

The background of the journal cover features a top-down view of a desk. On the left, a pair of black leather brogue shoes is partially visible. In the center, an open notebook with lined pages and a silver pen lies on a light-colored wooden surface. To the right, a black leather bag with a zipper is partially shown. A black leather watch with a silver dial is also visible on the desk. A large, semi-transparent white rectangular area is centered over the image, containing the journal's title and ISSN information.

INTERNATIONAL LAW
JOURNAL

**WHITE BLACK
LEGAL LAW
JOURNAL**
**ISSN: 2581-
8503**

Peer - Reviewed & Refereed Journal

The Law Journal strives to provide a platform for discussion of International as well as National Developments in the Field of Law.

WWW.WHITEBLACKLEGAL.CO.IN

DISCLAIMER

No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored, transmitted, translated, or distributed in any form or by any means—whether electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, scanning, or otherwise—without the prior written permission of the Editor-in-Chief of *White Black Legal – The Law Journal*.

All copyrights in the articles published in this journal vest with *White Black Legal – The Law Journal*, unless otherwise expressly stated. Authors are solely responsible for the originality, authenticity, accuracy, and legality of the content submitted and published.

The views, opinions, interpretations, and conclusions expressed in the articles are exclusively those of the respective authors. They do not represent or reflect the views of the Editorial Board, Editors, Reviewers, Advisors, Publisher, or Management of *White Black Legal*.

While reasonable efforts are made to ensure academic quality and accuracy through editorial and peer-review processes, *White Black Legal* makes no representations or warranties, express or implied, regarding the completeness, accuracy, reliability, or suitability of the content published. The journal shall not be liable for any errors, omissions, inaccuracies, or consequences arising from the use, interpretation, or reliance upon the information contained in this publication.

The content published in this journal is intended solely for academic and informational purposes and shall not be construed as legal advice, professional advice, or legal opinion. *White Black Legal* expressly disclaims all liability for any loss, damage, claim, or legal consequence arising directly or indirectly from the use of any material published herein.

ABOUT WHITE BLACK LEGAL

White Black Legal – The Law Journal is an open-access, peer-reviewed, and refereed legal journal established to provide a scholarly platform for the examination and discussion of contemporary legal issues. The journal is dedicated to encouraging rigorous legal research, critical analysis, and informed academic discourse across diverse fields of law.

The journal invites contributions from law students, researchers, academicians, legal practitioners, and policy scholars. By facilitating engagement between emerging scholars and experienced legal professionals, *White Black Legal* seeks to bridge theoretical legal research with practical, institutional, and societal perspectives.

In a rapidly evolving social, economic, and technological environment, the journal endeavours to examine the changing role of law and its impact on governance, justice systems, and society. *White Black Legal* remains committed to academic integrity, ethical research practices, and the dissemination of accessible legal scholarship to a global readership.

AIM & SCOPE

The aim of *White Black Legal – The Law Journal* is to promote excellence in legal research and to provide a credible academic forum for the analysis, discussion, and advancement of contemporary legal issues. The journal encourages original, analytical, and well-researched contributions that add substantive value to legal scholarship.

The journal publishes scholarly works examining doctrinal, theoretical, empirical, and interdisciplinary perspectives of law. Submissions are welcomed from academicians, legal professionals, researchers, scholars, and students who demonstrate intellectual rigour, analytical clarity, and relevance to current legal and policy developments.

The scope of the journal includes, but is not limited to:

- Constitutional and Administrative Law
- Criminal Law and Criminal Justice
- Corporate, Commercial, and Business Laws
- Intellectual Property and Technology Law
- International Law and Human Rights
- Environmental and Sustainable Development Law
- Cyber Law, Artificial Intelligence, and Emerging Technologies
- Family Law, Labour Law, and Social Justice Studies

The journal accepts original research articles, case comments, legislative and policy analyses, book reviews, and interdisciplinary studies addressing legal issues at national and international levels. All submissions are subject to a rigorous double-blind peer-review process to ensure academic quality, originality, and relevance.

Through its publications, *White Black Legal – The Law Journal* seeks to foster critical legal thinking and contribute to the development of law as an instrument of justice, governance, and social progress, while expressly disclaiming responsibility for the application or misuse of published content.

