

# Research on the Construction of the Public Interest Litigation System for Intellectual Property

Ningbo Zhang<sup>1\*</sup>, Dejun Zhou<sup>2</sup>

1.Jiangsu Jingke Patent Agency, Zhenjiang, Jiangsu, 212013

2.School of Law, Jiangsu University, Zhenjiang, Jiangsu, 212013

\*Corresponding author: Ningbo Zhang, [ipcounsel2010@163.com](mailto:ipcounsel2010@163.com)

**Copyright:** 2025 Author(s). This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY-NC 4.0), permitting distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited, and explicitly prohibiting its use for commercial purposes.

**Abstract:** The system of public interest litigation in intellectual property prosecution is an important initiative in China to strengthen intellectual property protection and promote innovation and economic development in the new era. This paper aims to explore the construction and improvement of the public interest litigation system in intellectual property prosecution, with a focus on drawing lessons from foreign experiences. By analyzing the current legal framework and practical experiences in this field in China, the paper identifies the problems and challenges in the implementation of the system and proposes targeted improvement strategies. The research finds that there are deficiencies in the theoretical framework, practical operations, and legal safeguards of intellectual property public interest litigation. By comparing practices in developed countries such as the United States and Europe, this paper analyzes how to improve the system by refining relevant laws and regulations, enhancing the role of prosecutorial agencies, and increasing public participation. Drawing on international experiences, it proposes that China should focus on cross-departmental collaboration, improving legal safeguards, and strengthening judicial oversight to create a more effective intellectual property protection system that safeguards social public interests.

**Keywords:** Intellectual Property; Public Interest Litigation; System Construction; Social Public Interests

**Published:** Feb 27, 2025

**DOI:** <https://doi.org/10.62177/chst.v2i1.176>

## 1.Introduction

### 1.1 Research Background

Intellectual property (IP), as a crucial representation of innovative achievements, has become an indispensable core element in the global economy. With the advancement of globalization and informatization, the protection of intellectual property is not only a necessity for enterprises and individuals but also a critical factor for the sustainable development of nations and societies. In China, the protection of intellectual property has been steadily increasing, particularly in high-tech and cultural creative industries. The effective safeguarding of innovation has not only enhanced the competitiveness of businesses but has also facilitated the transformation and upgrading of the overall economy. However, with the growth of the market economy, new challenges have emerged. The number of intellectual property infringement cases has risen, with certain infringements becoming increasingly covert, complex, and transnational, thus placing considerable pressure on the existing judicial and administrative systems. At the same time, traditional methods of intellectual property enforcement still largely depend on the

proactive efforts of enterprises or rights holders, which presents various limitations, particularly in cases involving public interest. These cases often fail to receive effective judicial remedies. Consequently, strengthening the public interest protection of intellectual property and establishing a more robust public interest litigation system within the prosecution process has become a key issue in the development of China's legal framework.

## **1.2 The Introduction and Necessity of the Public Interest Litigation System in Prosecution**

In the context of the many challenges currently facing intellectual property (IP) protection, the introduction of a public interest litigation system by prosecuting authorities holds significant practical relevance. Public interest litigation is a lawsuit initiated by the prosecution on behalf of the public interest, aimed at correcting illegal activities and safeguarding the common good. The implementation of intellectual property public interest litigation is essential for advancing the national strategy of strengthening intellectual property, improving the regulation of IP infringement, and expanding the prosecutorial function in litigation. For intellectual property, the introduction of the public interest litigation system can effectively fill the gaps in the traditional litigation framework, especially in cases involving public interest or the collective rights of society, where it can play an irreplaceable role.

In 2012, the Supreme People's Procuratorate issued relevant judicial interpretations, clarifying the functions of prosecuting authorities in public interest litigation and gradually involving them in the field of intellectual property protection. The intervention of the prosecuting authorities not only raises social awareness of intellectual property protection but also strengthens public trust in legal fairness and justice. Particularly in the protection of innovation and the promotion of technological progress, the advancement of public interest litigation by prosecutors will undoubtedly play a positive role. In the era of the digital economy, intellectual property public interest litigation holds unique value, as it can reinforce IP protection and prevent the distortion of the intellectual property system. China's civil and administrative litigation laws, in their provisions on public interest litigation, use the term "etc." to extend the scope, providing room to expand the establishment of an independent intellectual property public interest litigation system. Therefore, to protect the accessibility and usability of public domain intellectual property, safeguard the public interests it embodies, promote cultural and technological innovation, and prevent the privatization and infringement of public domain intellectual property, the introduction of prosecutorial public interest litigation is both urgently necessary and practically feasible.

