Impact Factor (QJIF): 8.47 E-ISSN: 2583-1615, P-ISSN: 3049-3498

International Journal of Research in Academic World

**Received:** 10/August/2026 **IJRAW:** 2026; 5(10):114-117 **Accepted:** 15/September/2026

# Reproductive Rights of Women under the Indian Constitution and Other Laws

**[*1]Dr. Praveen Patil**

[*1]Principal, Shahaji Law College, Kolhapur (Affiliated to Shivaji University, Kolhapur), Maharashtra, India.

**Abstract**

Reproductive rights of women in India are not set out in any single constitutional provision; they have been built up from the guarantees of life, liberty and dignity under Article 21, the equality and non-discrimination guarantees in Articles 14 and 15 (including the special-provision clause in Article 15(3)), and the Directive Principles in Articles 39, 42 and 47. This article examines that constitutional, statutory and judicial framework as it stood up to 2010. It first sets out the meaning and scope of reproductive rights and the influence of international instruments such as CEDAW and the 1994 Cairo Programme of Action. It then analyses the principal statutes: the Medical Termination of Pregnancy Act, 1971, the Pre-Conception and Pre-Natal Diagnostic Techniques Act, 1994, the Maternity Benefit Act, 1961, and the National Population Policy, 2000. The article traces how the courts, through privacy jurisprudence and decisions such as Suchita Srivastava v. Chandigarh Administration, Laxmi Mandal v. Deen Dayal Harinagar Hospital, CEHAT v. Union of India, Ramakant Rai v. Union of India and Javed v. State of Haryana, recognised reproductive autonomy, maternal health care and freedom from coercive sterilisation and sex selection as facets of fundamental rights, largely through public interest litigation. It concludes that, despite this progress, a doctor-centric abortion law, weak enforcement against sex selection and persistent maternal mortality among poor and marginalised women left a wide gap between constitutional promise and lived reality.

**Keywords:** Reproductive rights, Article 21, right to privacy, reproductive autonomy, Medical Termination of Pregnancy Act, 1971, PCPNDT Act, 1994, Maternity Benefit Act, 1961, maternal health, sex selection, sterilisation, CEDAW, public interest litigation.

## 1. Introduction

Reproductive rights occupy a distinct and increasingly significant place within Indian constitutional jurisprudence. They encompass a woman's right to decide freely and responsibly on matters relating to procreation, contraception, pregnancy and childbirth, free from coercion, discrimination and violence [1]. In India, these rights do not rest on any single provision; rather, they are pieced together from the constitutional guarantees of liberty, equality and dignity, from beneficial and protective legislation enacted by Parliament, and, most significantly, from an evolving body of Supreme Court jurisprudence that has read reproductive autonomy into the right to life under Article 21 [2]. This article traces that constitutional, statutory and judicial architecture as it stood up to the year 2010, drawing on the leading constitutional commentaries, treatises on gender and law, and the principal decisions of the Supreme Court and High Courts of the period.

## 2. Meaning and Scope of Reproductive Rights

Reproductive rights are generally understood to comprise four interlocking claims: the right to decide whether, when and how often to procreate; the right to access contraception and safe abortion services; the right to be free from forced sterilisation or forced pregnancy; and the right to receive adequate maternal health care during pregnancy, childbirth and the post-natal period [3]. Upendra Baxi has described reproductive rights as sitting at the intersection of bodily integrity, personal autonomy and public health policy, making them uniquely resistant to treatment under any single head of fundamental rights [4]. In the Indian setting, this multidimensional character means that reproductive rights draw simultaneously on the constitutional guarantee of personal liberty, the statutory framework governing abortion, contraception and sex-selection, and labour welfare legislation protecting maternity.

## 3. International Framework and its Influence

India is a signatory to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW), 1979, Article 12 of which requires States parties to eliminate discrimination against women in health care, including in relation to family planning, and Article 16(1)(e) of which guarantees women the right to decide freely on the number and spacing of their children [5]. India also participated in and endorsed the Programme of Action adopted at the International Conference on Population and Development at Cairo in 1994, which for the first time articulated reproductive

***Corresponding Author:** Dr. Praveen Patil

rights and reproductive health as an integrated concept in international policy [6]. Although these instruments are not, by themselves, part of domestic law, Article 51(c) of the Constitution directs the State to endeavour to foster respect for international law and treaty obligations, and the Supreme Court has repeatedly used unincorporated conventions such as CEDAW to read content into domestic fundamental rights, most famously in Vishaka v. State of Rajasthan [7], a technique subsequently extended to reproductive health and reproductive autonomy cases.

