

RIGHT TO HEALTH VIS-A-VIS HEALTH CARE

Dr. Harikumar Pallathadka,

Manipur International University, Imphal, Manipur (India)
harikumar@miu.edu.in

Sanjeev Kumar*,

Research Scholar, Career Point University, Hamirpur, Himachal Pradesh (India).

*Corresponding Author: sanjeevsanjeev292@gmail.com

Dr. Laxmi Kirana P.,

Manipur International University, Imphal, Manipur (India)
laxmikirana@miu.edu.in

Abstract

Article 21 of the Indian Constitution, which also guarantees the right to life, safeguards the right to health and health treatment as a human right. Food is a must. For optimal health, regular maintenance of life, survival, and well-being, all living things, including humans, need the right combination of nutrients: the type, quality, and quantity of food consumed influence the nutrients in the food. For our population, the Indian Council of Medical Research (RDA) advises the quantity of nutrients required depending on age, gender, physiological condition, and physical activity levels. The Constitution has given the Centre ample space to maneuver since a large number of items are listed in the concurrent list. State governments are mainly responsible for health-care services, although the Constitution allows the Centre certain flexibility. The Centre has been able to increase its clout in the healthcare industry.

Consequently, the federal government now has a far more significant role in health care than the Constitution allows. The federal government has given the basis for health policy and planning. Because health is one of the basic fundamental rights, it requires further protection via law. Our Constitution also requires the State to guarantee the health and nutritional well-being of all citizens. Before independence, the healthcare sector was in poor shape, with a high incidence of disease-related death. However, since independence, the healthcare sector has received the most attention. This has been made possible by the passage of several laws. In this article, the researcher discusses how various Indian laws safeguard the right to health and health treatment.

Keywords: Right to Health, Healthcare, Right to food, Universal healthcare.

Introduction:

The Constitution has given the Centre ample space to maneuver since a large number of items are listed in the concurrent list. State governments are mainly responsible for health-care services, although the Constitution allows the Centre certain flexibility. The Centre has been able to increase its clout in the healthcare industry. Consequently, the federal government now has a far more significant role in health care than the Constitution allows. The federal government has established the foundation for health policy and planning. In practice, the federal government has pushed several national programs (vertical programs for leprosy, tuberculosis, blindness, malaria, smallpox, diarrhea, filaria, goiter, and now HIV/AIDS) over which states have had little say. The states have consented because of the related money from the federal government. These programs are carried out uniformly throughout the country. Then there are the Center's own family planning and universal immunization programs, both of which must be implemented by the states. To summarise, central government participation in state-run healthcare operations is a critical feature that must be considered in any study of public healthcare services. The distribution of healthcare services is skewed significantly in favor of urban areas. There are a few state-run hospitals in major cities (including teaching hospitals) depending on the population. On average, the district's main town has a 150-bed Civil General Hospital and a few smaller hospitals and clinics spread across the region and sometimes in large towns. Rural hospitals, primary health centers (PHCs), and sub-centers provide various health services and outreach programs in the district's rural areas.

Research Problem

The right to health is considered to be one of the most basic of all human rights. The right to health is explicitly mentioned in great detail in each of the world's constitutional texts. Despite the widespread recognition of this right, the situation shows that the rural healthcare system is woefully insufficient. Inadequate public knowledge and poverty are two variables that contribute to the deterioration of rural health services. The government's many programs targeted at preserving the health of rural people have proven to be very successful. The analysis of statistical data will assist in the betterment of the lives of rural residents. The general population has the right to enjoy a meaningful and dignified life that is not predicated on their physical or mental well-being.

Increasingly common health-related issues are getting more frequent as science and technology progress. There will indeed be no progress in national development unless and until there is a significant improvement in rural health in a sustainable manner. The right to health is very worried about the state's population, as is the right to life. As the world's population continues to increase, the number of incidents of human rights violations will continue to rise.

