



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](http://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.

# **THE CURRENT STATUS OF WOMEN'S RIGHTS IN THE INDIAN PRISON SYSTEM: AN ANALYTICAL STUDY**

AUTHORED BY - MANJU DEVI

Research Scholar, IIMT University, Meerut

CO-AUTHOR - DR. KAMLESH RISHI

Assistant Professor, IIMT University, Meerut

## **Abstract**

Women constitute a small yet highly vulnerable population within India's prison system, and their experiences reflect deep structural inequalities shaped by gender, class, caste, health status, and social marginalisation. This analytical study examines the current status of women's rights in Indian prisons through the lens of constitutional guarantees, statutory protections, judicial interventions, and administrative practices. It evaluates the extent to which Articles 14, 15, and 21 of the Constitution of India, the Prisons Act, 1894, Model Prison Manual, 2016, and international human-rights standards such as the UN Bangkok Rules are implemented in custodial settings. The study explores key concerns affecting incarcerated women, including overcrowding, inadequate healthcare, reproductive and menstrual hygiene, custodial violence, lack of gender-sensitive infrastructure, access to legal aid, separation from children, and rehabilitation and reintegration programmes.

Judicial pronouncements of the Supreme Court and High Courts have progressively expanded the rights of prisoners, recognising dignity, privacy, and access to medical care as integral to the right to life. However, the research highlights persistent gaps between normative frameworks and actual conditions on the ground, largely due to resource constraints, uneven state-level implementation, lack of trained personnel, and weak monitoring mechanisms. The paper argues that meaningful reform requires stronger legislative compliance, gender-responsive budgeting, independent oversight bodies, improved data collection, and community-based alternatives to incarceration for women. By synthesising legal analysis with contemporary policy debates, this study seeks to contribute to ongoing discussions on prison reform and gender justice in India.

**Keywords:** Women prisoners; Prison reform; Human rights; Gender justice; Indian legal system.

## Introduction

The condition of women in custodial institutions has increasingly attracted scholarly, judicial, and policy attention in India, particularly in light of expanding constitutional jurisprudence on dignity, equality, and personal liberty. Although women constitute a comparatively small proportion of the total prison population, their incarceration raises distinctive legal and social questions concerning bodily autonomy, reproductive health, childcare, protection from abuse, access to justice, and rehabilitation. According to the National Crime Records Bureau (NCRB), women account for less than five per cent of India's prison population, yet their vulnerability within an overwhelmingly male-oriented prison infrastructure remains acute.<sup>1</sup> The present analytical study situates women's rights in Indian prisons within this complex normative and empirical landscape, examining the intersection between constitutional guarantees, statutory frameworks, administrative rules, and international human-rights obligations.

This introduction seeks to map the conceptual, legal, and institutional terrain governing the treatment of women prisoners in India. It first outlines the historical evolution of prison administration and gendered incarceration, followed by a discussion of constitutional protections and statutory regimes applicable to incarcerated women. It then locates Indian practice within the broader international human-rights framework, before identifying persistent structural challenges and the rationale for undertaking the present study.

### Historical Context of Prisons and Gendered Incarceration in India

India's prison system remains largely governed by colonial-era legislation, most notably the Prisons Act, 1894, which was enacted primarily to ensure discipline and security rather than to protect prisoner welfare.<sup>2</sup> While the Act contains limited provisions for the segregation of women prisoners and the appointment of female warders, it does not reflect contemporary understandings of gender justice, trauma-informed care, or rehabilitative penology. Post-Independence reform efforts have been sporadic, and although several states have enacted prison manuals and rules, implementation has varied considerably across jurisdictions.

---

<sup>1</sup> National Crime Records Bureau, *Prison Statistics India 2022*, Ministry of Home Affairs, <https://ncrb.gov.in> (accessed 23 January 2026).

<sup>2</sup> The Prisons Act, 1894, No. 9 of 1894 (India), available at <https://legislative.gov.in> (accessed 23 January 2026).

Historically, criminological discourse in India paid scant attention to women offenders, often treating them as marginal anomalies within a male-dominated system.<sup>3</sup> Feminist legal scholarship has since challenged this marginalisation, arguing that women prisoners frequently come from backgrounds marked by poverty, domestic violence, lack of education, and social exclusion, which both shape pathways to crime and intensify custodial hardship.<sup>4</sup> The persistence of these structural vulnerabilities underscores the need for a gender-sensitive approach to prison governance.

### Constitutional Foundations of Prisoners' Rights

The constitutional framework provides the normative backbone for analysing women's rights in custody. Articles 14 and 15 guarantee equality before the law and prohibit discrimination on grounds of sex, while Article 21—interpreted expansively by the Supreme Court—protects life and personal liberty, encompassing dignity, health, privacy, and humane treatment. Beginning with *Sunil Batra v. Delhi Administration*, the Court affirmed that prisoners do not shed their fundamental rights at the prison gate and that any deprivation must be just, fair, and reasonable.<sup>5</sup>

Subsequent decisions have extended these principles to issues such as custodial violence, medical care, and access to legal aid. In *Sheela Barse v. State of Maharashtra*, the Supreme Court specifically addressed the plight of women prisoners, directing the appointment of female guards, separate lock-ups, legal assistance, and periodic judicial inspection of prisons housing women.<sup>6</sup> The Court's intervention marked an early recognition of gender-specific vulnerabilities in custody, situating women's prison rights firmly within constitutional discourse.