## **2. The Theoretical Foundation of the Intellectual Property Public Interest Litigation System**

### **2.1 Overview of Public Interest Litigation**

Public interest litigation is a special legal procedure that allows prosecuting authorities, social organizations, or other legally qualified entities to file lawsuits on behalf of the public interest against unlawful activities. The goal of such litigation is not to compensate individual interests but to restore the legitimacy and rationality of social public interests. The subjects of public interest litigation often involve areas of social public interest such as environmental protection, consumer rights, public health, and intellectual property. Unlike traditional civil litigation, public interest litigation focuses on collective interests, especially in cases where individuals cannot independently file lawsuits or cannot obtain effective protection. Public interest litigation serves multiple functions and plays a crucial role in the development of the rule of law in society. Firstly, it effectively fills the gaps in traditional litigation mechanisms. Secondly, public interest litigation strengthens society's concept of the rule of law, fairness, and justice. Thirdly, it contributes to the improvement of legal and judicial systems. Finally, public interest litigation promotes the diversification and integrated governance of intellectual property protection.

### **2.2 The Public Interest Nature of Intellectual Property Protection**

Intellectual property protection concerns not only the individual interests of creators but also the broader public interest of society. First, by protecting innovative achievements, intellectual property incentivizes innovation, drives technological progress, and supports industrial development, directly contributing to sustained social and economic growth. Without effective intellectual property protection, innovators would lose exclusive rights to their creations, which could suppress innovation intentions and, in turn, hinder technological innovation and social progress. Second, intellectual property protection offers

consumers more choices and guarantees, preventing the circulation of counterfeit and substandard goods, ensuring product quality and safety, and thereby safeguarding public interest. Consequently, intellectual property protection not only ensures the protection of innovation and consumer rights but also aligns with society's long-term interests. This protection promotes economic development and plays an important role in advancing public interest. The public interest nature of intellectual property protection requires the state to ensure the smooth conduct of innovative activities through legal measures and provide society with more innovative and high-quality products and services.

### **2.3 Theoretical Support for Prosecutorial Public Interest Litigation**

The theoretical foundation of prosecutorial public interest litigation primarily stems from the protection of public interest. In modern rule-of-law societies, public interest is regarded as the core of social development, and its protection is one of the foundations of legal systems. As the legal supervisory body of the state, the prosecuting authority is responsible for representing the public interest. Public interest litigation is not only an essential means for the prosecution to perform its legal oversight functions but also an effective tool for strengthening the rule of law and achieving social fairness and justice. Theoretically, prosecutorial public interest litigation is supported by institutional frameworks. The implementation of public interest litigation helps remedy the deficiencies in the traditional litigation system, especially in cases involving public interest, where individuals or specific groups may lack the capacity to protect their rights and cannot seek protection through civil litigation. Through the public interest litigation mechanism, prosecuting authorities can proactively intervene, initiate lawsuits on behalf of public interests, and protect societal interests that cannot be effectively protected through private lawsuits, ensuring fairness and justice in the legal system. The involvement of prosecuting authorities legally safeguards these public interests from infringement, fostering social harmony and sustainable development.

## **3. The Current Situation and Issues of Intellectual Property Public Interest Litigation in China**

### **3.1 The Legal Status of Intellectual Property Protection**

#### **3.1.1 Current State of Intellectual Property Protection Legislation**

China has established a relatively comprehensive legal framework for intellectual property protection. Since the 1990s, China has gradually developed and implemented a series of laws, regulations, and rules covering various aspects such as patents, trademarks, copyrights, and trade secrets. In recent years, China has continued to adapt its laws to address intellectual property issues in emerging fields, such as intellectual property infringements in the internet environment and the protection of intellectual property related to artificial intelligence technologies. For example, the introduction of the "Regulations on the Protection of the Right to Network Communication" and the "Data Protection Law Draft" reflects China's ongoing progress in intellectual property protection.

