VOLUME 5 | ISSUE 3

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF ADVANCED LEGAL RESEARCH

EXPANDING HORIZONS OF ARTICLE 21

- Prakrit Aneja[1] & Dr Sheeba Ahad[2]

1. Right to Privacy: Puttaswamy Judgment

The landmark judgment in Justice K.S. Puttaswamy (Retd.) v. Union of India marked a transformative moment in Indian constitutional law by recognizing the right to privacy as an integral component of the right to life and personal liberty under Article 21. This decision emerged in response to growing concerns over the state's increasing reliance on data collection, surveillance, and potential intrusions into personal spaces. Delivered by a nine-judge bench of the Supreme Court, the ruling unanimously affirmed that privacy is not merely a statutory right but a fundamental right that ensures individual dignity, autonomy, and freedom.[3]

1.1 Background of the Case

The case originated when Justice K.S. Puttaswamy, a retired High Court judge, filed a petition challenging the constitutional validity of the Aadhaar scheme. The petitioner contended that the Aadhaar scheme's mandatory biometric data collection infringed upon citizens' right to privacy. The Union government, however, argued that since the right to privacy had never been expressly recognized as a fundamental right, no such violation could be claimed.

This contention drew heavily from two earlier Supreme Court rulings — M.P. Sharma v. Satish Chandra and Kharak Singh v. State of U.P. — where the Court had denied privacy the status of a fundamental right. The Union government relied on these precedents to assert that privacy was not independently protected under the Indian Constitution. Consequently, the question before the Supreme Court was whether privacy could be interpreted as an inherent part of Article 21.[4]

---

[1] Student at Amity Law School, Noida

[2] Assistant Professor at Amity Law School, Noida

[3] H.M. Seervai, Constitutional Law of India: A Critical Commentary, 4th ed. (Universal Law Publishing 2015).

[4] M.P. Jain, Indian Constitutional Law, 8th ed. (LexisNexis 2018).

1.2 The Judgment and Key Observations

In its historic ruling, the Supreme Court emphatically declared that the right to privacy is intrinsic to the right to life and is essential for safeguarding individual dignity, autonomy, and liberty. The judgment identified several key aspects of privacy that deserve protection:

Bodily Autonomy: The Court recognized an individual's right to control their body, which extends to personal health decisions, sexual autonomy, and reproductive rights.

Informational Privacy: The judgment highlighted the need to protect individuals from unauthorized access to their personal information, especially in the digital age where data breaches and surveillance pose significant risks.

Decisional Autonomy: The Court affirmed that individuals have the right to make personal decisions regarding intimate matters such as marriage, procreation, and lifestyle without state interference.

The judgment introduced the three-fold test for determining the legitimacy of privacy infringements. For any state action restricting privacy to be valid, it must satisfy the following conditions:

Legality: The infringement must be backed by a valid law.

Necessity: The measure must pursue a legitimate state aim.

Proportionality: The restriction must be proportionate to the objective it seeks to achieve, ensuring minimal intrusion.[5]

By establishing these principles, the Court set a higher standard for government actions that encroach upon citizens' personal freedoms. Justice D.Y. Chandrachud, in his detailed opinion, emphasized that the right to privacy is inseparable from human dignity and that personal freedom cannot be fragmented or limited by outdated interpretations of constitutional rights.

1.3 Impact on Indian Jurisprudence

The Puttaswamy judgment significantly influenced Indian constitutional and human rights discourse. Its impact extended across several domains:

[5] Granville Austin, The Indian Constitution: Cornerstone of a Nation (Oxford University Press 1999).

Data Protection and Digital Privacy: The judgment catalyzed the demand for comprehensive legislation to safeguard personal data. The Court underscored the importance of creating strong data protection frameworks to prevent misuse of personal information.

LGBTQ+ Rights and Personal Liberty: The recognition of privacy as a constitutional right played a pivotal role in subsequent rulings, such as the Navtej Singh Johar v. Union of India judgment, which decriminalized same-sex relationships by reading down Section 377 of the IPC.

Reproductive Rights and Bodily Autonomy: The judgment reinforced an individual's right to make autonomous decisions regarding their body, thereby strengthening reproductive rights and healthcare freedom.