More recently, judicial pronouncements concerning privacy, reproductive autonomy, and conditions of detention—such as *Justice K.S. Puttaswamy v. Union of India*—have indirectly strengthened the normative basis for challenging intrusive surveillance, inadequate sanitation,

---

<sup>3</sup> Veena Das, "Gender and Social Control in Colonial India" in *Critical Perspectives on Crime and Punishment* (Oxford University Press 2011), <https://global.oup.com> (accessed 23 January 2026).

<sup>4</sup> Flavia Agnes, *Law and Gender Inequality* (Oxford University Press 1999), <https://academic.oup.com> (accessed 23 January 2026).

<sup>5</sup> *Sunil Batra v Delhi Administration* (1978) 4 SCC 494, <https://indiankanoon.org> (accessed 23 January 2026).

<sup>6</sup> *Sheela Barse v State of Maharashtra* (1983) 2 SCC 96, <https://indiankanoon.org> (accessed 23 January 2026).

and denial of reproductive healthcare in prisons.<sup>7</sup> These evolving constitutional standards form a critical backdrop against which the present study evaluates current practices.

### **Statutory and Administrative Framework**

Beyond constitutional guarantees, the statutory regime governing prisons includes the Prisons Act, 1894, state prison rules, the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973, and special legislation concerning undertrial prisoners and juveniles. However, many of these instruments lack explicit gender-sensitive provisions. To address this gap, the Ministry of Home Affairs released the Model Prison Manual, 2016, which devotes a separate chapter to women prisoners, prescribing standards relating to accommodation, healthcare, pregnancy and childbirth, crèches for children, vocational training, and post-release rehabilitation.<sup>8</sup>

The Manual draws heavily upon international best practices and represents a significant normative advance. Nevertheless, as it is merely advisory, its effectiveness depends on adoption by individual states—a process that remains uneven. Empirical studies and parliamentary committee reports suggest that overcrowding, shortage of female staff, limited medical facilities, and poor sanitation continue to characterise many women's prisons and enclosures within mixed institutions.<sup>9</sup>

The gap between law on the books and law in action remains a central concern of prison-reform discourse. This study therefore interrogates not only the formal content of statutes and manuals but also the institutional capacity and political will required to translate normative commitments into lived realities.

### **International Human-Rights Norms and Comparative Perspectives**

India is a party to several international instruments relevant to the treatment of prisoners, including the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR) and the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW). Article 10 of

---

<sup>7</sup> *Justice K.S. Puttaswamy v Union of India* (2017) 10 SCC 1, <https://indiankanoon.org> (accessed 23 January 2026).

<sup>8</sup> Ministry of Home Affairs, *Model Prison Manual 2016*, Government of India, <https://www.mha.gov.in> (accessed 23 January 2026).

<sup>9</sup> Department-related Parliamentary Standing Committee on Home Affairs, *Prison Conditions, Infrastructure and Reforms* (2021), <https://rajyasabha.nic.in> (accessed 23 January 2026).

the ICCPR mandates humane treatment of persons deprived of liberty, while CEDAW obliges states to eliminate discrimination against women in all spheres, including penal institutions.<sup>10</sup>

Particularly significant are the United Nations Rules for the Treatment of Women Prisoners and Non-custodial Measures for Women Offenders, popularly known as the Bangkok Rules, adopted by the UN General Assembly in 2010.<sup>11</sup> These rules emphasise gender-specific healthcare, protection from abuse, alternatives to incarceration for pregnant women and mothers of young children, and post-release reintegration support. Indian policy documents, including the Model Prison Manual, explicitly reference these standards, signalling a willingness to align domestic practice with international norms.

Comparative experiences from jurisdictions such as the United Kingdom, South Africa, and Canada—where courts and prison authorities have experimented with community-based sentencing, mother-and-child units, and trauma-informed correctional models—further illuminate possible pathways for reform in India.<sup>12</sup> Situating Indian practice within this global context allows for a critical appraisal of both achievements and deficiencies.

### **Contemporary Challenges and the Rationale for the Present Study**

Despite progressive constitutional jurisprudence and policy initiatives, conditions for women prisoners in India continue to raise serious human-rights concerns. Reports by the NCRB, the National Human Rights Commission, and civil-society organisations document problems such as delayed medical attention, inadequate mental-health services, custodial violence, lack of privacy, and disruption of family ties, particularly for women incarcerated with children.<sup>13</sup> The overrepresentation of undertrial prisoners among women detainees further compounds these issues, highlighting systemic delays in investigation and trial.

