601
[3] European Commission, *Commission Decision of 18 July 2018 in Case AT.40099 — Google Android* (2018)

ISSN (O): 2584-2196

INTRODUCTION

The interface between intellectual property rights and competition law has been the subject of both academic discourse and regulatory interest for many years. Intellectual property, in its nature, gives exclusivity to authors and mark holders so that they are able to exploit their work and symbols for commercial purposes. Copyright shields original works like literary, artistic, and computer works, and trademark protects unique signs that convey the origin of goods and services. These rights promote innovation, pay for creativity, and guarantee consumer confidence.[4] But when used strategically, copyright and trademark rights can also become instruments for determining market entry, dictating distribution, and limiting competition. One of the most significant expressions of this overlap is the utilization of tying and bundling contracts. Tying happens where the sale or licensing of one product (the tying product) is made contingent upon the purchase of another.

Bundling is the sale of two or more products, either as a combined package or for a bundled price. Although both are routine in commercial usage and generally efficiency-driven, they become matters of concern when employed by companies with considerable market power. Through the use of copyright or trademark exclusivity, firms are able to employ these arrangements to exclude competitors, ensnare consumers, and extend dominance into related markets. This anxiety is especially acute in the digital economy, as copyrighted software and entertainment content and branded platforms serve as key portals to consumer access.

The other essential aspect of this discussion is achieving an equilibrium between innovation stimuli and consumer well-being. Intellectual property rights are meant to remunerate innovation efforts and spur investment in emerging technologies, while competition law aims to ensure open markets and guard against dominance abuse. Responsibly employed tying and bundling can contribute to innovation by assuring compatibility, presenting bundled offerings, and offering cost savings. But when abused, they have the potential to subvert the very intent of competition law by solidifying monopolies and deterring market entry.[5] Thus, the challenge for regulators and policymakers is to sort out good business tactics from exclusionary behavior that injures competition. That challenge is met in this paper by examining the risks and rewards of tying and bundling through the framework of copyright and trademark rights.

EFFECT OF TRADEMARK AND COPYRIGHT ON COMPETITION LAW

The influence of tying and bundling arrangements using copyright and trademark rights on competition law is significant, since it undermines the very core goals of ensuring equal market

[4] N S Gopalakrishnan and T G Agitha, *Principles of Intellectual Property* (2nd edn, Eastern Book Company 2014) 45

[5] *Eastman Kodak Co v Image Technical Services Inc*, 504 US 451 (1992)

access, avoiding abuse of dominance, and protecting consumer choice. Copyright and trademark form legal monopolies by granting sole rights over content and brand identity, which can be utilized to strengthen a company's standing in interdependent markets. When a powerful company makes access to its trademarked product or copyrighted work contingent on the acceptance of other goods or services, it. successfully utilizes its monopoly in one area to shut out competition in another. The practice has the potential to foreclose competing firms, increase entry barriers, and restrict consumer choice through locking consumers into ecosystems where substitutes are barred. The behavior directly invokes the provisions of dominance and exposes risks of market foreclosure, especially in technology-intensive industries such as software, media, and e-commerce. Simultaneously, competition law has to balance the need to limit abusive behavior and maintain the fair exploitation of intellectual property rights. The fundamental contribution, in turn, is one of forcing regulators and judges to make a fine balancing act: decide when tying and bundling promote efficiencies, integration, and innovation, and when they disrupt the competitive process by entrenching monopoly structures.

One of the important effects on competition law is how tying and bundling may manipulate market structures by erecting artificial barriers to entry. In copyright-protected products like software, films, or music-dominated markets, or trademark-based consumer brand loyalty in branded products, entrants tend to find it difficult to compete without incumbents' distribution channels. When incumbents use tying, for example, forcing customers to buy other services as a prerequisite to access copyrighted material, they increase competitors' costs and diminish the competitive attractiveness of alternative providers. Trademark bundling can also influence consumer perception by taking advantage of the popularity of a brand to drive less competitive goods, making new entry by firms with better products challenging. This manipulation not only solidifies market power but also works against the goals of competition law, which aims to maintain dynamic and contestable markets. Thus, competition law is confronted with the task of identifying practices that are pro-competitive as opposed to those that are exclusionary.

ECONOMIC EFFECTS — HARMS AND POSSIBLE EFFICIENCIES

1.Exclusion of competition

The most immediate damage of bundling and tying is the exclusion of competition from the market.[6] When an enterprise possessing considerable copyright or trademark authority induces customers to acquire tied products, it excludes competing companies from selling their substitutes.[7] For instance, if a dominant software firm mandates users to install its own media

[6] *Shamsher Kataria v Honda Siel Cars India Ltd*, Case No. 03/2011, Competition Commission of India (2014)
[7] *Eastman Kodak Co v Image Technical Services Inc*, 504 US 451 (1992)

player in addition to an operating system, other media players are disenfranchised from a significant portion of potential customers. Foreclosure is also a deterrent for new entrants, as they are aware that entry into a pre-commitment market that is already linked to another good is business-wise not feasible.