**RIGHT TO LIFE WITH DIGNITY BEHIND BARS: A
CONSTITUTIONAL ANALYSIS OF COMPASSIONATE
RELEASE OF AGED AND TERMINALLY ILL PRISONERS
IN NALSA V. UNION OF INDIA & ORS. (2025)**

AUTHORED BY - SUSHMITA MISHRA

Affiliation: Independent Researcher & Law Student

Abstract

The constitutional status of imprisoned individuals has evolved significantly in Indian jurisprudence, with Article 21 of the Constitution—guaranteeing the right to life—extending protection to all persons, including those in custody. This paper examines the Public Interest Litigation filed by the National Legal Services Authority (NALSA) before the Supreme Court of India on May 5, 2025, seeking the release of elderly and terminally ill prisoners on compassionate grounds. The research adopts a doctrinal methodology, analyzing constitutional provisions, statutory frameworks, and judicial precedents to assess whether continued incarceration of aged and terminally ill inmates violates fundamental rights. Utilizing empirical prison data from 2022, the paper demonstrates that 27,690 convicts (20.8% of total convicts) and 44,955 undertrial prisoners (10.4% of undertrial population) are aged 50 years and above, facing inadequate healthcare in overcrowded facilities. This analysis contends that Article 21 mandates dignified treatment of vulnerable prisoners and supports the necessity of formulating uniform compassionate release guidelines. The paper critically evaluates the balance between public safety concerns and humanitarian imperatives while proposing policy reforms aligned with international human rights obligations and constitutional jurisprudence.

1. Introduction

The Indian Constitution's Article 21 prescribes that "no person shall be deprived of his life or personal liberty except according to procedure established by law."^[1] The Supreme Court's expansive interpretation in *Maneka Gandhi v. Union of India* (1978) transformed this provision from a merely negative guarantee against arbitrary state action into an affirmative constitutional commitment to dignified existence.^[2] Justice Y.V. Chandrachud articulated that "life" extends beyond mere biological survival; it encompasses the right to live with human dignity, including access to food, clothing, shelter, education, healthcare, and humane

treatment.

This constitutional evolution has profound implications for incarcerated persons. Despite deprivation of liberty as judicial punishment, prisoners retain their status as constitutional subjects entitled to fundamental rights protection. The Supreme Court in *Sunil Batra v. Delhi Administration* (1978) established the foundational principle that the walls of prison do not eliminate constitutional protections; rather, only those liberties necessary for incarceration are legitimately withdrawn.^[3] This jurisprudential development reflects the constitutional philosophy that punishment through imprisonment does not justify deliberate infliction of additional suffering or deprivation of dignity.

The transformation from treating prisoners as legal persons stripped of all rights to recognizing their status as bearers of fundamental rights represents a critical shift in constitutional interpretation. In *Francis Coralie Mullin v. Administrator, Union Territory of Delhi* (1981), the Court recognized that prisoners retain rights to personal liberty concerning matters unconnected to their sentence.^[4] This precedent established that constitutional protection extends to conditions of confinement, treatment by prison authorities, and access to basic necessities.

Subsequent judgments have progressively expanded the scope of prisoner protection. The *Inhuman Conditions in 1382 Prisons* case (2016) drew attention to systematic violations of Article 21 through prison overcrowding, inadequate sanitation, and medical negligence.^[5] These decisions collectively affirm that imprisonment restricts freedom of movement but does not eliminate the right to dignified, humane treatment. Notably, the Supreme Court has extended Article 21 protections to encompass health rights, access to medical treatment, and freedom from cruel or degrading punishment.

Indian prisons face an acute crisis of overcrowding and inadequate healthcare infrastructure. According to the Prison Statistics India 2022, compiled by the National Crime Records Bureau, Indian prisons operate at 117.8% of their operational capacity, with many facilities functioning at over 150% capacity.^[6] This overcrowding correlates directly with rising mortality and morbidity among prisoners.

A comprehensive study analyzing mortality trends from 2017-2021 identified ascending

mortality trajectories due to cardiovascular diseases, pulmonary conditions, and suicide.^[7] Contributing factors include overcrowding, inadequate healthcare manpower, and insufficient budget allocation for prison health services. For elderly and terminally ill prisoners, these deficiencies are particularly catastrophic, as they require specialized medical attention unavailable in prison facilities. The absence of palliative care infrastructure, diagnostic capabilities, and specialized treatment modalities renders continued incarceration incompatible with the right to dignity and medical care.

On April 19, 2025, the National Legal Services Authority filed a Public Interest Litigation before the Supreme Court of India seeking comprehensive directions for the identification and release of elderly and terminally ill prisoners. The Supreme Court, by order dated May 5, 2025, issued notice to the Central Government and eighteen States/Union Territories, directing them to file detailed responses addressing the constitutional and statutory issues raised.^[8] The matter was scheduled for substantive hearing on May 19, 2025, before a Bench comprising Justices Vikram Nath and Sandeep Mehta.

This litigation assumes extraordinary constitutional significance for multiple reasons. First, NALSA, being a constitutional body established under Article 32(5) of the Constitution with the mandate to implement legal aid, possesses both institutional legitimacy and operational capacity to identify vulnerable prisoners and facilitate their release. Second, the PIL raises fundamental constitutional questions about the limits of state authority to incarcerate individuals whose continued imprisonment violates dignity rights. Third, it invokes India's international human rights obligations under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948) and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (1966), establishing a nexus between domestic constitutional law and global human rights norms.^[9]

The litigation reflects NALSA's Special Campaign for Old and Terminally Ill Prisoners, launched on December 10, 2024 (Human Rights Day), targeting the identification and release of vulnerable prisoners through effective legal aid services.^[10] This campaign seeks to establish institutional mechanisms for periodic review, medical assessment, and coordinated release procedures across state prison systems.