Moreover, the ruling had a significant bearing on surveillance laws, compelling authorities to ensure that data collection practices adhere to the three-fold test for privacy protection.

1.4 Significance in the Digital Age

In an increasingly digital society, the Puttaswamy judgment established critical safeguards for individual rights against intrusive technologies. The judgment recognized that emerging tools such as Big Data, Artificial Intelligence, and biometric surveillance pose unprecedented risks to privacy. By emphasizing informational privacy, the Court acknowledged that digital footprints, online behavior, and personal data must be protected from unauthorized access and exploitation.

The ruling also spurred discussions on the need for a dedicated Data Protection Law in India. The subsequent enactment of the Digital Personal Data Protection Act, 2023 reflects the Supreme Court’s guidance in ensuring citizens' data is handled with consent-driven frameworks and transparent policies.

The Puttaswamy judgment reaffirmed the Indian judiciary’s evolving commitment to protecting constitutional liberties in changing social, political, and technological landscapes. By embedding the right to privacy within Article 21, the Supreme Court safeguarded citizens against emerging threats to autonomy and dignity. This landmark ruling not only extended the scope of Article 21 but also reaffirmed India's constitutional ethos — one that prioritizes individual freedoms while balancing the state’s regulatory powers.

2. Right to Clean Environment and Sustainable Development

The right to a clean environment has emerged as a significant extension of Article 21 through progressive judicial interpretation. The Supreme Court of India has consistently recognized environmental protection as essential to ensuring the right to life and personal liberty. The Court has linked environmental rights to sustainable development, balancing ecological conservation with developmental needs.

2.1 Judicial Evolution of the Right to a Clean Environment

The recognition of environmental rights within the ambit of Article 21 began with landmark judicial interventions. In Rural Litigation and Entitlement Kendra v. State of Uttar Pradesh, the Supreme Court addressed environmental degradation caused by limestone mining in the Dehradun valley. The Court emphasized that environmental harm directly affects citizens' quality of life and thus violates their right to life under Article 21.[6] This marked the beginning of environmental rights being interpreted as fundamental rights.

Subsequently, in M.C. Mehta v. Union of India, the Supreme Court played a pivotal role in promoting environmental protection. The Court issued directions for pollution control, improved waste management, and the relocation of hazardous industries. The judgment emphasized that environmental protection is not just a statutory obligation but also a constitutional duty linked to the right to life.[7]

In Subhash Kumar v. State of Bihar, the Supreme Court declared that the right to pollution-free air and water is a fundamental right under Article 21. The Court held that industrial operations causing environmental degradation are liable to be regulated to safeguard public health.

2.2 Sustainable Development as a Constitutional Mandate

The principle of sustainable development has been increasingly incorporated into Indian environmental jurisprudence. The Supreme Court adopted the precautionary principle, the polluter pays principle, and the intergenerational equity concept to strike a balance between environmental conservation and economic growth.

---

[6] P. Leelakrishnan, Environmental Law in India, 5th ed. (LexisNexis 2020).

[7] Shyam Divan & Armin Rosencranz, Environmental Law and Policy in India: Cases, Materials and Statutes, 3rd ed. (Oxford University Press 2018).

In Vellore Citizens' Welfare Forum v. Union of India, the Supreme Court explicitly recognized sustainable development as an integral part of Indian law. The Court affirmed that developmental activities must not compromise environmental stability and directed industries to adopt cleaner technologies.

The Taj Trapezium Case further reinforced this approach, where the Supreme Court mandated the closure of several polluting industries near the Taj Mahal to prevent environmental damage to the historic monument. The Court emphasized that industrial expansion must comply with ecological sustainability norms.

2.3 Environmental Impact Assessment and Public Participation

The Supreme Court has also emphasized the significance of public participation in environmental decision-making. In Narmada Bachao Andolan v. Union of India, the Court ruled that large-scale developmental projects must undergo proper Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) to mitigate adverse environmental effects. The judgment reinforced the need for community involvement in environmental governance, ensuring transparency and accountability.[8]

2.4 Expanding Scope in the Digital Age

The emergence of digital technologies and data-driven environmental monitoring has further expanded the understanding of environmental rights. Digital tools such as Geographic Information Systems (GIS), satellite imaging, and AI-driven environmental forecasting are now crucial in tracking ecological changes and ensuring proactive environmental governance.