#### **3.1.2 Current State of Judicial Protection of Intellectual Property**

In terms of judicial protection, China's intellectual property judicial system has gradually developed and formed a certain scale in recent years. Since the establishment of intellectual property courts in 2008, China has built a relatively efficient and specialized judicial system for handling intellectual property cases. Intellectual property courts have been set up in various cities across the country, with specialized judges managing relevant cases. These courts have provided more professional adjudication standards and judicial efficiency in intellectual property infringement cases.

However, despite certain achievements in intellectual property judicial protection, some pressing issues remain. First, the trial cycle for intellectual property cases tends to be long, especially in complex cases. Courts face a large backlog of cases, leading to delays in processing cases and making it difficult to meet society's demands for timely intellectual property protection. Second, due to differences in the expertise of judicial personnel, court rulings in some intellectual property cases may vary, especially in handling new types of intellectual property disputes, where judicial interpretations may not be sufficiently clear.

Furthermore, there is still room to improve the enforcement of intellectual property judicial protection in China. In some cases, despite favorable rulings for rights holders, infringement activities are not fully halted, and the enforcement of judgments remains weak. This is particularly evident in the insufficient fines and compensation amounts imposed on

infringers, especially in cross-border infringement cases where issues of jurisdiction across regions complicate enforcement. Additionally, the “regional differences” in intellectual property protection present a major issue in China’s judicial system. Courts in different regions may issue inconsistent judgments due to local protectionism, which undermines the uniformity and authority of judicial protection. Therefore, the judicial efficiency and authority of intellectual property protection still need further enhancement.

## **3.2 Main Issues in the Current Intellectual Property Public Interest Litigation System**

### **3.2.1 Practical Barriers to Public Interest Litigation**

Although the public interest litigation mechanism for intellectual property protection by prosecuting authorities has been initially established, numerous obstacles remain in its practical implementation. First, since intellectual property cases often involve complex technical issues, prosecuting authorities require specialized technical support and judicial expertise, making case investigation and handling more challenging. Many prosecuting authorities lack sufficient technical personnel and related professional knowledge, which results in an inability to provide adequate technical evidence during the case review process, thus affecting the outcome of the litigation.

Second, the nature of intellectual property cases means that infringements may be hidden and cross-regional, especially in the internet environment, where infringements often span multiple locations and fields. This limits the scope of investigation for prosecuting authorities, making it difficult to track and collect evidence. Due to the complexity of these cases, prosecuting authorities sometimes fail to detect infringements in a timely manner, further hindering the efficiency of public interest litigation.

Additionally, while public interest litigation is legally supported, its concept has not fully formed in judicial practice in some regions and cases. In certain areas, prosecuting authorities may not fully prioritize public interest litigation, resulting in a lower case filing rate. Furthermore, because public interest litigation concerns the public good, judgments in such cases may lead to significant social consequences, causing some prosecuting authorities to be more cautious in advancing these cases.

### **3.2.2 Challenges in Legal Application**

Legal application remains a major issue for public interest litigation in practice. The existing intellectual property legal system is still incomplete in some aspects, especially in the protection of intellectual property in emerging fields, where relevant laws and regulations are lagging behind. The scope of public interest litigation has not been entirely clarified. In intellectual property protection, it is still uncertain which cases constitute “public interest” violations and how to determine the applicability of public interest litigation. In particularly complex cases involving multiple stakeholders, the standards and conditions for public interest litigation are difficult to unify. The question of how prosecuting authorities and courts can accurately assess whether a case meets the conditions for public interest litigation remains an issue requiring further clarification. Additionally, the application of intellectual property law faces regional judicial discrepancies. In some regions, there may be inconsistencies in the judgment and application standards for intellectual property cases, leading to different legal opinions on the application of the law when handling similar cases, which further complicates the difficulty in applying the law.

### **3.2.3 Judicial Resource Allocation and Coordination Issues**

With the increasing number of intellectual property cases, issues regarding the allocation and coordination of judicial resources have become more apparent. First, prosecuting authorities, courts, and other judicial bodies face resource limitations, particularly in some regions where the volume of intellectual property cases is high but the professional capacity and technical support for handling them have not fully caught up. This results in pressure on judicial resources and delays in case processing. The coordination mechanism between prosecuting authorities and courts in public interest litigation is also not fully developed. Prosecuting authorities are responsible for initiating public interest litigation, while the courts handle the adjudication and rulings. Although the relationship between the two is theoretically cooperative, practical cooperation still faces barriers. For instance, when prosecuting authorities initiate public interest litigation, how to effectively communicate the focus of the case with the courts and maintain synchronization during the trial process are key factors influencing the efficiency of case handling.