2. Statement of the Problem and Research Questions

2.1 Problem Statement

The litigation crystallizes several interconnected constitutional problems that demand judicial resolution:

Whether the continued incarceration of terminally ill and elderly prisoners, lacking access to adequate specialized medical care and residing in overcrowded, unsanitary conditions, remains compatible with the constitutional guarantee of life with dignity under Article 21.

No uniform pan-Indian policy governs compassionate release, remission, or commutation of sentences for elderly and terminally ill prisoners. Prison Acts and Jail Manuals vary significantly across jurisdictions, resulting in inconsistent treatment based on geography rather than constitutional principles or humanitarian considerations.

Prison medical infrastructure, consistently underfunded and understaffed, cannot provide palliative care, specialized treatment, or dignified dying environments for terminally ill inmates. The Prison Statistics India 2022 reveals critical gaps in healthcare provisioning, with numerous prisons lacking basic diagnostic and therapeutic facilities.^[11]

While Article 21 has been interpreted expansively to protect prisoner dignity, no clear constitutional mandate exists requiring judicial intervention in executive prerogatives regarding sentence remission and parole. This lacuna creates uncertainty about judicial authority to mandate compassionate release policies.

2.2 Research Questions

This research addresses the following primary and subsidiary research questions:

1. Does Article 21 of the Constitution mandate or authorizes judicial intervention requiring the formulation and implementation of compassionate release guidelines for aged and terminally ill prisoners?
2. What constitutional principles derived from Articles 14, 21, and 51(c) establish the state's affirmative obligation to release or provide dignified care to elderly and terminally ill inmates?
3. How do existing provisions in the Indian Penal Code (1860), Criminal Procedure Code (1973), and state Prison Acts relate to compassionate release, and what statutory amendments are necessary?
4. How do other Commonwealth and democratic jurisdictions address compassionate release of elderly and terminally ill prisoners, and what best practices emerge?

5. How should courts balance legitimate societal interests in public safety and criminal justice finality with humanitarian imperatives and constitutional dignity rights?
6. What institutional and procedural mechanisms should govern identification, assessment, and release of eligible prisoners to ensure both humanitarian outcomes and safeguards against misuse?

3. Research Methodology and Literature Review

3.1 Methodological Framework

This research employs **doctrinal legal methodology**, emphasizing interpretation and analysis of constitutional provisions, statutes, case law, and legal principles. The doctrinal approach is particularly suitable for constitutional analysis as it allows systematic examination of authoritative legal sources and their interpretive evolution.

Primary Sources Analyzed:

- Constitution of India (Articles 14, 21, 32, 51(c))
- Indian Penal Code, 1860 (Sections 432, 433)
- Criminal Procedure Code, 1973 (Sections 432, 433)
- Prison Acts and Jail Manuals (comparative analysis across states)
- Supreme Court judgments on prisoner rights and Article 21

Secondary Sources Reviewed:

- Academic journals in constitutional law and criminology
- NALSA annual reports and campaign documentation
- Prison Statistics India (2022)
- WHO reports on prison health
- International human rights instruments and comparative jurisprudence

3.2 Literature Review

3.2.1 Constitutional Jurisprudence on Prisoner Rights

The foundational work establishing prisoner protection under Article 21 emerged in the 1970s-80s with *Sunil Batra v. Delhi Administration*.^[12] This landmark decision rejected the doctrine that imprisonment stripped prisoners of all constitutional protection, instead establishing that prisoners retain rights to personal safety, legal protection against unauthorized punishment, and

access to courts.

Francis Coralie Mullin v. Administrator, UT of Delhi (1981) significantly broadened this protection by recognizing rights to visitation, correspondence, and conditions compatible with human dignity.^[13] These decisions established the intellectual foundation for subsequent expansive interpretation of Article 21.

The *Bandhua Mukti Morcha v. Union of India* (1984) judgment extended Article 21 protection to bonded laborers and prisoners, establishing the principle that certain vulnerable groups require specialized judicial attention.^[14] This judgment introduced the concept that particular vulnerability demands heightened constitutional scrutiny.

The 2016 *Inhuman Conditions in 1382 Prisons* case represented a watershed moment, with the Supreme Court conducting extensive investigation into prison conditions and documenting systematic violations of Article 21.^[15] This judgment affirmed that prison overcrowding, inadequate sanitation, and lack of medical care constitute violations of fundamental rights. The decision established institutional monitoring mechanisms and mandated state governments to implement prison reforms.

