VOLUME 6 | ISSUE 4

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF ADVANCED LEGAL RESEARCH

PASSIVE EUTHANASIA IN INDIA: A LEGAL ANALYSIS OF JUDICIAL DEVELOPMENTS

- Jaya Singh[1]

ABSTRACT

The issue of euthanasia raises complex questions relating to law, ethics, medicine, and human rights. It concerns the circumstances in which a person suffering from severe and irreversible medical conditions may be allowed to end their life in order to escape unbearable pain and suffering. Across the world, different jurisdictions have adopted varying approaches toward euthanasia, ranging from complete prohibition to carefully regulated legalization. In India, the legal position regarding euthanasia has evolved primarily through judicial interpretation rather than legislative enactment.

The constitutional debate surrounding euthanasia focuses on Article 21 of the Constitution of India, which guarantees the right to life and personal liberty. The central question before the courts has been whether the right to life includes the right to die with dignity in situations where life is artificially prolonged by medical technology despite the absence of any realistic chance of recovery. Over the years, the Supreme Court of India has gradually developed a legal framework addressing this issue through a series of landmark judgments.

The decision in *Gian Kaur v. State of Punjab* clarified that the Constitution does not recognize a general right to die but acknowledged that the right to life includes the right to die with dignity in cases of terminal illness. Later, in *Aruna Ramchandra Shanbaug v. Union of India*, the Supreme Court recognized passive euthanasia under strict procedural safeguards. The Constitution Bench judgment in *Common Cause v. Union of India* further strengthened this framework by recognizing advance medical directives or living wills as an expression of

[1]Student at Amity University Law School, Lucknow.

For general queries or to submit your research for publication, kindly email us at ijalr.editorial@gmail.com

https://www.ijalr.in/

personal autonomy. More recently, the decision in *Harish Rana v. Union of India* demonstrated the practical implementation of passive euthanasia principles within the Indian legal system.

This research paper examines the evolution of euthanasia jurisprudence in India through a detailed analysis of these landmark cases. It also discusses ethical debates, international perspectives, and the continuing need for a comprehensive legislative framework governing end-of-life medical decisions.

Keywords: *Passive Euthanasia, Right to Die with Dignity, Article 21 of the Constitution of India, Living Will, Judicial Interpretation, End-of-Life Decisions, Medical Ethics, Constitutional Law, Human Dignity, Indian Supreme Court.*

Introduction

The concept of euthanasia has been a subject of legal, ethical, and philosophical debate for centuries. With the advancement of modern medical science, it has become possible to prolong human life through sophisticated technologies such as ventilators, artificial feeding tubes, and other life-support systems. While these developments have significantly improved healthcare and increased survival rates, they have also created complex dilemmas concerning the continuation of medical treatment in situations where patients suffer from irreversible medical conditions and have little or no possibility of recovery. In such circumstances, difficult questions arise regarding whether individuals should have the right to refuse life-sustaining treatment and whether the law should permit medical professionals to withdraw such treatment when continued medical intervention only prolongs suffering without any realistic hope of improvement.

The term euthanasia is derived from the Greek words *eu*, meaning "good," and *thanatos*, meaning "death." Literally translated, euthanasia means "good death." In the medical and legal context, it refers to the practice of intentionally ending the life of a person who is suffering from severe illness or terminal conditions in order to relieve pain and suffering. Euthanasia may take various forms, including active euthanasia, which involves directly causing the death of a patient, and passive euthanasia, which involves withholding or

withdrawing life-sustaining medical treatment and allowing the patient to die naturally. Despite the humanitarian arguments supporting euthanasia, the concept remains highly controversial because it requires balancing two fundamental values: the sanctity of human life and the autonomy of individuals to make decisions concerning their own bodies, dignity, and medical treatment.