## **4. International Models for Intellectual Property Public Interest Litigation**

### **4.1 The United States' Public Interest Litigation System for Intellectual Property**

The United States has established a relatively comprehensive prosecutorial function in the field of intellectual property protection, particularly in public interest protection. While the prosecuting authorities do not directly engage in public interest litigation in intellectual property cases, they often participate in such cases under different legal frameworks, representing the public interest.

#### **4.1.1 Role of Prosecuting Authorities in Intellectual Property Protection**

In the intellectual property field, the primary roles of the prosecuting authorities include:

Market supervision and enforcement to ensure compliance with intellectual property laws by businesses.

As representatives of the public interest, prosecuting authorities can intervene in cases that cannot be initiated by private parties, particularly in cases involving social fairness, public safety, and consumer interests. Through litigation or direct intervention, prosecuting authorities can help eliminate infringing activities that may have widespread negative impacts on society.

#### **4.1.2 U.S. Intellectual Property Litigation Mechanisms**

The U.S. intellectual property litigation mechanism is influential globally, especially in the practice of public interest litigation, offering valuable lessons for China. The U.S. system includes multiple levels of legal procedures and places significant emphasis on the protection of public interest.

**Cost-Sharing in Litigation:** The U.S. system particularly encourages reasonable procedures to resolve disputes by adopting the “loser pays” principle for litigation costs. This offers plaintiffs a greater incentive to pursue litigation, especially in public interest cases.

**Specialized Intellectual Property Courts:** Intellectual property cases are given special attention, especially in federal courts, where specialized intellectual property courts are in place. These courts possess high levels of professionalism and efficiency, allowing for swift and effective resolution of intellectual property disputes.

**Encouragement of Public Participation:** The U.S. judicial system encourages social organizations and consumers to participate in litigation, especially in large-scale infringement cases. Through collective litigation, both the interests of litigants and the public are effectively safeguarded, fully reflecting the social value of intellectual property.

### **4.2 Practices in the European Union and Other Countries**

#### **4.2.1 The European Union's Legal Framework for Intellectual Property Public Interest Litigation**

The European Union (EU) has established a relatively well-developed legal framework for intellectual property protection, particularly for the protection of public interest. While the EU does not have a specialized “intellectual property public interest litigation system,” its legal framework protects public interests through a coordinated approach across various laws and policies, particularly in cases of intellectual property infringement involving consumer rights, market fairness, and competition.

**EU Intellectual Property Protection Framework:** The EU relies on the “EU Intellectual Property Directive” and the “EU Intellectual Property Court Rules” for its intellectual property protection. These regulations cover multiple areas such as patents, trademarks, and copyrights, ensuring unified protection of intellectual property and providing effective litigation pathways for infringement cases.

**Cross-Border Infringement:** The EU emphasizes unified governance for cross-border infringement cases. For example, in large-scale intellectual property infringement actions, the EU encourages multinational cooperation and information sharing, establishing rapid-response mechanisms to ensure swift handling of cases.

**Promotion of Collective Litigation:** In cases of large-scale infringement of consumer rights or social public interests, the EU allows consumer associations, industry groups, and non-governmental organizations to file lawsuits on behalf of the public. This collective litigation mechanism allows the public, especially those who cannot individually afford litigation costs, to seek legal protection, further advancing the protection of public interests.

#### **4.2.2 Practices in Other Countries (Japan, South Korea)**

Japan: In Japan, while prosecuting authorities play a relatively minor role in intellectual property protection, the courts play a significant role. Intellectual property cases in Japan are typically resolved through civil litigation, but in major public interest cases, especially cross-border infringement cases, the courts allow government agencies or public institutions to act as “public litigants.” These institutions not only safeguard individual rights but also represent the collective interests of society, thus achieving public interest protection to some extent.

South Korea: Similar to Japan, South Korea’s prosecuting authorities have a role in intellectual property protection, though its public interest litigation system is not as widely implemented as in the U.S. and the EU. However, with the strengthening of intellectual property protection, South Korea is gradually enhancing the public interest litigation function. The legal system allows industry associations and consumer organizations to represent public interests in lawsuits, particularly in fields such as online copyright protection and patent infringement. South Korea’s intellectual property courts play an important role in addressing cases involving societal public interests.