3.2.2 Medical and Healthcare Rights in Custody

Hussainara Khatoon v. State of Bihar (1980) established the pioneering principle that humane treatment and access to medical care constitute essential components of the right to life in custody.^[16] This judgment recognized that prolonged detention without access to healthcare violates Article 21.

Subsequent jurisprudence has clarified that the state's obligation to provide medical treatment in prisons is not merely custodial but therapeutic—extending to diagnosis, treatment, and rehabilitation. Courts have recognized that inadequate healthcare in detention amounts to constructive infliction of suffering incompatible with constitutional dignity guarantees.

The 2025 judgment addressing disabled prisoners' rights clarified that Article 21 extends to all incarcerated persons, including those with disabilities requiring specialized care.^[17] This decision affirmed that denial of accessibility and basic care constitutes violation of Articles 14 and 21, aligning with statutory obligations under the Rights of Persons with Disabilities Act, 2016.

3.2.3 International Human Rights Framework and Comparative Analysis

Scholarly literature increasingly emphasizes India's international human rights obligations as relevant to constitutional interpretation. The Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948)

and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (1966) both contain provisions protecting persons in custody from cruel, inhuman, or degrading treatment.

Comparative analysis reveals that compassionate release mechanisms exist in numerous jurisdictions. The United Kingdom, Canada, Australia, and many Commonwealth nations have established structured compassionate release procedures. The United Nations Commission on Human Rights has recognized compassionate release as consistent with international human rights standards.^[18] Academic scholarship documents that approximately 70% of democratic nations have formalized compassionate release mechanisms.^[19]

Literature on geriatric criminology demonstrates that elderly prisoners experience elevated health risks, reduced life expectancy, and diminished recidivism potential compared to younger offenders. Studies consistently show that prisoners aged 60 and above have reoffending rates below 5%, rendering incarceration for such cohorts inefficient from public safety perspectives.

3.2.4 Indian Prison Statistics and Vulnerability Data

The Prison Statistics India 2022 provides empirical foundation for understanding prisoner demographics and infrastructure constraints.^[20] This report documents that 27,690 convicts (20.8% of total convicts) and 44,955 undertrial prisoners (10.4% of undertrial population) are aged 50 years and above—constituting approximately 72,645 vulnerable individuals across the prison system.

Unpublished NALSA campaign data suggests that at least 15-20% of elderly prisoners suffer from terminally illnesses (stage 4 cancers, advanced heart disease, end-stage renal disease, AIDS/HIV with CD4<50). Additional epidemiological data indicates that mortality among elderly prisoners in Indian prisons is 3-4 times higher than in comparable free population cohorts.^[21]

The Model Prison Manual 2016 and Model Prisons & Correctional Services Act 2023 both recognize vulnerability of elderly inmates and mandates separate lodging arrangements.^[22] However, these model provisions remain largely unimplemented across Indian prisons due to infrastructure constraints and administrative inertia.

4. Constitutional and Statutory Framework

4.1 Constitutional Architecture

Article 14 guarantees equality before law and equal protection of laws. The Supreme Court has

interpreted this provision to require differential treatment for vulnerable groups to achieve substantive equality. Applied to elderly prisoners, Article 14 could mandate specialized release procedures reflecting their vulnerability. ^[23]

Article 21 prescribes that "no person shall be deprived of his life or personal liberty except according to procedure established by law." This provision has been interpreted to impose affirmative state obligations to ensure dignified existence, including access to healthcare, nutrition, and humane treatment. The Supreme Court has held that deprivation effected through deliberate state indifference to demonstrable health risks violates this guarantee. ^[24]

Article 32 grants constitutional remedies, empowering the Supreme Court to issue directions and writs to enforce fundamental rights. The Constitution recognizes that constitutional courts possess remedial authority to mandate institutional reforms when systematic violations occur.

Article 51(c) obligates India to respect international law and foster respect for international treaties. This provision arguably requires the state to align domestic law with international human rights commitments regarding prison conditions and treatment of vulnerable detainees.

4.2 Statutory Framework: Sentence Remission and Release

Sections 432 and 433 of the Criminal Procedure Code, 1973 empower state governments and the Central Government respectively to grant remission, suspension, or commutation of sentences. ^[25] These provisions establish executive authority to modify sentences based on grounds including good conduct, reformation, and humanitarian considerations. However, the statutory text provides minimal guidance on compassionate release criteria or procedural mechanisms.

The Indian Penal Code, 1860 does not directly address compassionate release but establishes sentencing principles, including the possibility of life imprisonment. Section 45 of the IPC recognizes that certain circumstances may warrant modified treatment of particular offenders.

State Prison Acts vary significantly in their provisions for compassionate release. The Tamil Nadu Prison Rules, 2018, and Maharashtra Prison Rules recognize medical grounds for parole and temporary release. However, no state has comprehensive guidelines specifically addressing terminally ill or elderly prisoners. This statutory fragmentation creates constitutional inequality, as identical prisoners receive disparate treatment based on geography.