In India, the legal debate surrounding euthanasia has largely been shaped by judicial interpretation rather than comprehensive legislative enactment. The central constitutional provision involved in this debate is Article 21 of the Constitution of India, which guarantees the right to life and personal liberty. Over the years, the Supreme Court of India has interpreted Article 21 broadly to include several essential aspects of human dignity, such as the right to privacy, the right to health, and the right to live with dignity. Consequently, an important question emerged before the judiciary: whether the right to life under Article 21 could also include the right to die with dignity, particularly in cases where life is artificially prolonged by medical intervention despite the absence of any meaningful possibility of recovery.

Through a series of landmark judgments such as *Gian Kaur v. State of Punjab*, *Aruna Ramchandra Shanbaug v. Union of India*, and *Common Cause v. Union of India*, the Supreme Court gradually developed the legal framework governing passive euthanasia in India. These decisions reflect the judiciary's attempt to reconcile constitutional principles, medical ethics, and humanitarian considerations in addressing the complex issue of end-of-life care. By recognizing the importance of dignity in the process of dying, the courts have sought to balance the protection of life with respect for individual autonomy and compassion toward those facing irreversible medical suffering.

Meaning and Types of Euthanasia

Euthanasia refers to the deliberate act of ending a person's life to relieve suffering caused by serious illness or incurable medical conditions. The concept is closely related to issues of medical ethics, human dignity, and personal autonomy. In legal discourse, euthanasia is generally classified into different categories based on the manner in which death is caused and the level of consent involved.

The most common distinction is between active euthanasia and passive euthanasia.

Active euthanasia involves taking deliberate action to cause the death of a patient. This may include administering a lethal injection or providing medication intended to end life. In most legal systems, including India, active euthanasia is considered a criminal offense because it involves direct participation in causing death.

Passive euthanasia, on the other hand, involves withholding or withdrawing medical treatment that prolongs life. Instead of actively causing death, passive euthanasia allows the patient to die naturally by discontinuing life-sustaining medical interventions such as ventilators, artificial feeding, or resuscitation measures.

Another important distinction is between voluntary, non-voluntary, and involuntary euthanasia. Voluntary euthanasia occurs when the patient consents to the termination of life. Non-voluntary euthanasia takes place when the patient is unable to express consent due to medical incapacity. Involuntary euthanasia occurs when the patient's life is ended without consent despite the ability to express a preference.

In India, passive euthanasia has been recognized under specific circumstances by judicial decisions, while active euthanasia remains illegal. The legal acceptance of passive euthanasia reflects the recognition that forcing a person to continue living in a state of extreme suffering may violate the dignity guaranteed under the Constitution.

Constitutional Framework

The legal debate surrounding euthanasia in India is closely connected to the interpretation of the Constitution of India, particularly the fundamental rights guaranteed under Part III. The most significant constitutional provision in this context is Article 21 of the Constitution of India, which states that no person shall be deprived of life or personal liberty except according to the procedure established by law. Over time, the Supreme Court has interpreted Article 21 in a broad and progressive manner, recognizing that the right to life does not merely refer to physical survival but also includes the right to live with dignity, autonomy,

and respect. This interpretation has allowed the judiciary to address complex issues related to medical treatment, bodily integrity, and end-of-life decisions.

The constitutional interpretation of euthanasia first came before the Supreme Court in *Gian Kaur v. State of Punjab*. In this case, the Court examined the relationship between the right to life under Article 21 and the criminal provisions relating to suicide under Section 309 of the Indian Penal Code and Section 306 of the Indian Penal Code. The Court held that the right to life does not include the right to die. However, it acknowledged that the concept of dignity extends to the natural process of dying, which later influenced discussions on passive euthanasia.

The constitutional framework developed further in *Aruna Ramchandra Shanbaug v. Union of India*, where the Supreme Court recognized passive euthanasia under specific safeguards. The Court emphasized that decisions regarding withdrawal of life support must respect the dignity and best interests of the patient while ensuring judicial oversight.

The framework was significantly expanded in *Common Cause v. Union of India*, where a Constitution Bench held that the right to die with dignity is a part of Article 21**.** The Court also recognized the validity of living wills or advance medical directives, allowing individuals to decide in advance whether they wish to receive life-prolonging medical treatment in situations where recovery is unlikely. These judicial interpretations have collectively shaped the constitutional approach to passive euthanasia in India.

