NEPAL – COUNTRY REPORT

Patents | Reporting update through 16 October 2026

This report summarises patent registrations, legislative developments and relevant judicial decisions in Nepal. It draws primarily on publications of the Department of Industry (DOI) and the Patent, Design and Trademark Act, 2022 (1965) (PDTA). [1][2][3]

1. Recent patent statistics

The DOI's Industrial Statistics for FY 2081/82 (2024/25 AD) record 90 patent registrations cumulatively as of the end of that year: 54 domestic and 36 foreign. Two domestic patents, and no foreign patents, were registered during FY 2081/82. The DOI's subsequent report for FY 2082/83 (2025/26) records four patent registrations during that year, increasing the official cumulative total to 94. The newer report does not provide a domestic/foreign breakdown of those four registrations. [2] [3]

Period / measure	Patent registrations	Source / qualification
FY 2080/81 (2023/24)	2	Domestic: 2; foreign: 0 [2]
FY 2081/82 (2024/25)	2	Domestic: 2; foreign: 0 [2]
Cumulative to end FY 2081/82	90	Domestic: 54; foreign: 36 [2]
FY 2082/83 (2025/26)	4	Breakdown not stated in DOI report [3]
Cumulative to end FY 2082/83	94	Official figure in DOI report [3]

2. Changes in patent laws and regulations

Current legal position. Patent protection continues to be governed by the PDTA. A patent must be registered with the DOI to obtain statutory rights (section 3). The DOI examines whether the subject matter is a new invention and useful to the public (section 5), subject to the refusal grounds in section 6. The PDTA also provides for publication of registered patents, except those kept confidential in the national interest (section 7A), and an initial seven-year term renewable twice for seven years each (sections 8 and 23B). [1]

No enacted patent-law reform identified during this reporting period. No new patent statute or patent-specific amendment took effect. [1] [4] However, a new bill is being prepared.

Industrial Property Bill, 2082 (2025). The Industrial Property Bill, 2082 was registered in the House of Representatives on 23 Jestha 2082, presented to the House on 29 Ashadh 2082 and referred for clause-by-clause consideration in committee. The Bill became inactive upon dissolution of the House on 27 Bhadra 2082. It therefore did not become law and has not replaced the PDTA. [4] A new bill is currently under discussion but has not yet been presented before the House.

Administrative practice. The DOI's FY 2082/83 public-information report describes specialist review as part of patent registration, including selection of technical experts, confidentiality arrangements and examination of applications. These are reported administrative procedures, not new statutory patentability standards. [3] The DOI also recently requested applications for preparing a roster of experts for Patent examination.

3. Notable court decisions related to patents

There have been no patent-specific judgment delivered during 2024–October 2026. The following earlier Supreme Court judgments remain relevant. They are included as historical authorities, not as recent decisions.

3.1 Nebico Pvt. Ltd. v Pashupati Biscuit Industries Pvt. Ltd. (Supreme Court, 27 Jestha 2076 / 2019; NKP Decision No. 10216).

The dispute concerned "High Energy" biscuits and included a registered patent and related trademark claims. The Supreme Court affirmed that patent and trademark registration disputes are for the DOI to decide under the PDTA, and that an affected party may seek judicial relief where the DOI fails to decide within a reasonable time. The Court upheld a direction requiring the DOI to decide the pending dispute; it did not decide the substantive validity of the biscuit patent or grant an unrestricted market monopoly. [5]

3.2 Ashok Steel Industries Pvt. Ltd. v Department of Industry and Others (Supreme Court, 15 Ashadh 2049 / 1992; NKP 2049, Issue 8).

Following a patent-infringement complaint concerning reinforcement steel technology, the DOI withheld documents concerning the registered patent and the complaint. The Supreme Court held that non-publication in the Nepal Gazette, without a national-interest confidentiality basis, did not justify withholding material that the PDTA contemplated making available. It also required a meaningful opportunity to examine the allegations and evidence and respond, and set aside the

procedurally defective administrative actions. The ruling concerns disclosure and natural justice, rather than a final finding on infringement or patent validity. [6]

Sources

[1] Patent, Design and Trade Mark Act, 2022 (1965), as amended (Nepal Law Commission consolidated text; WIPO Lex reference). Link

[2] Department of Industry, Industrial Statistics, FY 2081/82 (2024/25), Table 11, printed p. 181 (PDF p. 189). Link

[3] Department of Industry, FY 2082/83 fourth-quarter RTI report (Asar 2083), printed pp. 22–23 (PDF pp. 24–25). Link

[4] House of Representatives, Industrial Property Bill, 2082 – legislative status and lapse notice. Link

[5] Supreme Court of Nepal, NKP Decision No. 10216 (2019). Link

[6] Supreme Court of Nepal, Ashok Steel Industries, NKP 2049, Issue 8 (1992). Link