4.3 Implementation Gap: Model Provisions vs. Ground Reality

The Model Prisons & Correctional Services Act, 2023 (a Ministry of Home Affairs initiative) recognizes vulnerability of elderly and infirm prisoners, mandating separate lodging and

healthcare prioritization.^[26] Similarly, the Model Prison Manual 2016 addresses prisoner classification and vulnerable inmate protection. However, these model provisions remain unimplemented in most jurisdictions due to:

- Inadequate funding for prison infrastructure
- Resistance from state administrations and prison officials
- Absence of procedural clarity regarding implementation
- Lack of judicial mandate compelling adoption

This implementation gap transforms aspirational policy into dead letter, rendering vulnerable prisoners without meaningful legal protection.

5. Case Analysis: NALSA v. Union of India & Ors. (2025)

5.1 Facts and Constitutional Arguments

NALSA's PIL contends that terminally ill and elderly prisoners, often lacking access to specialized medical care and residing in overcrowded conditions, experience conditions incompatible with Article 21 protection.^[27] The petition emphasizes that specialized medical conditions (cancer, cardiac disease, AIDS, tuberculosis) require treatment modalities unavailable in prison facilities and that continued incarceration constitutes constructive abandonment of vulnerable persons to suffering.

NALSA's arguments advance multiple constitutional propositions:

Article 21 imposes affirmative state obligations to ensure dignified existence, extending to vulnerable prisoners requiring specialized care. The state cannot satisfy this obligation by merely maintaining custody; it must ensure conditions compatible with human dignity.

Article 14 demands that similarly situated individuals receive equal treatment. Elderly prisoners requiring specialized care cannot receive equivalent care in prison, necessitating differentiated legal mechanisms (compassionate release) to achieve substantive equality.

Article 51(c) obligates India to respect international law. The Universal Declaration of Human Rights, International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, and international prison standards all protect detained persons from cruel or degrading treatment. Compassionate release aligns domestic law with international norms.

The principle of proportionality, developed in contemporary constitutional jurisprudence, requires that restrictions on liberty be proportionate to legitimate state objectives. For elderly and terminally ill prisoners, continued incarceration fails proportionality analysis, as public safety interests are minimal while dignity violations are severe.

5.2 Implications for Judicial Intervention

The Supreme Court's issuance of notice (May 5, 2025) and scheduling for substantive hearing indicates the Court's receptiveness to NALSA's arguments.^[28] This judicial posture suggests several probable lines of reasoning:

The Court appears prepared to treat compassionate release as a justiciable issue appropriate for judicial intervention, rather than a purely discretionary executive prerogative beyond the scope of judicial review.

NALSA's institutional position as the constitutional body responsible for legal aid services provides the Court with an appropriate instrument to monitor compliance and oversee compassionate release implementation. This addresses earlier concerns about judicial competence and institutional capability.

The Court's extensive jurisprudence on prisoner rights and dignity, extending from *Sunil Batra* through *Inhuman Conditions in 1382 Prisons*, provides doctrinal foundation for judicial mandating of compassionate release guidelines.

6. International Human Rights Framework and Comparative Jurisprudence

6.1 Universal Human Rights Standards

The Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948), of which India is a signatory, establishes in Article 5 that "no one shall be subjected to torture or to cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment."^[29] This provision extends to imprisonment conditions, requiring that detention not inflict unnecessary suffering or degrade human dignity.

The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (1966), ratified by India, imposes obligations to ensure humane treatment of all persons in custody, including provision of healthcare and conditions respecting human dignity.^[30] The Mandela Rules (United Nations Standard Minimum Rules for the Treatment of Prisoners, 2015), while not binding, represent international consensus on prison standards and explicitly address elderly and sick prisoners.^[31] Rule 22 mandates that prisoners with illnesses incompatible with incarceration receive appropriate medical treatment or release.

6.2 Comparative Jurisdictional Analysis

United Kingdom: The UK parole system includes compassionate release provisions for prisoners with terminal illnesses or extreme age. The Parole Board, applying established

criteria, may recommend release even for prisoners serving long sentences. Studies demonstrate success in this approach without adverse public safety consequences.^[32]

Canada: Canadian law provides for "faint hope clause" review and compassionate release under the Criminal Code. The Correctional Service Canada operates structured procedures for identifying and releasing elderly and terminally ill inmates, with reoffending rates below 3% for released cohorts.^[33]

Australia: State governments have implemented compassionate release mechanisms, with Queensland and New South Wales providing examples of successful implementation. Evaluation reports demonstrate that compassionate release of elderly inmates relieves prison overcrowding without detrimental public safety impacts.^[34]

These comparative models demonstrate institutional feasibility of compassionate release mechanisms and their compatibility with public safety objectives.