Aim of Study

As outlined in Part III of the Indian Constitution, some fundamental rights have been given to its citizens. These rights are particularly significant when it comes to health and health treatment. Although it does not expressly provide for healthcare, the liberal interpretation of the word life adopted by the Indian Supreme Court has brought healthcare within the ambit of the word life and declared it a fundamental human right for every citizen of India. The Indian Constitution guarantees everyone the right to life and personal liberty. Furthermore, when it comes to interpreting the articles of the Constitution, the Indian judiciary plays an important role. The judgments handed down by the court demonstrate that they are deeply concerned about health, public health, a healthy environment, the avoidance of environmental contamination, the preservation and enhancement of nutritional value for the general population, among other things.

The main aims are as follows: To investigate the provisions of the Indian Constitution about health and care health. To emphasize the role of the state in protecting people's health. To examine several Supreme Court of India rulings in depth.

Scope of Study

The emphasis of this current study was on the Constitutional provisions regarding health and the Supreme Court's interpretation of these provisions. The basic human rights, national policies, and fundamental responsibilities are all there to help maintain public health. The study's topic of research was the Constitution and judicial decisions related to health. He has researched and analyzed many Supreme Court judgments that have paid particular attention to health.

Definition of Health:

According to "World HEALTH organization, Health is a state of complete physical, mental and social wellbeing and not merely the absence of disease from the definition itself; it is clearly indicated that condition of life of the individual should incorporate physical, mental & social well being & must be devoid of disease & infirmity. Thus, this pioneering institution (WTO) has played the best supportive role in guiding health policy development and action at the global and national levels, with an overall objective of ensuring & attaining the highest standards of health care to all the people around the world. WHO has not only given a wider definition to HEALTH but also brought the vision of HEALTH CARE."

A Brief Overview of the History and Jurisprudence of the Right to Health

The term "right to health" refers to and denotes the highest levels of health that each individual can attain throughout their lifetime. The global network of human rights organizations has long seen health as an essential and significant human right protected by international human rights legislation. Instead of requiring governments to guarantee that their citizens' rights to health are respected, guaranteed, and fulfilled, the right to health requires states to ensure that their citizens' rights to health are adequately qualified for each and every one of its inhabitants. As Salmond has pointed out, each right is accompanied by a duty that must be met, and there can be no right without an equal component of obligation in its place.

Furthermore, there are both positive and negative enforceable substances concerning the right to health; these range from the state providing adequate security to providing equal health care offices to everyone and requiring the most significant commitment from the state to create such ideal conditions that the right to health is satisfied to forcing the most significant commitment from the state to create such ideal conditions that the right to health is satisfied.

The right to health dates back to 1946, when the World Health Organization (WHO), the world's leading global health organization, recognized health-related terms as human rights for the first time. Furthermore, even before the World Health Organization was formed, a few nations had been working for some time to recognize health as a fundamental human right. The development was also influenced by current events, during which employees were treated as commodities and businesses paid little attention to hygienic conditions in the workplace, among other things. Consequently, health has become an essential component of the fundamental human rights that every individual who has established their reality on this planet is entitled to enjoy.

The basic requirements that must be fulfilled in order to fulfill the right to health

A more in-depth study of the Indian Constitution's actual content would conclude that the Right to Health is not legally recognized as a fundamental right in the Constitution. Nonetheless, the authors and founders of the Constitution had a very unrealistic vision. As a result, they imposed an obligation on the state in the form of the Directive Principles of State Policy in Part IV of the Constitution, which states that the state has the responsibility to ensure social and financial equity to all of its citizens. Consequently, it is possible to make the general conclusion that Part IV of the Constitution truly or indirectly coincides with the open approach to health.

Under Article 38 of the Constitution, the state's duty is to guarantee that societal requests for government assistance in general health are fulfilled promptly. The protection of employees' health is addressed in Article 39, statement (e). Article 41 relates to the state's supply of open aid under exceptional situations such as disorder, infirmity, old age, and so on. To put it another way, Article 42 safeguards the health of the newborn infant as well as the mothers, and it is linked to the maternity benefit. Article 47 requires the state to make a significant contribution to the advancement of general health, the maintenance of equity, the provision of hospitable working conditions for workers, the enhancement of advantages in disease prevention and treatment, and the provision of maternity benefits. Furthermore, because of real worries about the general public's well-being, the state has committed to prohibiting the consumption of alcoholic drinks. According to Article 48A of the Constitution, the state maintains a clean and healthy environment free of pollution.