These international examples highlight diverse approaches to intellectual property public interest litigation and offer useful lessons for improving China’s system, particularly in terms of enhancing public interest protection and improving coordination among judicial bodies.

## **5. The Construction of Intellectual Property Public Interest Litigation System in China**

### **5.1 Improving the Legal Framework**

#### **5.1.1 Clarifying the Functions and Responsibilities of Prosecuting Authorities**

To improve the intellectual property public interest litigation system in China, it is essential to clearly define the functions and responsibilities of prosecuting authorities at the legal level. According to current practice, the role of prosecuting authorities has expanded to include the protection of public interests, especially in the field of intellectual property protection, where prosecuting authorities are responsible for intervening in intellectual property infringement cases that involve public interest. Therefore, legislation should clearly outline the role of prosecuting authorities in intellectual property protection, particularly in public interest litigation. Prosecuting authorities should supervise intellectual property infringements, especially within administrative and judicial processes. They should play a legal oversight role to ensure that administrative bodies and courts act in strict accordance with the law when handling intellectual property cases. Prosecuting authorities can initiate public interest litigation on behalf of society when they detect intellectual property violations that harm public interests. Clarifying this function will help address intellectual property infringement cases involving widespread consumer interests, market order, and public benefits, filling the legal gap caused by difficulties in individual rights protection. Prosecuting authorities should play a coordinating role in multi-party cooperation, particularly in cross-regional or cross-border infringement cases, ensuring smooth case handling and enforcement through collaboration with local governments, judicial bodies, social organizations, and others.

#### **5.1.2 Defining the Scope of Application**

The first step in establishing the intellectual property public interest litigation mechanism in China is to provide institutional support at the legal level. In intellectual property public interest litigation, it is crucial to clearly define its scope of application. The prosecuting authorities’ qualification to file a lawsuit should be appropriately defined, focusing on areas where private rights holders lack the motivation to act. There should be a collaborative and mutually restrictive relationship with administrative enforcement agencies, creating a comprehensive and all-encompassing enforcement system. As representatives of the public interest, prosecuting authorities should only intervene in cases that meet the conditions for public interest litigation to ensure the efficient use of legal resources. The following aspects should be clarified regarding the types of cases suitable for public interest litigation:

**Cases Involving Broad Public Interest:** Prosecuting authorities should focus on intervening in intellectual property infringement cases that affect the overall public interest, such as large-scale violations of copyrights, patents, trademarks, etc., especially cross-regional or cross-border infringement cases. Such violations often have severe impacts on market order, consumer interests, and the innovation environment, making it necessary for prosecuting authorities to act proactively.

**Cases That Individuals or Enterprises Cannot Independently Pursue:** In many intellectual property cases, the injured party

may be unable to file a lawsuit due to economic costs, information asymmetry, or other reasons. Particularly in cases involving consumer rights or the interests of small and medium-sized enterprises, prosecuting authorities should intervene through public interest litigation when these parties are unable to protect their rights independently, ensuring the protection of their legitimate interests.

**Cases Involving Major Social Issues:** Prosecuting authorities should pay special attention to intellectual property infringement cases that concern social credibility and public safety, such as counterfeit products and pirated software. These infringements not only violate intellectual property rights but also harm consumer safety and public interest, warranting legal action through public interest litigation.

**Cases Affecting Economic Order and National Security:** Serious intellectual property violations, such as transnational piracy and counterfeiting, may have a profound impact on national economic security, technological innovation, and industrial development. Prosecuting authorities should intervene in these cases, as authorized by law, to protect national interests from being infringed upon.

## **5.2 Optimizing the Function Allocation of Prosecuting Authorities**

### **5.2.1 Building Specialized Teams**

To improve the efficiency and professionalism of prosecuting authorities in intellectual property public interest litigation, the construction of specialized teams is crucial. Intellectual property cases involve complex legal and technical issues, requiring prosecuting authorities to have professionals, particularly legal experts with a background in intellectual property law and technology, to accurately identify infringements, effectively gather evidence, and conduct litigation activities in compliance with the law. Prosecuting authorities should strengthen their technical and legal capabilities by recruiting professionals with expertise in intellectual property law, such as judges and lawyers, and fostering a specialized workforce. Additionally, internal training mechanisms should be established to provide regular training on intellectual property law for existing prosecutors, enhancing their ability to handle complex cases. Beyond legal talent, prosecuting authorities should form cross-disciplinary teams based on the specific needs of cases. These teams should include experts from fields such as intellectual property, information technology, economics, and market regulation, so that during the case review process, they can offer technical support and policy advice, ensuring comprehensive analysis from multiple perspectives.