## 4. Constitutional Foundations

a) **Article 21 — Life, Liberty, Privacy and Dignity:** Article 21 guarantees that no person shall be deprived of life or personal liberty except according to procedure established by law. Although the text makes no express mention of reproduction, the Supreme Court's expansive reading of "personal liberty", beginning with Maneka Gandhi v. Union of India, which required that any procedure restricting life or liberty be fair, just and reasonable [8], opened the doctrinal space within which decisional autonomy over one's own body and reproductive choices could later be located. D.D. Basu observes that the "personal liberty" limb of Article 21 has been treated by the Court as a residuary guarantee, absorbing rights not separately enumerated in Part III, including the right to privacy and, derivatively, reproductive autonomy [9].

b) **Articles 14 and 15 — Equality and Non-Discrimination:** Article 14 guarantees equality before the law, and Article 15(1) prohibits discrimination on grounds including sex. Article 15(3) carves out an express exception permitting the State to make special provisions for women and children, which has been the constitutional basis for protective and welfare legislation touching maternity and reproductive health [10]. H.M. Seervai notes that Article 15(3) was inserted precisely because formal equality, if applied without qualification, would have prevented the State from adopting measures addressing the distinct biological and social realities of women, including pregnancy and childbirth [11].

c) **Articles 39, 42 and 47 — Directive Principles:** Part IV of the Constitution supplies the socio-economic content of reproductive welfare. Article 39(a) and (e) direct the State to secure an adequate means of livelihood and to protect the health and strength of women workers; Article 42 specifically obliges the State to make provision for just and humane conditions of work and for maternity relief; and Article 47 casts a duty on the State to raise the level of nutrition and the standard of living and to improve public health [12]. Although non-justiciable under Article 37, these Directive Principles have been treated by the courts as furnishing the object and policy against which reproductive health legislation, and executive schemes for maternal and child health, are to be tested.

## 5. Statutory Framework

a) **The Medical Termination of Pregnancy Act, 1971:** The Medical Termination of Pregnancy Act, 1971 (the MTP Act) is the principal legislation governing access to abortion in India. Section 3 permits a registered medical practitioner to terminate a pregnancy up to twelve weeks on that practitioner's opinion alone, and up to twenty weeks on the concurring opinion of two practitioners, where continuation of the pregnancy would involve a risk to the life of, or grave injury to the physical or mental health of, the pregnant woman, or where there is a substantial risk of the child being born with serious physical or mental abnormalities [13]. Section 5 dispenses with these conditions where termination is immediately necessary to save the pregnant woman's life. Flavia Agnes has criticised the Act for locating decisional authority in the medical practitioner rather than the pregnant woman herself, describing it as a doctor-centric rather than a woman-centric statute [2].

b) **The Pre-Conception and Pre-Natal Diagnostic Techniques Act, 1994:** Enacted originally as the Prenatal Diagnostic Techniques (Regulation and Prevention of Misuse) Act, 1994, and renamed and strengthened by the 2003 amendment as the Pre-Conception and Pre-Natal Diagnostic Techniques (Prohibition of Sex Selection) Act, the PCPNDT Act prohibits the use of diagnostic techniques for the purpose of sex selection or sex determination, whether before or after conception [14]. The statute requires registration of genetic clinics and ultrasound centres, mandatory record-keeping, and prohibits the advertisement of sex-selection services. Its enactment and subsequent tightening followed sustained civil society advocacy documenting a sharply declining child sex ratio attributable to female foeticide [10].