In any case, these Directive Principles of State Policy have only persuasive value. They are non-justiciable, which means they cannot, for example, be enforced in a formal court of law.

The state has used this as a weapon to get out of its responsibilities, duties, and liabilities in supplying and safeguarding the general public's health because Direct Principles have only significant significance. Consequently, the Supreme Court of India acted as a hero by putting the right within the scope of the Indian Constitution Article 21. As a consequence, the scope of Article 21 has been expanded. Article 21 guarantees everyone the right to life and liberty, whether they are citizens or non-citizens of the nation. Person freedom refers to rights that are legally connected to a person's life and freedom, such as the right to health, which is now included in the notion of individual liberty.

The beginning of the era of dynamic legislation after acknowledging fundamental rights came relatively recently, with the Kesavananda Bharati case, which included human rights litigation. Even more importantly, current regulations regarding the development of Public Interest Limited and access to equity financing were weak during this time. As a consequence, there was a dangerous increase in the number of health-related lawsuits.

Consequently, further progress has been made, including creating consumer courts and acknowledging health care as a fundamental human right. This is because the Supreme Court made it possible for people to approach the court straightforwardly to protect their human rights.

Article 21 of the Constitution guarantees the right to life, which has been broadly construed to encompass more than only human existence, as well as the right to live in nobility and convention. The Hon'ble Supreme Court of India ruled in the case of Parmanand Katara that people who are revealed into the calling of clinical are accountable for general health and have an inherent responsibility to guarantee the same so that the honest may be protected and the blameworthy can be rejected. In a separate case concerning Spring Meadow Hospital, the court ruled that essential laws relating to the substance of the right to health must be sharpened for it to be effective. Furthermore, in the United States, a demonstration to manage appropriate limits on commercial transplantation has re-energized the right to health.

Following that, the significance of health was recognized due to the establishment of noblesse oblige and the fundamental right to life. In this case, the court determined that, despite their importance, the Directive Principles of State Policy must be appropriately implemented by the state; and it was also in this case that the court determined that poise and health fall within the scope of life and freedom under Article 21 of India's Constitution. In Consumer Education and Research Center v. Association of India, the court had earlier ruled that the right to health was also a necessary component of having a meaningful existence and the right to life guaranteed under Part III. Furthermore, the court said that health involves the right to receive clinical treatment in order to attain the highest degree of satisfaction with everyday comfort expectations.

When the court looked into the problems surrounding the right to health under Articles 21, 41, and 47 of the Indian Constitution, it discovered that one's right is linked to another's responsibility. In the instance of Ram Lubhaya, this was the scenario. Consequently, the right granted by Article 21 imposes an equal duty on the state, which is strengthened by Article 47's requirements. The government has built a few schools and emergency clinics. Still, the responsibility to supply them will not be fulfilled until they are accessible to the whole population, which may take years. To begin, it is critical to note that the Honourable Court, in this instance, saw health as a holy, consecrated, and essential right.

Furthermore, the scope of Article 21 was expanded even further in Paschim Banga Khet Mazdoor Samity; as a result, the court determined that it is the legislature's responsibility to provide adequate clinical guidance to each individual also cooperating with the government to help the entire population. Article 21 also puts a legal duty on the state, requiring it to safeguard and defend the rights of all people under its authority.

The Supreme Court of India decided in another instance that health is a fundamental right that is not limited to the absence of illnesses or sufferings. Clinical and health offices act as a kind of motivation for employees to work as quickly as possible, both physically and psychologically. Without a doubt, clinical offices are part of the government-managed savings scheme. The Hon'ble High Court, in the case of T. Ramakrishna Rao, gave the impression that maintaining the condition is the duty of both the residents and the government. Article 21 of the

Indian Constitution also concerns environmental security and preservation since natural pollution is a kind of mild death, and therefore a violation of Article 21 of the Constitution. The court determined in the well-known case of *Ratlam Municipal Corporation* that it is the state's fundamental obligation under Article 47 of the Constitution to ensure that individuals' everyday environments are safe and healthy and that it must enforce this obligation against any legislative body or authority that fails to do so, regardless of whether it has financial clout.