2. Consumer lock-in and diminished choice

Bundling can make switching for consumers very expensive, in effect tying them to one ecosystem. Copyright-protected digital platforms, for instance, tend to bundle a number of different services like music, video, and cloud storage under one package, making it difficult or expensive for consumers to switch suppliers. Trademark bundling also impacts consumer choice by tying strong brand loyalty to other unrelated products, causing consumers to buy products on the basis of brand identification, not on the basis of product quality or price. This lock-in undermines consumer sovereignty and reduces competitive pressure on businesses to enhance their products.

3. Price discrimination and margin squeezing

Another damage comes from the power of leading firms in utilizing tying and bundling as instruments of price discrimination. By bundling products, companies are able to draw out more consumer surplus, selling higher aggregate prices than they can for separated products. For instance, a copyright holder for material of crucial educational importance can compel institutions to buy packaged digital services at premium prices. Just the same, bundling may result in margin squeezing, where competitors cannot profitably compete since the dominant company manipulates tied markets' prices to exclude competitors.[8] Both practices undermine the principles of fair competition and ultimately harm consumer welfare.

POTENTIAL EFFICIENCIES

1**.**Reduced transaction costs and convenience

From a pro-competitive angle, bundling can be good for consumers because it reduces the cost of transactions. Rather than buying separate complementary products, consumers have the option to buy them in a single bundle and save time and money. For instance, a copyright holder packaging e-book with study guides or a computer programmer selling a productivity package instead of individual applications enables consumers to purchase bundled products at a lower search and acquisition cost. Competition law has to account for the efficiencies generated, as they can more than offset possible detriments.

2**.** Quality coordination and compatibility

[8] *Deutsche Telekom AG v European Commission*, Case C-280/08 P, [2010] ECR I-9555

Tying and bundling can also provide improved quality control and compatibility. A brand that is trademarked can bundle warranty or after-sales services with its product to ensure performance and safe consumers from spurious threats. In the same way, a software firm can tie applications with its operating system to provide seamless operation and minimize technical errors. From an economic perspective, it avoids inefficiency due to incompatibility and offers a more assured consumer experience.

3. Incentives to invest in content and brand

Perhaps the most powerful arguments for bundling and tying on efficiency grounds relate to upholding incentives for brand investment and innovation. Copyright and trademark rights already provide incentives for creators and companies to invest, but the freedom to sell products in combination can increase revenue streams and lower risks. An instance is a movie studio bundling copyright-protected movies with digital membership subscriptions to recover their expensive production costs. Similarly, trademark bundling can maintain brand reputation across product lines, creating consistent consumer confidence. These efficiencies ultimately reward consumers with a broadened range and quality of products.

ENFORCEMENT ISSUES WITH INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAWS

1.Defining the market and separating the product

The first of the competition law challenges to enforcing against tying and bundling is to decide whether the products at issue are, in fact, separate or otherwise encompassed in a single, integrated offering.[9] In most copyright and trademark-based markets, companies contend that the tied product is a built-in aspect of the tying product and not a separate product. For instance, computer software firms might assert that a bundled program is needed to ensure proper operation of the operating system. Likewise, trademark owners could assert that bundled after-sales services with branded products are part of ensuring quality and consumer confidence. This nuance complicates demonstrating the existence of a tying arrangement under the law of competition.

2. Determining market power and foreclosure effects

Another important enforcement challenge is in gauging the level of market power of a copyrighted or trademarked product. Intellectual property rights provide exclusivity, and yet exclusivity does not necessarily imply dominance. There might be open-source alternatives to a copyrighted software, or a trademarked product might be in an intensely competitive industry with several

[9] United States v. Microsoft Corp. 253 F.3d 34 (DC Cir 2001); see also *Re: Harshita Chawla v. WhatsApp Inc.* 2020 SCC OnLine CCI 32

substitutes. Regulators must thus determine not only the presence of IP rights, but whether such rights generate enough market power to skew competition in the tied market.

3. Balancing efficiencies with anticompetitive harm

An added dilemma is the need to balance efficiency rationales against likely anticompetitive harm. Tying and bundling tend to provide consumer advantages like convenience, reduced costs, or better compatibility. For example, a trademarked good packaged with warranties and service plans might improve consumer well-being by deterring imitation threats. Regulators need to take great care to determine whether these efficiencies are real or whether they simply serve as cover for exclusionary behavior. If the competition authorities do not balance this in a proper manner, they might inhibit legitimate innovation or permit dangerous exclusionary activity to go unchallenged.[10]

POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS & SOLUTIONS

1.More defining standards of product separability

Competition authorities would need to develop more precise standards for considering two products distinct for the purpose of tying and bundling analysis.[11] Uncertainty in market definition generally enables firms to make the case that their bundled products are "natural integrations" instead of distinct products. By making sector-specific guidelines particularly for industries such as software, streaming platforms, or branded consumer products regulators would minimize uncertainty and improve enforcement.[12] The same clarity would serve both businesses in drafting legitimate agreements and regulators in discerning true abuses of market power.