### **5.2.2 Improving the Judicial Coordination Mechanism**

Coordination between prosecuting authorities, courts, administrative agencies, industry associations, and other parties is vital in intellectual property public interest litigation. Establishing and improving judicial coordination mechanisms ensures smooth and efficient case handling while avoiding conflicts of interest and resource waste. Prosecuting authorities should maintain close contact with the courts and establish information-sharing and case-coordination mechanisms. For instance, during the prosecution stage, prosecuting authorities can provide legal opinions to the courts, ensuring that the courts consider the public interest aspect of the case thoroughly during the review process. Additionally, prosecutors and courts should jointly discuss legal issues in the case, ensuring that the ruling maximally protects public interest. Given that intellectual property infringement cases may involve multiple domains, prosecuting authorities should also collaborate with other relevant departments, such as the police and customs. For cases involving cross-border infringement, prosecuting authorities should cooperate with international judicial bodies and foreign trade departments to facilitate the handling of such cases and prevent the spread of infringement. Prosecuting authorities should also actively guide social organizations and the public to participate in intellectual property protection. In public interest litigation, consumer associations, industry groups, and other social organizations can become supporters and partners of cases, assisting prosecuting authorities in collecting evidence and providing background information. Through this mechanism, prosecuting authorities can better reflect the power of social supervision and public participation, strengthening the social impact of intellectual property protection.

## **5.3 Strengthening the Standardization of Judicial Practice**

### **5.3.1 Issuance and Implementation of Judicial Interpretations**

To strengthen the standardization of judicial practice, it is essential to issue and implement relevant judicial interpretations that clarify the legal application and procedural requirements for intellectual property public interest litigation. Judicial

interpretations help unify the standards for legal application and guide the review of specific cases, especially in complex intellectual property cases, where they play a crucial role. The Supreme People's Court and the Supreme People's Procuratorate should jointly issue targeted judicial interpretations that address common legal issues and practical challenges in intellectual property public interest litigation. For example, issues such as how to determine whether an intellectual property infringement involves public interest, which cases qualify for public interest litigation, and how to define "significant social impact" in a case should be clearly addressed in judicial interpretations. These explanations will unify the standards applied by courts and prosecuting authorities, ensuring consistency in the application of the law during case reviews and litigation. Additionally, judicial interpretations should outline procedural requirements for public interest litigation, specifying the process for initiating a lawsuit, burden of proof, case filing conditions, and other procedural details. For instance, clarifying the evidence standards required for initiating public interest litigation, the cooperation mechanisms with relevant administrative departments, and timelines for case proceedings would standardize the entire litigation process and improve litigation efficiency.

### **5.3.2 Guiding Role of Typical Cases**

In judicial practice, the summary and promotion of typical cases play an important role in standardizing judicial behavior and unifying judgment standards. Typical cases not only provide guidance for handling similar cases but also demonstrate the correct application of legal principles through their example. Prosecuting authorities and courts should select representative intellectual property public interest litigation cases as typical cases for summarization and publication based on actual judgments. These typical cases should meet the following characteristics:

They involve public interest, demonstrating the substantive impact of public interest litigation.

They present significant legal application issues that provide high-value guidance.

The case review process is typical and offers practical references for other similar cases.

By publishing typical cases, courts and prosecutors can quickly understand the approach and standards for handling cases, offering clear judicial guidance to parties involved and the general public. The publication of typical cases helps unify standards for case handling and aids lower courts and prosecuting authorities in better understanding and applying the law. This is particularly important in cases involving complex technical issues or cross-regional matters, where typical cases can provide judgment references for lower courts, reducing arbitrariness and discrepancies in judicial practice. Additionally, the study and citation of typical cases help enhance the competence and professional expertise of prosecuting authorities in intellectual property public interest litigation, ultimately improving the quality of judicial practices in these cases.