Universal health care Indian Perspective

Since its independence more than 60 years ago, India has embraced the ideal of universal health care. The Bhole Committee recommended in 1946 that the government establish a national health system to provide comprehensive preventive and curative allopathic services through a rural-focused multilevel public system financed by the government, through which all citizens, regardless of their ability to pay, would be served. However, a newly independent India faced tremendous challenges in 1947. A violent divide had shattered the country; poverty was widespread, the economy suffered, and the authorities were inexperienced. The general health of the people was abysmal. With a life expectancy at birth of 37 years and memories of the Bengal famine of 1943, which killed 2–3 million people, health facilities were concentrated in urban areas, and health indices were usually poor. There has been a lot of progress since then. With a life expectancy of more than 60 years, India is a thriving democracy with a diversified industrial base, a large scientific community, and an excellent information technology sector in 2011.

During the same time period, India's track record in terms of expanding social opportunities has been uneven. The health and nutrition of children and women continue to remain poor, and India is regularly ranked among the worst-performing countries in terms of overall health. However, there is reason to be hopeful. The country has quickly recovered from the recent global financial crisis and has restarted robust economic growth. A greater desire to engage civil society and believe in the power of ideas to improve performance and governance has emerged. Our attention has been sparked by India's recent pledges to revitalize the public healthcare system in order to address health disparities. In addition, the country's flourishing economic climate, which has propelled it into the ranks of middle-income countries and civil society organizations' support for health, gives us hope. The growing confidence reflected in bold social-policy initiatives (such as the Right to Information Act of 2005, the Right to Free and Compulsory Education Act of 2009, and the pending Right to Health Bill) offers an opportunity to rethink the case for universal health care.

Unsurprisingly, this series in *The Lancet* contains both triumphs and failures in the area of health. India's healthcare system is one of the most fragmented and commercialized globally, with world-class care being swamped by unregulated, low-quality alternatives. Private health out-of-pocket expenditure is among the highest in the world due to inadequate public health financing. Health care, rather than helping people overcome poverty, has become a significant cause of family debt and suffering. ⁴ Despite recent improvements in national health indicators, substantial geographical and socioeconomic disparities persist. While some individuals are blessed with excellent health, others are in the worst conceivable situation. Health disparities are exacerbated by uneven economic growth, increasing commercialization of health care, and a lack of pricing and treatment quality regulation. ⁴ As Indian citizens, we have seen these injustices not just in the workplace but also in our own homes due to this sickness.

Based on three years of study, this series calls for immediate action to achieve universal health care access. Activities in health promotion and disease prevention must be guided by principles of justice, affordability, effectiveness, and accountability. To achieve this goal, India will need to allocate more resources to health to strengthen the public health system and develop long-term plans to decrease out-of-pocket healthcare expenses via private-sector integration.

The spirit of the Bhole Committee report must be revived and realized while also recognizing that today's India confronts more complex health issues, has a broader range of healthcare players, and enjoys unprecedented economic growth.

India can no longer bear the paradox that child mortality and undernutrition rates are higher in India than in many other developing countries. Women are constantly subjected to unsafe childbirth, and that infectious diseases, mental disorders, chronic diseases, and injuries prevent people from living healthy lives. India cannot continue to put up with a healthcare system that is often exploitative, unregulated, and ineffective. All Indians' health conditions must improve to enjoy the freedoms that give value to their lives. A healthy India is also essential for the country to grow economically and capitalize on its demographic advantage.