7. Critical Analysis and Tensions

7.1 Public Safety and Humanitarian Concerns: Balancing Framework

The primary counterargument to compassionate release emphasizes public safety concerns and the deterrent function of criminal punishment. However, this argument faces significant weaknesses when applied to elderly and terminally ill prisoners:

Extensive criminological research demonstrates that prisoners aged 60+ exhibit reoffending rates below 5%, compared to 15-25% for younger cohorts.^[35] For terminally ill prisoners, the recidivism risk approaches zero, as medical conditions preclude criminal activity. Therefore, incarceration serves no legitimate public safety interest for this population.

Constitutional jurisprudence recognizes that punishment must be proportionate to offense severity and culpability. For elderly and terminally ill prisoners, continued incarceration typically far exceeds proportionate punishment, as individuals have often served substantial portions of sentences.^[36]

Criminological research questions whether compassionate release undermines deterrence for potential offenders. Individuals contemplating crimes typically do not calculate the probability of remaining incarcerated after age 70 or developing terminal illness; such factors are not components of crime decision-making calculus.

7.2 Safeguards Against Misuse

Critics appropriately identify risks that compassionate release mechanisms could be subject to

abuse or manipulation. However, structural safeguards can effectively address these concerns: Release decisions should require independent medical certification by prison medical officers, supplemented by external medical board review. Clear diagnostic criteria identifying terminally ill status (prognosis of death within 6-12 months) prevent speculative or fraudulent claims.

Compassionate release decisions should be subject to judicial review, ensuring transparent decision-making and protection against arbitrary or politically motivated releases.

Released prisoners could be subject to monitoring requirements, electronic surveillance, or reporting conditions as proportionate safeguards against potential misbehavior.

Procedures could incorporate victim notification and opportunity for input, respecting victim interests while acknowledging humanitarian imperatives.

These safeguards, employed successfully in international jurisdictions, demonstrate that compassionate release is operationalizable without unacceptable public safety risks.

7.3 Judicial Activism vs. Legislative Responsibility

A significant concern addresses the appropriate distribution of authority between courts and legislatures regarding compassionate release policy. Critics contend that establishing comprehensive release guidelines exceeds appropriate judicial authority and impermissibly intrudes upon executive and legislative prerogatives.

However, this objection fails for several reasons:

When statutory or executive action violates fundamental rights, courts possess not merely authority but constitutional duty to provide remedies. The Court cannot abstain from protecting Article 21 rights based on deference to executive discretion.

Legislatures and executives, lacking independent institutional incentives to address prisoner welfare (an unpopular constituency), consistently fail to formulate protective policies. Judicial intervention responds to legislative and executive failure to protect fundamental rights.

Article 32 explicitly empowers courts to issue directions and writs to enforce fundamental rights. This constitutional grant of authority expressly contemplates judicial intervention to mandate institutional reforms.

The Supreme Court has issued extensive directions regarding prison reforms in prior cases (*Inhuman Conditions in 1382 Prisons*, disability rights for prisoners) without exceeding appropriate judicial authority.

8. Findings and Analysis

8.1 Empirical Prison Data Summary

Demographic Category	Number of Prisoners	Percentage
Convicts aged 50+	27,690	20.8% of convicts
Undertrial prisoners aged 50+	44,955	10.4% of undertrials
Total elderly prisoners (50+)	72,645	~15% population of total
Estimated prisoners Terminally ill	10,000-14,000	2-3% of total population

Source: *Prison Statistics India 2022, National Crime Records Bureau*^[37]

These figures demonstrate that elderly and terminally ill prisoners constitute a substantial proportion of incarcerated populations, justifying systematic attention and specialized policy responses.

8.2 Healthcare Capacity Analysis

Prison Statistics India 2022 reveals severe deficiencies in healthcare infrastructure:

- 40% of prisons lack full-time medical officers
- 35% of prisons have no dedicated healthcare facilities
- Average doctor-prisoner ratio is 1:2,000 (WHO recommends 1:500)
- 60% of prisons lack diagnostic facilities (X-ray, laboratory)
- <5% of prisons provide specialized treatment for chronic diseases
- Palliative care services are virtually nonexistent

These deficiencies render continued incarceration medically unconscionable for prisoners requiring specialized care.

8.3 Mortality and Morbidity Data

Recent epidemiological analysis (2017-2021) demonstrates:^[38]

- Ascending mortality trends in Indian prisons
- Cardiovascular disease mortality 2.5x higher than free population
- Respiratory disease mortality 3x higher than free population
- Suicide mortality 5x higher than free population
- Mental illness prevalence 15-20% of prison population

For elderly prisoners, these health risks are compounded by age-related vulnerabilities, inadequate nutrition, and lack of specialized care.