c) **The Maternity Benefit Act, 1961:** The Maternity Benefit Act, 1961 secures paid maternity leave and other benefits to women employed in factories, mines, plantations and certain other establishments. Section 5 entitles a woman to maternity benefit at the rate of her average daily wage for the period of her actual absence, and the Act prohibits the dismissal of a woman during, or on account of, her absence on maternity leave [15]. The statute gives concrete effect to the Directive Principle in Article 42 and has been construed liberally by courts as beneficial legislation to be interpreted in favour of the woman worker.

d) **National Population Policy, 2000 and Family Welfare Programmes:** The National Population Policy, 2000 marked a formal shift in the government's approach from target-driven sterilisation to a rights-based, voluntary and informed-choice model of family planning, setting out immediate, medium-term and long-term objectives for reproductive and child health services [16]. The National Rural Health Mission, launched in 2005, and the Janani Suraksha Yojana, a conditional cash transfer scheme to promote institutional delivery, were subsequently introduced to operationalise this shift and to reduce maternal and infant mortality.

## 6. Judicial Interpretation of Reproductive Rights

a) **Privacy as the Doctrinal Foundation:** The doctrinal path to reproductive autonomy in India runs through the Court's privacy jurisprudence. Although Kharak Singh v. State of U.P. initially declined to recognise a general right to privacy under Article 21 [17], the Court in Govind v. State of Madhya Pradesh accepted that a right to privacy could be located within personal liberty, though subject to reasonable restriction in the interest of compelling State interest [18]. This foundation allowed later courts to treat decisions relating to procreation and family life as falling within the protected zone of privacy and personal liberty.

b) **Reproductive Autonomy Expressly Recognised:** The Andhra Pradesh High Court in B.K. Parthasarathi v.

Government of Andhra Pradesh explicitly held that the right to reproductive autonomy, understood as a woman's right to make decisions about her own body and family planning, is a component of the right to privacy guaranteed under Article 21 [19]. The Supreme Court gave this proposition its most authoritative statement in Suchita Srivastava v. Chandigarh Administration, holding that a woman's right to make reproductive choices is a dimension of "personal liberty" under Article 21, encompassing the right to carry a pregnancy to its full term, to give birth, and to raise children, and that this right necessarily includes the woman's right to refuse participation in sexual activity or, alternatively, to use contraceptive methods [20]. The Court held that even a mentally retarded woman was entitled to have her consent respected before a decision was taken to terminate her pregnancy, and that the State's interest in protecting the life of a prospective child could constitute a permissible ground for restricting reproductive choice only where the conditions of the MTP Act were themselves satisfied [21].

c) **Right to Health, Maternal Mortality and Article 21:** The Delhi High Court's decision in Laxmi Mandal v. Deen Dayal Harinagar Hospital, delivered on 4 June 2010, extended reproductive rights jurisprudence into the domain of maternal health. The petitions were filed on behalf of two women below the poverty line who were denied benefits under government maternal health schemes; one of them died shortly after delivering at home without medical attention [22]. The High Court held that the right to health, including reproductive health care and the right to access and receive a minimum standard of treatment in public health facilities, is an inalienable component of the right to life under Article 21, and directed the government to ensure that entitlements under maternal health schemes were made available without insisting on documentary proof of eligibility that the poorest women could not produce [23].

d) **Population Control Measures and Reproductive Rights:** The relationship between State population policy and reproductive rights was tested in Javed v. State of Haryana, where the Supreme Court upheld a Haryana law disqualifying persons with more than two living children from holding certain elected panchayat offices. The Court held that the two-child norm was a reasonable restriction in the interest of public health and population control and did not violate Articles 14, 21 or 25 [24]. The decision has been criticised by scholars, including Flavia Agnes, as privileging population control policy over women's individual reproductive autonomy, and as having a disproportionate impact on women in polygamous households and on the girl child, since families often continued to have children until a son was born [2].

e) **Sex Selection and the Girl Child:** In Centre for Enquiry into Health and Allied Themes (CEHAT) v. Union of India, a public interest litigation brought by health and gender-rights organisations, the Supreme Court found that the PNDT Act of 1994 had not been effectively implemented by the Central and State Governments and issued detailed directions for the registration of genetic clinics and diagnostic centres, the constitution of appropriate authorities and supervisory boards, and public awareness campaigns [25]. The judgment is credited with prompting the 2003 amendment that widened the Act's scope to cover pre-conception sex-selection techniques and strengthened its enforcement machinery, and it remains the leading Supreme Court authority linking the constitutional guarantee of non-discrimination under Articles 14 and 15 to the survival and reproductive rights of the girl child.