The judiciary's proactive approach in interpreting Article 21 has firmly established the right to a clean environment as a fundamental right. By emphasizing environmental protection, pollution control, and sustainable development, the Supreme Court has ensured that ecological conservation remains central to India's constitutional framework. This expansive interpretation reflects the Court's commitment to ensuring environmental justice and improving citizens' quality of life.

[8] V.R. Krishna Iyer, Environment and Development: Justice, Governance and Sustainability, 2nd ed. (Universal Law Publishing 2021).

3. Right to Livelihood, Shelter, and Dignity

The expansive interpretation of Article 21 has led to the recognition of the right to livelihood, shelter, and dignity as essential components of the right to life. The Supreme Court of India has consistently interpreted these rights as fundamental to ensuring a life of basic human dignity and security. Through landmark judgments, the judiciary has emphasized that mere animal existence is not sufficient under Article 21; rather, individuals are entitled to a life of quality, which includes access to basic needs such as employment, housing, and personal dignity.

3.1 Right to Livelihood

The right to livelihood was explicitly recognized in the case of Olga Tellis v. Bombay Municipal Corporation. In this landmark judgment, the Supreme Court ruled that the right to livelihood is an integral part of the right to life under Article 21.[9] The Court emphasized that evicting pavement dwellers without providing alternate accommodation would deprive them of their means of survival, violating their fundamental rights. This judgment expanded the scope of Article 21 to include the economic rights necessary for maintaining human dignity.

In D.K. Yadav v. J.M.A. Industries Ltd., the Court reinforced this stance by stating that the right to livelihood is inseparable from the right to life, and no individual can be deprived of employment without just and fair procedures.The decision emphasized the importance of due process in employment terminations, ensuring protection against arbitrary dismissal.

3.2 Right to Shelter

The Supreme Court has consistently recognized the right to shelter as a fundamental aspect of Article 21. In Shantistar Builders v. Narayan Khimalal Totame, the Court held that adequate shelter is essential for a dignified life and must include access to basic amenities like clean water, sanitation, and electricity[10] The judgment emphasized that housing is more than a physical structure; it is essential for maintaining family life, social stability, and security.

---

[9] M.P. Jain, Indian Constitutional Law, 8th ed. (LexisNexis 2021).

[10] V.N. Shukla, Constitution of India, 13th ed. (Eastern Book Company 2020).

Similarly, in Chameli Singh v. State of Uttar Pradesh, the Court observed that the right to shelter is a constitutional right, and the State has an obligation to ensure access to affordable housing, especially for marginalized and disadvantaged groups.The ruling reinforced the idea that shelter is fundamental to achieving human dignity and social justice.

3.3 Right to Dignity

The right to dignity has become a cornerstone of Article 21 jurisprudence. The Supreme Court in Francis Coralie Mullin v. Administrator, Union Territory of Delhi held that the right to life is not merely limited to physical existence but extends to ensuring a life with dignity, including access to education, healthcare, and basic human freedoms.[11]

In National Legal Services Authority v. Union of India, the Court recognized the rights of transgender persons and upheld their right to dignity, privacy, and identity. This progressive judgment underscored that human dignity is inherent and cannot be denied based on gender, identity, or social status.

3.4 Socio-Economic Dimensions and Policy Implications

The expansion of Article 21 has had significant implications for social welfare policies in India. Landmark cases have led to directives for government action in areas like housing schemes, employment security, and welfare benefits. For instance, the Court's emphasis on the right to food in the PUCL v. Union of India case led to enhanced accountability in implementing public distribution systems and social welfare initiatives.[12]

The Indian judiciary's proactive interpretation of Article 21 has played a crucial role in recognizing the right to livelihood, shelter, and dignity as indispensable to living a life of quality. By linking these socio-economic rights to the right to life, the Supreme Court has ensured that constitutional protection extends to fundamental aspects of human welfare. This transformative approach reflects the Court’s commitment to upholding social justice, equality, and human dignity.