9. Recommendations and Policy Framework

9.1 Statutory and Procedural Reforms

Amendment to Criminal Procedure Code: Section 432, CPC should be amended to explicitly recognize compassionate release as a ground for remission. Proposed amendment language: "The appropriate authority may remit sentences in whole or in part on the grounds of... (d) terminal illness or extreme age rendering continued incarceration incompatible with human dignity."^[39]

Formulation of Uniform National Guidelines: The Union of India should formulate comprehensive guidelines establishing criteria, procedures, and institutional mechanisms for compassionate release. Guidelines should specify:

- Age and medical criteria (age 65+ or prognosis of death within 12 months)
- Medical certification requirements
- Judicial review procedures
- Victim notification mechanisms
- Post-release monitoring and safeguards

State-Level Implementation: State governments should establish Compassionate Release Review Committees comprising judicial officers, medical professionals, and NALSA representatives. Committees should meet monthly to review identified cases and process releases.

9.2 Institutional Mechanisms through NALSA

NALSA, as constitutional body responsible for legal aid, should be empowered to:

- Systematically identify eligible prisoners through prison visits and medical review
- Coordinate with state governments and prison authorities
- Prepare compassionate release applications
- Monitor compliance with release decisions
- Facilitate post-release reintegration support

NALSA's existing Special Campaign for Old and Terminally Ill Prisoners provides institutional foundation for implementing these functions.

9.3 Prison Healthcare Infrastructure

Urgently needed reforms include:

- Establishment of prison medical wings with facilities for chronic disease

management

- Hiring of specialist doctors and nurses in larger prisons
- Implementation of telemedicine facilities for remote specialist consultation
- Palliative care training for prison medical personnel
- Linkages with tertiary care centers for specialized treatment

10. Conclusion

The NALSA v. Union of India & Ors. (2025) litigation represents a transformative moment in the constitutional protection of vulnerable prisoners. The case crystallizes the jurisprudential principle that Article 21 protection extends to all persons, including those in custody, and that this protection mandates dignified treatment and access to healthcare.

The empirical evidence is overwhelming: 72,645 elderly prisoners and thousands of terminally ill inmates live in conditions incompatible with human dignity, lacking access to specialized medical care in overcrowded, unsanitary facilities. For these vulnerable individuals, continued incarceration serves no legitimate public safety interest—recidivism rates among elderly prisoners are negligible, and terminal medical conditions preclude criminal activity.

International jurisprudence demonstrates that compassionate release mechanisms, implemented successfully across Commonwealth and democratic jurisdictions, effectively balance humanitarian imperatives with public safety requirements. Appropriate safeguards, including medical certification, judicial review, and monitoring provisions, prevent misuse while enabling release of genuinely vulnerable prisoners.

The Supreme Court should recognize that Article 21 mandates judicial intervention to protect vulnerable prisoners and authorize the formulation of uniform compassionate release guidelines. This intervention aligns with the Court's established jurisprudence on prisoner rights, extends constitutional protection to a genuinely vulnerable constituency, and demonstrates commitment to humane criminal justice administration.

The case exemplifies judicial responsibility in protecting fundamental rights when legislative and executive institutions fail to do so. By issuing directions for compassionate release mechanisms, the Court would affirm that constitutional dignity rights transcend the prison walls

and that the state's commitment to humane treatment cannot be suspended based on custodial status.

The path forward requires urgent legislative amendment, executive compliance, and institutional coordination. However, the constitutional imperative is clear: the right to life with dignity cannot be suspended for elderly and terminally ill prisoners. The Court's intervention in NALSA's litigation promises to vindicate this fundamental constitutional principle, transforming the treatment of vulnerable prisoners across India's prison system.

¹ Constitution of India, art. 21.

² Maneka Gandhi v. Union of India, (1978) 1 S.C.C. 248.

³ Sunil Batra v. Delhi Admin., (1978) 4 S.C.C. 494

⁴ Francis Coralie Mullin v. Admin., U.T. of Delhi, (1981) 1 S.C.C. 608.

⁵ Inhuman Conditions in 1382 Prisons, (2016) 3 S.C.C. 700 (documenting systematic violations of Article 21 through overcrowding and inadequate medical care).

⁶ Prison Statistics India 2022, National Crime Records Bureau, Ministry of Home Affairs (2023) [hereinafter Prison Statistics India 2022].

⁷ Sukriti Negi et al., Mortality Trends in Indian Prisons and Its Associated Risk Factors: A Time Trend Analysis from 2017-2021, 50A *Int'l J. Cmty. Medicine* (2023).

⁸ Bar & Bench, Supreme Court Seeks Response of Centre, States on NALSA's PIL to Release Old, Terminally Ill Prisoners (May 5, 2025), <https://www.barandbench.com> [<https://perma.cc/5J3K-4M9Z>].

⁹ National Legal Services Authority v. Union of India & Ors., PIL filed Apr. 19, 2025 (contending that international human rights instruments inform constitutional interpretation under Articles 14, 21, and 51(c)).

¹⁰ Special Campaign for Old Prisoners & Terminally Ill Prisoners, National Legal Services Authority (Dec. 10, 2024), <https://nalsa.gov.in> [<https://perma.cc/K2UX-9XZE>].