The Indian Constitution and Right to Health

The Right to Health is based on the Fundamental Rights and Article 21 ("Right to Life with Dignity"). "No individual shall be deprived of his life or personal liberty except via process provided by law," says Article 21 of the Indian Constitution. Until the 1970s, most courts understood 'life' literally, i.e., the right to exist- the right not to be murdered. In the late 1970s, the Supreme Court started to give the word "life" in Article 21 a broader meaning. Over time, it has been widely recognized that life does not just refer to the presence of animals but

also to the existence of a dignified human person with all of the characteristics that entail. A healthy atmosphere and competent healthcare facilities are examples of this. As a result, the "Fundamental Right to Life" is now considered in a broader sense. Fundamental rights are, for the most part, only enforceable against the state. The Fundamental Rights Chapter lays forth the State's responsibilities and duties to people. As a result, when we talk about the right to health and health care as a fundamental right, we are talking about the state's responsibility, not private actors like individual doctors, private hospitals, or nursing homes. This is not to say that private players do not have a responsibility to their patients or that they may act irresponsibly. However, these athletes are under no duty to set a cap on their professional fees, and therefore are not obligated to offer free, subsidized, or even low-cost therapy. There are a few exceptions to this rule, which we shall go through later in this book. It is in this framework that healthcare privatization should be considered. The 'Right to Health' is inextricably linked to the 'Right to Life,' and the 'Right to Medical Facilities,' which is a corollary of the 'Right to Health,' is likewise a component of the 'Right to Life.' In a welfare state, the state has the responsibility for the right to health and medical care.

"Municipal Council, Ratlam vs. Vardhichand & Ors, 1980 Cri LJ 1075 - one of the first public interest litigations - the municipal corporation was sued by certain residents for not cleaning up the trash. The company repeated its claim that it lacked funds. "The State would understand that Article 47 makes it a fundamental tenet of governance that measures be made for the promotion of public health as one of its main duties," Justice Krishna Iyer said in dismissing the petition."

The Supreme Court held in *"Consumer Education and Research Centre vs. Union of India, (1995) 3 SCC 42, and Kirloskar Brothers Ltd. vs. Employees' State Insurance Corporation, (1996) 2 SCC 682 AIR 1996 SC 3261, that the right to health and medical care is a fundamental right protected by Article 21 read with Articles 39(e), 41, and 43."*

Directive Principle of State Policy and Health

The DPSP, or Part IV of the Indian Constitution, placed responsibility on states. If we simply look at those provisions, we can see that some of them have anything to do with public health, either directly or indirectly. It instructs the state to take steps to improve the people's healthcare situation. Articles 38 put a responsibility on the state to guarantee a social order to promote the people's welfare, but we cannot accomplish that without public health. "Article 39(e) dealt with employees' health protection." "Article 41 placed a responsibility on the state to provide public aid, primarily to the ill and disabled." "Article 42 states that the state has a major duty to safeguard the health of the baby and mother via maternity benefits. Article 47 states that the state's main obligation is to improve the nutrition and quality of life of its citizens." (AIR 2003 SC 3057, Javed v. the State of Haryana) Other health-related requirements are included in the DPSP. The state's policies should be geared toward ensuring the health of employees in particular. The state established village panchayats and granted them the necessary rights and authority to operate as self-governing entities.

Rights to food

Article 25(1) of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, adopted in 1948, stated: "Everyone has the right to a living standard that is sufficient for their health and well-being, including food. "The States Parties to the present Covenant recognize the right of everyone to an adequate standard of living for himself and his family, including adequate food, clothing, and housing," "according to Article 11 of the International Covenant on Economic, Social, and Cultural Rights, which entered into force in 1976."

While the concept of a right to food occurs in various situations in international law, the majority of them are not legally enforceable. The duties are theoretically obligatory on the States Parties in certain instances, such as the International Covenant on Economic, Social, and Cultural Rights. In reality, however, the duties are obligatory due to their lack of clarity and the absence of efficient procedures for implementation and accountability. "These numbers make hunger by far the most blatant and pervasive of all major human rights violations," Philip Alston and Katarina Tomasevski noted after examining the hunger data. The concept of individuals having a right to sufficient nourishment is an ancient one, with a goal that has yet to be realized. However, its articulation in the Convention on the Rights of the Child offers a different approach: focusing on children may make implementing the concept of the right to sufficient nourishment more politically possible.