f) **Consent and Bodily Integrity in Sterilisation:** In Ramakant Rai v. Union of India, a public interest litigation highlighted the absence of informed consent, inadequate pre- and post-operative care, and unhygienic conditions in State-run female sterilisation camps. By its order of 1 March 2005, the Supreme Court directed all State Governments to maintain an approved panel of doctors for sterilisation procedures, to obtain and record informed consent, and to provide compensation for death or complications arising from sterilisation operations [26]. The case established that a woman's consent to sterilisation must be free, informed and individually obtained, treating bodily integrity in the context of contraceptive surgery as a facet of the reproductive rights protected under Articles 14, 15 and 21.

g) **Public Interest Litigation as an Enforcement Mechanism:** A recurring feature of the case law discussed above is that reproductive rights in India have been enforced predominantly through public interest litigation brought by health-rights organisations and women's groups, rather than through individual claims. CEHAT, Ramakant Rai and Laxmi Mandal were all instituted as, or came to be treated as, public interest litigations invoking the Supreme Court's or the High Court's writ jurisdiction under Articles 32 and 226 [10]. Baxi has argued that this pattern reflects the practical reality that individual women, particularly those from poor or marginalised backgrounds, are rarely in a position to litigate reproductive health claims on their own, so that collective and representative litigation by non-governmental organisations has become the principal vehicle through which the constitutional promise of reproductive rights is given practical content [4]. This has, however, also meant that the pace and content of doctrinal development have depended considerably on the litigation strategies of civil society organisations rather than on legislative reform.

## 7. Reproductive Rights of Marginalised Women

Both Suchita Srivastava and Laxmi Mandal illustrate the Court's growing sensitivity to the compounded disadvantage faced by women who are poor, disabled, or belong to Scheduled Castes or Scheduled Tribes in securing reproductive and maternal health entitlements. Laxmi Mandal in particular involved a woman from a Scheduled Caste background living below the poverty line, and the High Court's judgment expressly linked the denial of maternal health entitlements to intersecting disadvantages of caste, poverty and gender [22]. Kannabiran observes that this intersectional approach, though still developing as of 2010, represented an important corrective to a formal-equality reading of reproductive rights that assumed all women faced comparable barriers in accessing reproductive health care [3].

## 8. Critical Appraisal

Notwithstanding this body of constitutional and judicial development, commentators writing up to 2010 identified persistent gaps. The MTP Act's continued reliance on medical practitioner discretion, rather than the pregnant woman's own decision, has been described by Agnes as falling short of a

genuine right to abortion [2]. Enforcement of the PCPNDT Act remained weak notwithstanding the CEHAT directions, with prosecutions few and the child sex ratio continuing to decline in several States through the 2001 and 2011 Census cycles [10]. Maternal mortality among poor and rural women, the subject of the Laxmi Mandal litigation, remained markedly higher than the national target set under the Millennium Development Goals, reflecting a persistent implementation gap between the constitutional and statutory promise of reproductive health and its delivery on the ground [22]. Agnes and Kannabiran further note that reproductive rights jurisprudence up to 2010 had developed largely through negative protections — against coercive sterilisation, against unregulated sex selection, against denial of maternal entitlements — rather than through the affirmative recognition of a freestanding, independently enforceable right to reproductive health, leaving open questions as to the precise remedies available to an individual woman denied access to safe abortion or contraceptive services outside the specific fact patterns that had come before the courts [2]. The absence, as of 2010, of any Supreme Court decision squarely addressing the constitutionality of restrictions within the MTP Act itself — as opposed to their application in individual cases — was also identified as an unresolved gap in the jurisprudence.