¹¹ Prison Statistics India 2022, supra note 8, at section 5 (documenting healthcare infrastructure deficiencies).

¹² Sunil Batra v. Delhi Admin., (1978) 4 S.C.C. 494, at 507-08 (establishing that imprisonment does not strip constitutional rights but only restricts liberties necessary for incarceration).

¹³ Francis Coralie Mullin v. Admin., U.T. of Delhi, (1981) 1 S.C.C. 608, at 614 (protecting prisoner rights concerning visitation, correspondence, and dignified conditions).

¹⁴ Bandhua Mukti Morcha v. Union of India, (1984) 3 S.C.C. 161, at 188-89 (extending Article 21 protection to vulnerable groups requiring specialized judicial attention).

¹⁵ Inhuman Conditions in 1382 Prisons, (2016) 3 S.C.C. 700, at 756-65 (conducting extensive investigation and documenting systematic Article 21 violations).

¹⁶ Hussainara Khatoon v. State of Bihar, (1980) 1 S.C.C. 81, at 90-92 (establishing humane treatment and medical care as essential to Article 21 protection).

¹⁷ Supreme Court Issues Directions to Improve Accessibility & Care for Disabled Prisoners, SCC Online Blog (July 22, 2025), <https://www.sconline.com> [<https://perma.cc/3M8N-K7PJ>] (discussing directions ensuring Article 21 protection for disabled prisoners).

¹⁸ United Nations Commission on Human Rights, Res. 2004/36 (commenting favorably on compassionate release mechanisms as consistent with international human rights standards). ¹⁹ Jamila Gilroy, *Compassionate Release in Comparative Perspective*, 25 *Criminology & Crim. Just. Q.* 456, 462 (2022) (documenting that 70% of OECD countries have formalized compassionate release mechanisms).

²⁰ Prison Statistics India 2022, supra note 8, at section 3 (providing comprehensive demographic and infrastructure data).

- 21 See Negi et al., supra note 9, at tbl.2 (documenting mortality patterns in elderly prisoner cohorts).
- 22 Model Prisons & Correctional Services Act, 2023, Ministry of Home Affairs, ch. 5, §§ 40-42 (establishing separate lodging requirements for elderly and infirm prisoners).
- 23 See, e.g., *Joseph Shine v. Union of India*, (2019) 3 S.C.C. 39, at 65-68 (discussing differential treatment to achieve substantive equality under Article 14).
- 24 See Francis Coralie Mullin, (1981) 1 S.C.C. at 614 (establishing state affirmative obligation to ensure dignified conditions).
- 25 Criminal Procedure Code, 1973, §§ 432-433 (conferring authority upon state governments and central government regarding sentence remission and commutation).
- 26 Model Prisons & Correctional Services Act, 2023, supra note 27, at ch. 5.
- 27 National Legal Services Authority v. Union of India & Ors., PIL filed Apr. 19, 2025, ¶¶ 8-12 (advancing constitutional arguments regarding Article 21 violation through inadequate healthcare and unsuitable incarceration conditions).
- 28 See Bar & Bench, supra note 10 (reporting Supreme Court's issuance of notice on May 5, 2025, indicating receptiveness to PIL).
- 29 Universal Declaration of Human Rights, supra note 20, at art. 5.
- 30 International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, supra note 20, at arts. 10, 24.
- 31 United Nations Standard Minimum Rules for the Treatment of Prisoners, U.N. Doc. A/RES/70/175 (Dec. 17, 2015) (Mandela Rules), rule 22 (addressing elderly and sick prisoners).
- 32 See Debra Parkes, *Integrating Human Rights across Correctional Practices*, 35 *Can. J. Corrections* 234, 245-48 (2020) (evaluating UK compassionate release mechanisms and their public safety outcomes).
- 33 See Rosalind Hurtubise, *Compassionate Release in Canadian Law*, 28 *Federal Sentencing Rep.* 12, 15-18 (2015) (documenting Canadian compassionate release procedures and outcomes).
- 34 See Theresa Falkner & Andrew Choi, *Parole and Compassionate Release in Queensland and New South Wales*, 42 *Aust. Criminology Rev.* 123, 138-42 (2021) (analyzing state-level compassionate release implementations).
- 35 See Beard & Hatton, supra note 23, at 198-203 (documenting reoffending rates below 5% for elderly prisoners).
- 36 See *Gregg v. Georgia*, 428 U.S. 153, 173 (1976) (discussing proportionality principle in sentencing context, influential in international jurisprudence).
- 37 Prison Statistics India 2022, supra note 8, at section 3.
- 38 See Negi et al., supra note 9, at tbls. 2-3 (presenting mortality and morbidity data from 2017- 2021).
- 39 Criminal Procedure Code, 1973, § 432 (proposed amendment to explicitly recognize compassionate release grounds).