Case Analysis: *Gian Kaur v. State of Punjab* (1996)

Facts of the Case

The case of *Gian Kaur v. State of Punjab* arose from a criminal prosecution under Section 306 of the Indian Penal Code, which deals with the abetment of suicide. The appellants, GianKaur and her husband Harbans Singh, were accused of abetting the suicide of their daughter-in-law. They were convicted by the trial court and the conviction was upheld by the High Court. The accused challenged the constitutional validity of Section 306, arguing that it violated the fundamental right to life guaranteed under Article 21 of the Constitution.

The petitioners relied on the earlier judgment of *P. Rathinam v. Union of India*, where the Supreme Court had held that the right to life includes the right not to live, thereby recognizing a right to die.

Issues

The Supreme Court considered the following key legal issues:

1. Whether the right to life under Article 21 includes the right to die.
2. Whether Section 306 of the Indian Penal Code, which criminalizes abetment of suicide, violates the fundamental rights guaranteed under the Constitution.
3. Whether the earlier decision in *P. Rathinam v. Union of India* was correctly decided.

Judgment

The Supreme Court overruled the decision in *P. Rathinam* and held that the right to life under Article 21 does not include the right to die. The Court observed that life is a natural right, whereas suicide represents an unnatural termination of life. Therefore, the Constitution cannot be interpreted as granting individuals the right to end their lives.

However, the Court made an important observation by stating that the right to life includes the right to live with dignity, and this dignity also extends to the natural process of dying. The Court noted that in cases involving terminal illness or situations where death is inevitable, the process of dying should not involve unnecessary suffering. This observation later became the constitutional basis for recognizing passive euthanasia.

Case Analysis: *Aruna Ramchandra Shanbaug v. Union of India* (2011)

Facts of the Case

The case of *Aruna Ramchandra Shanbaug v. Union of India* involved one of the most tragic medical situations in Indian legal history. Aruna Shanbaug was a nurse working at King Edward Memorial Hospital in Mumbai. In 1973, she was assaulted and strangled with a dog

chain by a hospital ward boy. The attack caused severe brain damage that left her in a persistent vegetative state for several decades.

Journalist Pinki Virani filed a petition before the Supreme Court requesting permission to withdraw life support for Aruna Shanbaug and allow her to die peacefully through euthanasia.

Issues

The Court considered several significant legal questions:

1. Whether euthanasia should be legalized in India.
2. Whether passive euthanasia could be permitted in certain circumstances.
3. Whether a third party (such as a friend or activist) can request euthanasia on behalf of a patient who is incapable of expressing consent.

Judgment

The Supreme Court rejected the request to withdraw life support in Aruna Shanbaug's case because the hospital staff caring for her opposed the decision and believed she should continue receiving treatment.

However, the Court recognized passive euthanasia under certain conditions. It held that withdrawing life support could be permitted in exceptional circumstances where a patient is in a permanent vegetative state and has no realistic chance of recovery.

The Court laid down several procedural safeguards:

- The decision must be taken by the patient's family or "next friend."
- A medical board of experts must evaluate the patient's condition.
- Approval must be obtained from the relevant High Court before life support can be withdrawn.

This judgment marked the first judicial recognition of passive euthanasia in India.

Case Analysis: *Common Cause v. Union of India* (2018)

Facts of the Case

The case of *Common Cause v. Union of India* was initiated through a Public Interest Litigation filed by the organization Common Cause. The petition sought recognition of the right to die with dignity as a fundamental right under Article 21 of the Constitution.

The petition also requested the Court to recognize the validity of advance medical directives, commonly known as living wills. These directives allow individuals to state in advance that they do not wish to receive life-prolonging medical treatment in certain circumstances.

Issues

The Supreme Court addressed several important constitutional questions:

1. Whether the right to die with dignity is a part of the right to life under Article 21.
2. Whether advance medical directives or living wills should be legally recognized.
3. What procedures and safeguards should be followed for passive euthanasia.