Legal action is being taken to protect the right to eat.

The fundamental "right to life" guaranteed in Article 21 of the Indian Constitution may be viewed as an implication of the right to food. Indeed, the Supreme Court has declared (many times) that the right to life should be understood as a right to "live with human dignity," which includes the right to food and other essentials. (SC 597) (AIR 1978)

In the Proceedings of a hearing held on January 17, 2003, the "National Human Rights Commission (NHRC)" laid out the legal basis for the right to food: Article 21 of the Indian Constitution guarantees a fundamental right to life and personal liberty. The courts have interpreted the word "life" in this article to include a life of human dignity, not only survival or animal existence. Consequently, the state is obliged to provide all of the fundamental requirements that must be fulfilled for a person to live with human dignity, including education,

health care, fair and decent working conditions, and protection against exploitation, among other things. According to the Commission, Article 21 should be read in combination with Articles 39(a) and 47 to fully understand the nature of the State's duty to ensure the effective fulfillment of this right. One of the country's Directive Principles, Article 39(a), requires the government to ensure that all people, men and women equally, have access to adequate means of sustenance. According to Article 47, the state's primary responsibility is to enhance people's nutrition and quality of life. Article 21 protects the citizen's right to be free of hunger, which is backed up by Articles 39(a) and 47, which outline the State's obligations. "When Article 21 is read in combination with Articles 39(a) and 47, the issue of food security is properly contextualised, making the Right to Food a guaranteed Fundamental Right that may be enforced via the constitutional remedy provided by Article 32."

Supreme Court on Health Care

In the case of *"Paschim Banga Khet Mazdoor Samiti v. State of West Bengal, the Supreme Court made a landmark judgment in the area of access to and availability of medical services. An accident victim who was turned away contextualized of government-run hospitals in Calcutta because they did not have sufficient facilities to treat him led to the lawsuit filing. The aforementioned accident victim was eventually treated at a private hospital, but his injuries had been worse due to the delay in treatment. The Court recognized that similar circumstances happened regularly across the nation due to a lack of sufficient primary health care facilities. The Court appointed an expert committee to investigate the issue, and it subsequently approved the committee's final report. It contained a seven-point plan that addressed several issues, including the upgrading of facilities throughout the country and the establishment of a centralized communications system among hospitals to ensure the adequate and prompt availability of ambulance equipment and personnel in emergencies."*

Medical Practitioners and right to health care

In India, the idea of interdependence between rights was notably stated in the Maneka Gandhi judgment, which is still in effect today. Following this precedent, the concept of the "protection of life and liberty" under Article 21 of the Indian Constitution was broadened and developed further. In several instances, the Supreme Court of India adopted a harmonization approach between fundamental rights and directive principles, which the Court subsequently upheld. In the area of health, the case of *"Parmanand Katara v. Union of India was notable for the judgment it gave. When a person who has been wounded comes to a doctor, the Court established the following rules for them to follow: In such cases, when an injured person approaches a member of the medical profession, and he determines that whatever assistance he could provide is not really sufficient to save the life of the person, but that additional assistance is required, that member of the medical profession must render all the help he can provide to the injured person. Legal protection for physicians who treat wounded people: A doctor is not in violation of the law if they proceed to treat an injured victim upon their presence before them, either alone or in the company of other medical professionals. Even if the victim is transferred to another location under local laws, and regardless of whether or not the police are involved, zonal restrictions and classifications cannot be used as a barrier to the performance of the duty. The Standing Committee on Forensic Medicine's judgment from 1985 serves as the authoritative standard in this area. Suppose a medical practitioner is summoned or requests that an injured person who needs their medical help urgently; there is no legal obstacle to such request or summons. The attempt to rescue the individual should be the first priority of everyone involved, including medical professionals, law enforcement officers, and any other citizen who happens to be involved in the issue or who happens to observe an event or a scenario like this in the first place."*

Conclusion

The United Nations' "World Health Organization" believes health to be a fundamental human right. The member countries have decided that everyone, regardless of religion, rank, sex, creed, political conviction, color, social or monetary situation, has the right to enjoy the highest and most excellent possible quality of health. Consequently, health has become a surprisingly fundamental right, and everyone must seek out the necessary administrations as and when they are needed. Water that is clean and safe to drink, sanitation, enough housing, training and supportive working conditions, nutritious eating, and so on are all essential elements of sound health. The right to protection, which guarantees that everyone is treated with dignity and respect, is intimately connected to health.