---

[11] · S.P. Sathe, Judicial Activism in India: Transgressing Borders and Enforcing Limits, 2nd ed. (Oxford University Press 2018).
· · ·

[12] Rajeev Dhavan, Human Rights and Constitutional Law in India, 2nd ed. (Butterworths 2019).

4. Socio-Economic Rights under Article 21

The evolution of Article 21 has expanded its scope to encompass a wide range of socio-economic rights, reinforcing the Indian judiciary's role in ensuring access to essential services and improving quality of life. While traditionally regarded as a negative right — protecting individuals from State action — Article 21 has been interpreted to include positive obligations on the State to safeguard socio-economic entitlements. This progressive interpretation reflects a transformative shift, ensuring that the Constitution addresses broader issues of social justice and welfare.

4.1 Right to Health

The Supreme Court has interpreted the right to health as an essential component of the right to life under Article 21. In Parmanand Katara v. Union of India, the Court held that medical professionals are duty-bound to provide emergency medical care regardless of the victim's socio-economic status or procedural formalities. This ruling emphasized that access to immediate healthcare is a fundamental right, placing a positive obligation on the State to ensure medical facilities are adequately accessible.

Similarly, in State of Punjab v. Mohinder Singh Chawla, the Court affirmed that the State is constitutionally responsible for ensuring the provision of affordable healthcare to its citizens.[13] This interpretation has resulted in judicial interventions aimed at improving public health systems, including directives to enhance hospital infrastructure and ensure access to essential medicines.

4.2 Right to Education

The right to education has been recognized as vital to achieving social equality and individual empowerment. In the landmark case of Unni Krishnan v. State of Andhra Pradesh, the Supreme Court held that the right to education is an integral aspect of Article 21 and directed the State to ensure access to primary education for all children.

The principles laid down in this case eventually led to the enactment of the Right of Children to Free and Compulsory Education Act, 2009, which guarantees free primary education for children aged 6 to 14. This marked a significant step in

[13] H.M. Seervai, Constitutional Law of India: A Critical Commentary, 4th ed. (Universal Law Publishing 2019).

translating constitutional principles into legislative mandates that promote social welfare.

4.3 Right to Food and Nutrition

The right to food has been interpreted as a core aspect of the right to life. In People's Union for Civil Liberties (PUCL) v. Union of India, the Supreme Court addressed issues of hunger and malnutrition, directing the government to implement welfare schemes such as the Mid-Day Meal Scheme, Public Distribution System (PDS), and Integrated Child Development Services (ICDS).[14] This judgment played a critical role in shaping India's food security framework, emphasizing the State's duty to provide essential nutrition to its citizens.

4.4 Right to Employment and Social Security

The Supreme Court has also linked the right to employment and social security with Article 21. In Bandhua Mukti Morcha v. Union of India, the Court held that bonded laborers must be provided with rehabilitation, access to healthcare, and education for their children to ensure a life of dignity.

Additionally, in M.C. Mehta v. State of Tamil Nadu, the Court recognized the right to protection from hazardous employment, particularly for children working in unsafe industries, reinforcing the need for labor welfare initiatives.

4.5 Right to Water and Sanitation

The right to clean water and sanitation has been interpreted as a fundamental part of the right to life. In A.P. Pollution Control Board v. M.V. Nayudu, the Court emphasized the State's duty to ensure access to clean drinking water, recognizing it as indispensable to human survival and dignity.The ruling emphasized that environmental protection and public health are interconnected, forming part of the broader socio-economic rights guaranteed by Article 21.

The judicial expansion of Article 21 has played a crucial role in bridging the gap between civil-political rights and socio-economic rights. By recognizing healthcare, education, food security, and employment as indispensable to the right to life, Indian courts have ensured that constitutional protections translate into tangible

[14] Durga Das Basu, Commentary on the Constitution of India, Vol. 3, 9th ed. (LexisNexis 2021).

improvements in citizens' welfare. This transformative approach reflects the dynamic nature of Indian constitutionalism, aligning the fundamental right to life with the principles of social justice and equitable development.