Judgment

A Constitution Bench of the Supreme Court unanimously held that the right to die with dignity is a fundamental right under Article 21 of the Constitution. The Court emphasized that personal autonomy and bodily integrity are essential components of human dignity.

The Court also recognized the validity of living wills, allowing individuals to make decisions regarding medical treatment in advance in case they become incapable of expressing their wishes.

The judgment simplified the procedural framework for passive euthanasia and provided detailed guidelines for implementing living wills.

This decision significantly strengthened the principle of patient autonomy in Indian constitutional law.

Case Analysis: *Harish Rana v. Union of India* (2026)

Facts of the Case

The case of *Harish Rana v. Union of India* represents a recent development in the jurisprudence of passive euthanasia in India. Harish Rana suffered severe brain injuries after falling from a building and remained in a permanent vegetative state for more than a decade.

Due to the absence of improvement in his medical condition, his parents approached the Supreme Court seeking permission to withdraw life-sustaining treatment.

Issues

The Court examined the following questions:

1. Whether the withdrawal of life-support systems constitutes passive euthanasia.
2. Whether such withdrawal is permissible under the legal framework established in earlier cases.
3. What safeguards should be followed to ensure that the decision is made in the best interest of the patient.

Judgment

The Supreme Court permitted the withdrawal of life-sustaining treatment after reviewing medical reports and ensuring compliance with the safeguards established in earlier judgments.

The Court emphasized that the decision must be guided by medical evidence and the principles established in *Common Cause*. It directed that the withdrawal of treatment should take place under strict medical supervision to ensure dignity and prevent suffering.

This case is significant because it demonstrated the practical implementation of passive euthanasia principles within the Indian legal system.

Ethical and Legal Debates

The legalization and recognition of passive euthanasia have generated significant ethical and legal debates across the world. The issue involves sensitive questions about the value of human life, the role of medical professionals, and the autonomy of individuals in making decisions about their own bodies and medical treatment. In the Indian context, these debates became particularly prominent after judicial decisions such as *Aruna Ramchandra Shanbaug v. Union of India*and *Common Cause v. Union of India*, which recognized passive euthanasia under certain conditions. While many scholars and medical professionals view passive euthanasia as a humane and compassionate response to extreme suffering, others remain concerned about its moral implications and potential for misuse.

Supporters of passive euthanasia argue that individuals suffering from terminal illnesses or irreversible medical conditions should have the right to decide whether to continue medical treatment that merely prolongs suffering without offering any meaningful chance of recovery. They emphasize that human dignity is closely linked with personal autonomy, which includes the ability to make decisions about one's own body and medical care. According to this perspective, forcing a person to remain alive through artificial life-support systems when recovery is impossible may violate the fundamental principle of dignity that forms part of the right to life. Advocates also argue that passive euthanasia allows patients to avoid unnecessary pain and suffering and enables them to experience a natural and peaceful death rather than prolonged medical intervention that offers no therapeutic benefit.

Another argument advanced by supporters is that modern medical technology has made it possible to artificially prolong life even in situations where the quality of life is extremely poor. In such circumstances, continuing aggressive medical treatment may not always serve the best interests of the patient. Therefore, allowing the withdrawal of life-sustaining treatment under strict safeguards can be seen as a compassionate and ethically justified approach that respects both the patient's dignity and the professional judgment of medical practitioners.

Opponents of euthanasia, however, argue that legalizing any form of euthanasia may undermine the fundamental principle of the sanctity of human life. From this perspective, life is considered inherently valuable and should be protected regardless of the circumstances. Critics fear that permitting euthanasia, even in limited forms such as passive euthanasia, may gradually weaken society's commitment to preserving life and could lead to a "slippery slope" where more controversial forms of euthanasia might eventually be accepted.

Another major concern raised by opponents is the possibility of coercion or misuse. Vulnerable groups such as elderly individuals, persons with disabilities, or those facing financial hardship might feel pressured to consent to the withdrawal of medical treatment in order to reduce the emotional or financial burden on their families. There are also concerns that relatives or caregivers might misuse euthanasia provisions for personal gain, particularly in situations involving inheritance or property disputes.