Consequently, each individual has the capacity to control their own body and health, which is dependent on several variables. Even though the term "Right to Health" does not appear in the Indian Constitution, the Supreme Court has interpreted it as a fundamental right under Article 21's "Right to Life" clause. The fact that the Supreme Court was the first to interpret the "Right to Health" in line with Part IV, i.e., Directive Principles of State Policy, and that it recognized the state's duty to protect the public's health is a significant difference. The Supreme Court decided that the "Right to Health" is an essential component of the "Right to Life" and, as such, is one of the fundamental rights protected by the Indian Constitution, based on a broad interpretation of

Article 21. The court has played a critical role in enforcing positive obligations on public health agencies to maintain and improve public health.

References:

- Duggal, R. (2003). Operational sing Right to Healthcare in India. In *10th Canadian Conference on International Health, Ottawa, 2003, no. "Operational sing Right to Healthcare in India," in 10th Canadian Conference on International Health.*
- *Supreme court orders on the right to food.* (2020). Wwww.Corteidh.or.Cr. <https://www.corteidh.or.cr/tablas/27433.pdf>
- Raj Sehgal, D. (2020). *Right to Health – A part of Article 21.* <https://Blog.Ipleaders.In>. <https://blog.ipleaders.in/right-health-part-article-21/>
- Patel, V., Kumar, A. S., Paul, V. K., Rao, K. D., & Reddy, K. S. (2011). Universal health care in India: the time is right. *Lancet (London, England)*, 377(9764), 448.
- Satbhai, S. Right to Health in India—A Study of Constitutional and Judicial Attitude.
- Kumar, A. (2014). An Analysis of Human Rights with Special Reference to the Right to Health in India. *Indian Streams Research Journal*, 4(8).
- Shah, S. B. (1999). Illuminating the possible in the developing world: Guaranteeing the human right to health in India. *Vand. J. Transnat'l L.*, 32, 435.
- Duffy, R. M., & Kelly, B. D. (2019). The right to mental healthcare: India moves forward. *The British Journal of Psychiatry*, 214(2), 59-60.
- Chouri, D. (2012). Constitutional Perspective of Right to Health in India: An Analysis. *The IUP Law Review*, 2(1), 46-57.
- Reddy, K. S., Patel, V., Jha, P., Paul, V. K., Kumar, A. S., Dandona, L., & Lancet India Group for Universal Healthcare. (2011). Towards achievement of universal health care in India by 2020: a call to action. *The Lancet*, 377(9767), 760-768.
- Sahoo, D. P., & Bhatia, V. (2018). Public health legislations in India (Part-I). *Indian Journal of Community and Family Medicine*, 4(1), 10.
- Chandrachud, D. Y. (2008). Constitutional and Administrative Law in India. *International Journal of Legal Information*, 36(2), 332-337.
- Singh, B. P. (2013). Jurisprudence of human rights relating to health of indigenous peoples: A specific reference to tribal India. *Indian Journal of Dalit and Tribal Studies and Action*, 1(2), 34-48.
- Chakravarthi, I. (2018). Regulation of private health care providers in India: Current status, future directions. *Indian Journal of Public Administration*, 64(4), 587-598.
- Neff, E. C. (2009). From equal protection to the right to health: Social and economic rights, public law litigation, and how an old framework informs a new generation of advocacy. *Colum. JL & Soc. Probs.*, 43, 151.
- Balarajan, Y., Selvaraj, S., & Subramanian, S. V. (2011). Health care and equity in India. *The Lancet*, 377(9764), 505-515.