## **5.4 Promoting Public Participation and Public Opinion Supervision**

### **5.4.1 Enhancing Public Awareness of Intellectual Property**

Improving public awareness of intellectual property is a crucial foundation for strengthening intellectual property public interest litigation. Public legal awareness, knowledge of intellectual property protection, and sensitivity to infringements directly impact the social environment for intellectual property protection. Raising public awareness of intellectual property helps create a positive social atmosphere, thus providing strong support for the advancement of intellectual property public interest litigation. Governments, prosecuting authorities, and social organizations should promote basic intellectual property knowledge through various channels, especially through education, media dissemination, and public campaigns, to increase public recognition of intellectual property. For example, schools can offer courses on intellectual property basics, and media outlets can raise public awareness of infringement by reporting typical intellectual property cases. Additionally, prosecuting and judicial authorities can collaborate to host public awareness campaigns and lectures on intellectual property, informing more people about the legal protections for intellectual property and the legal consequences and societal harm of infringements. By explaining the role of intellectual property in driving national economic, technological, and social cultural development, the public will be guided to understand that protecting intellectual property is a responsibility shared by society, not just a personal matter for businesses or creators. Especially in the context of the cultural industry, technological innovation, and the information age, the public should recognize that intellectual property protection is not only a matter of respecting individual creators but also an effective safeguard for social innovation.



### 5.4.2 Strengthening the Supervisory Role of Media and Social Organizations

Media and social organizations play a significant role in the supervision of intellectual property protection. They provide societal support for intellectual property public interest litigation, raise awareness of intellectual property protection, and promote judicial fairness and transparency. The media, as a key guide for public opinion, has an especially important role in enhancing intellectual property awareness, exposing infringing activities, and advancing judicial fairness. The media can increase the social impact of intellectual property cases by reporting typical cases, highlighting the societal harm caused by infringements. In major intellectual property cases or those with widespread societal impact, media outlets can generate broad public attention by offering timely news coverage and special discussions, creating significant public pressure that encourages relevant departments to take action. Furthermore, the media can also play a role in popularizing intellectual property knowledge by interviewing experts, publishing informative articles, and improving public awareness of intellectual property protection. Social organizations, such as consumer protection associations, industry associations, and cultural and creative industry associations, can represent public interests and act as a source of social supervision and rights protection. These organizations can help prosecuting authorities identify intellectual property infringement cases that involve public interest and provide support and cooperation during case progression. For example, social organizations can offer evidence for intellectual property public interest litigation, participate in the public evaluation of cases, and help expand the public impact of the cases. By collaborating with prosecuting authorities, social organizations can strengthen the supervision of intellectual property infringements and promote public opinion in favor of protecting intellectual property.

## 6. Conclusion

Establishing a well-developed public interest litigation system for intellectual property prosecution will not only enhance the effectiveness of intellectual property protection in China but also contribute to the construction of the rule of law and the promotion of justice and fairness in society. With the continued improvement of the legal framework and the active participation of all sectors of society, China's intellectual property protection system is expected to achieve more efficient and comprehensive coverage in the future, thereby driving social innovation and high-quality economic development.

## Funding

no

## Conflict of Interests

The author(s) declare(s) that there is no conflict of interest regarding the publication of this paper.

## References

- [1] Li, J. Z., & Zhou, X. W. (2023). The construction of the intellectual property public interest litigation mechanism in prosecutorial authorities. *Journal of Chongqing University of Technology (Social Sciences)*, 37(12), 118-128.
- [2] Li, F. F., & Xiao, Q. X. (2023). The development path of intellectual property public interest litigation in the digital economy era. *People's Procuratorate*, (03), 56-59.
- [3] Zhu, Y. (2023). A study on the prosecutorial public interest litigation system for intellectual property. North China University of Technology.
- [4] Du, A. X. (2021). The application of the prosecutorial public interest litigation mechanism for public domain intellectual property protection. *People's Procuratorate*, (12), 61-63.
- [5] Li, J. Z., & Zhou, X. W. (2023). The construction of the intellectual property public interest litigation mechanism in prosecutorial authorities. *Journal of Chongqing University of Technology (Social Sciences)*, 37(12), 118-128.
- [6] Jiang, W. (2022). Focusing on antitrust: New pathways for intellectual property public interest litigation in prosecutorial authorities. *Chinese Prosecutor*, (05), 72-76.