In addition, medical professionals have expressed ethical concerns about the role of doctors in end-of-life decisions. The traditional medical ethic reflected in the Hippocratic Oath emphasizes the duty of physicians to preserve life and avoid actions that may intentionally cause death. Some doctors therefore argue that participating in euthanasia may conflict with their professional responsibilities and moral obligations as healthcare providers.

The challenge for legal systems, therefore, lies in creating a balanced framework that allows compassionate end-of-life care while preventing potential abuse. Judicial guidelines and procedural safeguards, such as those established in the decisions of the Supreme Court, attempt to ensure that passive euthanasia is permitted only in carefully regulated circumstances where medical experts confirm the patient's condition and the decision reflects the genuine interests of the patient. Such safeguards are essential to maintain public trust in the healthcare system while respecting the dignity and autonomy of individuals facing terminal illness.

International Perspective

The legal status of euthanasia varies significantly across different countries, reflecting diverse cultural, ethical, and legal approaches toward end-of-life decisions. Some jurisdictions have

adopted liberal policies that allow euthanasia or assisted dying under strict regulations, while others continue to prohibit the practice entirely. These differences demonstrate the complexity of balancing individual autonomy, medical ethics, and the sanctity of human life.

Countries such as the Netherlands and Belgium were among the first to legalize both euthanasia and physician-assisted suicide through comprehensive legislation. In these countries, euthanasia is permitted only when strict conditions are satisfied. The patient must make a voluntary and well-considered request, suffer from unbearable pain with no prospect of improvement, and the decision must be reviewed by medical professionals. These legal frameworks also include procedural safeguards such as consultations with independent doctors and detailed reporting requirements to prevent misuse.

Similarly, Canada permits what is legally referred to as "medical assistance in dying" (MAiD). Under Canadian law, eligible patients suffering from serious and incurable medical conditions may request assistance from healthcare professionals to end their lives. The process involves careful assessment by medical practitioners to ensure that the request is voluntary and informed.

In Switzerland, assisted suicide is permitted provided that the person assisting does not act for selfish motives. This unique legal approach has led to the establishment of organizations that provide assistance to individuals seeking to end their lives under regulated circumstances.

In contrast, many countries continue to prohibit euthanasia due to ethical, religious, and social concerns about the protection of human life. Compared to these jurisdictions, India has adopted a cautious and limited approach by permitting only passive euthanasia under strict judicial guidelines. This framework attempts to balance respect for human dignity with the need to prevent potential abuse.

Conclusion

The evolution of euthanasia law in India reflects the judiciary's effort to balance compassion, autonomy, and respect for human life. For many years, Indian law strictly rejected the idea of

a right to die, emphasizing that the Constitution guarantees the protection of life. However, as medical technology advanced and the ethical complexities surrounding end-of-life carebecame more apparent, courts began to recognize that dignity in death is an essential aspect of the right to life.

The decision in *Gian Kaur v. State of Punjab* clarified that the Constitution does not recognize a general right to die. Nevertheless, it acknowledged that the right to life includes the right to die with dignity in circumstances where death is part of the natural process of life. This observation laid the foundation for future developments in euthanasia jurisprudence.

The case of *Aruna Ramchandra Shanbaug v. Union of India* represented a major turning point by recognizing passive euthanasia under strict procedural safeguards. Later, the Constitution Bench judgment in *Common Cause v. Union of India* significantly strengthened the legal framework by recognizing the validity of advance medical directives and affirming that the right to die with dignity forms part of Article 21.

The more recent decision in *Harish Rana v. Union of India* demonstrated the practical application of these principles and highlighted the importance of ensuring dignity in end-of-life care.

Despite these developments, India still lacks comprehensive legislation governing euthanasia. A clear statutory framework is necessary to ensure uniform procedures, protect vulnerable individuals, and provide guidance to medical professionals. Ultimately, the debate over euthanasia reflects society's continuing effort to reconcile compassion for suffering individuals with the need to safeguard the value and sanctity of human life.