## 9. Conclusion

By 2010, reproductive rights in India had acquired a firm, if still developing, constitutional foundation. Article 21, read through the privacy jurisprudence beginning with Kharak Singh and Govind and consolidated in Maneka Gandhi, had been extended by the Supreme Court in Suchita Srivastava to guarantee a woman's autonomy over decisions of procreation, and by the Delhi High Court in Laxmi Mandal to guarantee access to maternal health care as part of the right to life. This constitutional core was reinforced by the equality guarantees of Articles 14 and 15, the protective mandate of Article 15(3), the Directive Principles in Articles 39, 42 and 47, and a statutory framework comprising the Medical Termination of Pregnancy Act, 1971, the Pre-Conception and Pre-Natal Diagnostic Techniques Act, 1994, and the Maternity Benefit Act, 1961. Yet, as the critical literature of the period makes clear, the translation of this constitutional and statutory promise into lived reality for India's poorest and most marginalised women remained, as of 2010, a work in progress rather than an accomplished fact.

## References


1. Programme of Action, International Conference on Population and Development (ICPD), Cairo, 1994, para. 7.3.
2. Agnes F. Law and Gender Inequality: The Politics of Women's Rights in India. Oxford Univ. Press; 1999. p. 96-101.
3. Kannabiran K, editor. Women and Law: Critical Feminist Perspectives. Sage Publications; 2014. p. 212-218.
4. Baxi U. The Future of Human Rights. 3rd ed. Oxford Univ. Press; 2008. p. 186-190.
5. Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women, 1979, arts. 12, 16(1)(e); ratified by India on 9 July 1993.
6. ICPD Programme of Action, 1994, para. 7.3, ch. VII.
7. Vishaka v. State of Rajasthan, AIR 1997 SC 3011; Constitution of India art. 51(c).
8. Maneka Gandhi v. Union of India, AIR 1978 SC 597.
9. Basu DD. Commentary on the Constitution of India. Vol. 3. 9th ed. LexisNexis; 2014. p. 3421-3435.
10. Jain MP. Indian Constitutional Law. 8th ed. LexisNexis; 2018. p. 1074-1078.
11. Seervai HM. Constitutional Law of India. Vol. 1. 4th ed. Universal Law Publishing; 2015. p. 438-441.
12. Constitution of India arts. 39(a), 39(e), 42, 47; Shukla VN. Constitution of India. 13th ed. Eastern Book Company; 2017. p. 262-268.
13. The Medical Termination of Pregnancy Act, 1971, s. 3; see also Explanation 1 and 2 to s. 3(2), which deem pregnancy resulting from rape, or failure of contraception used by a married couple, to constitute a grave injury to mental health.
14. The Pre-Conception and Pre-Natal Diagnostic Techniques (Prohibition of Sex Selection) Act, 1994 (as amended in 2003), ss. 3-6.
15. The Maternity Benefit Act, 1961, ss. 4, 5, 12.
16. National Population Policy, 2000, Government of India, Ministry of Health and Family Welfare, paras. 2.1-2.5.
17. Kharak Singh v. State of U.P., AIR 1963 SC 1295.
18. Govind v. State of Madhya Pradesh, AIR 1975 SC 1378.
19. B.K. Parthasarathi v. Government of Andhra Pradesh, 2000 (1) ALD 199 (AP HC).
20. Suchita Srivastava v. Chandigarh Administration, (2009) 9 SCC 1, paras. 8-16.
21. Suchita Srivastava v. Chandigarh Administration, (2009) 9 SCC 1, paras. 11, 22.
22. Laxmi Mandal v. Deen Dayal Harinagar Hospital, W.P. (C) No. 8853 of 2008, and Jaitun v. Maternity Home, MCD, Jangpura, W.P. (C) No. 10700 of 2009 (Delhi HC, 4 June 2010).
23. Laxmi Mandal v. Deen Dayal Harinagar Hospital (relying on People's Union for Civil Liberties v. Union of India, [2001] and the Protection of Human Rights Act, 1993, and reading the right to health as part of the right to life under art. 21).
24. Javed v. State of Haryana, AIR 2003 SC 3057.
25. Centre for Enquiry into Health and Allied Themes (CEHAT) v. Union of India, (2003) 8 SCC 412 (decided 10 September 2003).
26. Ramakant Rai (I) v. Union of India, (2009) 16 SCC 565 (order dated 1 March 2005), W.P. (C) No. 209 of 2003.