2. Utilizing an effects-based approach

A move towards an effects-based framework instead of a strict formalist approach would see enforcement focus on consumer welfare ahead of strict legal tests. Rather than assuming tieing or bundling to be anticompetitive, authorities ought to assess the real effect on prices, production, innovation, and consumer choice. This is especially so in copyright and trademark instances, where exclusivity tends to converge with valid business reasons. Through the use of economic evidence like consumer surveys and foreclosure models, competition law can differentiate between exclusionary conduct that is harmful and efficient business practice. This reduces the likelihood of over-enforcement that might inadvertently stifle innovation.

3. Promoting transparency in licensing and distribution contracts

[10] *Shamsher Kataria v. Honda Siel Cars India Ltd.* 2014 CompLR 1 (CCI)
[11] United States v. Microsoft Corp. 253 F.3d 34 (DC Cir 2001)
[12] *Re: Harshita Chawla v. WhatsApp Inc.* 2020 SCC OnLine CCI 32

Most tying and bundling deals are nested in sophisticated licensing or distribution contracts that are transparent to consumers and regulators. To rectify this, authorities may demand more transparency regarding how copyright and trademark owners organize these deals. For example, companies can be compelled to make public whether specific features, services. Transparency obligations would enable consumers to make better-informed decisions and enable regulators to see more clearly evidence of possibly coercive tactics. In addition, it would not hold back companies from coming up with innovative bundling approaches—it would only force the competitive dynamics to be more apparent.[13]

4. Proportional and innovation-friendly remedies

Once anticompetitive bundling or tying is proved, remedies must be crafted with great care to restore competition without damaging intellectual property incentives. Rather than using blunt instruments such as compulsory licensing, regulators may use more proportional means such as demanding unbundled pricing, forcing interoperability standards, or limiting exclusivity clauses in agreements. These remedies maintain the commercial worth of trademark and copyright rights while avoiding their abuse for shutting out competitors.

CONCLUSION

Tying and bundling rules at the nexus of copyright, trademark, and competition law are among the most sophisticated fields of contemporary market regulation. Intellectual property rights provide creators and brand owners with exclusivity so that they can innovate, invest, and differentiate their products from others.[14] Conversely, when such rights are used to compel tied or bundled products on consumers, they could turn from innovation tools into market foreclosure tools. This double nature poses a perpetual dilemma for competition law: how to avoid abuse of dominance without destabilizing the very incentives that intellectual property legislations aim to safeguard.

The analysis in this essay illustrates that bundling and tying can create both substantial harms as well as efficiencies. On the harm side, they can diminish consumer choice, drive out competitors, and increase barriers to entry, especially in digital and branded markets where copyright and trademarks have enormous commercial clout. But they can also spur efficiency by reducing transaction costs, coordinating product compatibility, safeguarding brand reputation, and providing integrated solutions that consumers prefer. That precarious balancing act is why competition law cannot work on strictly presumptive assumptions it must assess tying and

[13] Prabuddha Ganguli, *Intellectual Property Rights: Unleashing the Knowledge Economy* (Tata McGraw-Hill 2001) 227
[14] V.K. Ahuja, *Law Relating to Intellectual Property Rights* (3rd edn, LexisNexis 2022) 301

bundling contextually, considering the competitive configuration of the market and the wider economic implications.

The role of competition law, then," Is not to ban tying and bundling per se, but to identify the harmful exclusionary conduct from the permissible business strategies. Adopting a sophisticated, fact-based, and globally coordinated approach, competition agencies can allow intellectual property to continue to drive innovation while preventing its abuse as a means of market control.

SUGGESTIONS

In light of the challenges discussed, a number of practical suggestions may be considered to reconcile the efficiency benefits of tying and bundling with the risks of anticompetitive harm:

1. Sector-Specific Guidelines: - The Competition Commission of India (CCI) may consider developing sector-specific guidelines, especially for software, digital platforms, and branded consumer markets. Clearer criteria for product separability would reduce disputes over whether a bundled product is a "natural integration" or a distinct tied product.
2. Adoption of an Effects-Based Approach: - Enforcement should progressively shift from a formalistic framework towards an effects-based analysis, focusing on actual market impact rather than presumptive rules. This approach, followed in jurisdictions such as the United States and the European Union, would allow authorities to identify genuinely harmful foreclosure without discouraging innovation.
3. Transparency Obligations in Licensing and Distribution: - Authorities could impose greater transparency requirements on copyright and trademark holders in their licensing and distribution agreements. Public disclosure of whether features, services, or warranties are optional or mandatorily bundled would enhance consumer choice and enable regulators to detect coercive tactics more easily.
4. Proportional, Innovation-Friendly Remedies: - Remedies against anticompetitive bundling should be proportionate. Instead of blunt instruments like compulsory licensing, regulators could employ more balanced measures such as mandating unbundled pricing, ensuring interoperability, or restricting exclusivity clauses. Such measures would prevent abuse without undermining the commercial value of intellectual property rights.