The COVID-19 pandemic exposed and exacerbated existing deficiencies, drawing judicial scrutiny to overcrowding and healthcare in prisons nationwide.<sup>14</sup> These developments have

---

<sup>10</sup> International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, 1966, <https://www.ohchr.org> (accessed 23 January 2026).

<sup>11</sup> United Nations General Assembly, *Rules for the Treatment of Women Prisoners and Non-custodial Measures for Women Offenders (Bangkok Rules)*, 2010, <https://www.unodc.org> (accessed 23 January 2026).

<sup>12</sup> Penal Reform International, *Global Prison Trends 2023*, <https://www.penalreform.org> (accessed 23 January 2026).

<sup>13</sup> National Human Rights Commission, *Annual Report 2021–22*, <https://nhrc.nic.in> (accessed 23 January 2026).

<sup>14</sup> *In Re: Contagion of COVID-19 Virus in Prisons* (2020) SCC OnLine SC 343, <https://indiankanoon.org> (accessed 23 January 2026)

renewed calls for comprehensive prison reform grounded in gender sensitivity, transparency, and accountability.

Against this backdrop, the present analytical study seeks to evaluate the *current* status of women's rights in Indian prisons, rather than merely the normative ideals articulated in statutes and judgments. By synthesising constitutional law, statutory analysis, administrative practice, and empirical data, the study aims to identify structural barriers to reform and propose pathways for ensuring that the incarceration of women conforms to the constitutional promise of dignity and equality.

### **Objectives of the study**

- To critically examine the legal and institutional framework governing the rights of women prisoners in India and assess the extent of its implementation in practice.
- To identify systemic challenges within the Indian prison system affecting incarcerated women and propose reforms consistent with constitutional mandates and international human-rights standards.

### **Research methodology**

This study adopts a doctrinal and analytical research methodology, relying primarily on secondary sources such as constitutional provisions, statutes, prison manuals, judicial decisions, parliamentary reports, and international human-rights instruments. It also incorporates empirical data drawn from National Crime Records Bureau statistics and reports of the National Human Rights Commission and civil-society organisations to evaluate ground realities. Comparative analysis is employed to examine international standards and best practices relevant to women prisoners. The collected materials are critically analysed to identify gaps between normative frameworks and actual implementation and to propose legally sustainable reforms for strengthening the protection of women's rights in Indian prisons.

### **Analysis**

Indian constitutional courts have played a central role in transforming prisons from closed administrative spaces into sites subject to constitutional scrutiny. Although early prison legislation was largely silent on gender-specific concerns, judicial interpretation of Articles 14, 15 and 21 has progressively infused custodial regimes with norms of dignity, healthcare,

procedural fairness, and protection against abuse. This section analyses how courts—through a series of landmark decisions spanning five decades—have shaped the rights of prisoners generally and women prisoners in particular, while also identifying persistent structural gaps between legal standards and lived realities.

## I. Expansion of Article 21 and Prisoners' Rights

The modern jurisprudence on prisoners' rights began with *Sunil Batra v Delhi Administration*, where the Supreme Court held that incarceration does not eclipse fundamental rights and condemned practices such as solitary confinement and custodial brutality.<sup>15</sup> The Court's insistence that prison authorities are subject to constitutional discipline laid the foundation for later gender-sensitive interventions.

Earlier, in *Hussainara Khatoon v State of Bihar*, the Court exposed the plight of undertrial prisoners languishing for years without trial, linking speedy justice to Article 21.<sup>16</sup> Although not gender-specific, the ruling is crucial for women prisoners, a majority of whom remain undertrials according to NCRB data. Closely allied was *Francis Coralie Mullin v Administrator, Union Territory of Delhi*, which expanded the meaning of "life" to include the right to live with dignity, adequate nutrition, and facilities for family contact—concerns of particular relevance to incarcerated women and mothers.<sup>17</sup>

The Court reiterated these principles in *Rama Murthy v State of Karnataka*, identifying systemic deficiencies in prisons, including overcrowding, lack of medical care, and absence of grievance mechanisms, and calling for comprehensive reform.<sup>18</sup> These structural critiques underpin contemporary assessments of women's custodial conditions.

## II. Gender-Specific Judicial Interventions

A watershed moment for women prisoners came in *Sheela Barse v State of Maharashtra*, where the Supreme Court addressed custodial violence and neglect faced by female detainees. The Court mandated separate lock-ups for women, interrogation only in the presence of female

---

<sup>15</sup> *Sunil Batra v Delhi Administration* (1978) 4 SCC 494, <https://indiankanoon.org/doc/1424976/> (accessed 23 January 2026).

<sup>16</sup> *Hussainara Khatoon v State of Bihar* (1980) 1 SCC 81, <https://indiankanoon.org/doc/274688/> (accessed 23 January 2026).

<sup>17</sup> *Francis Coralie Mullin v Administrator, UT of Delhi* (1981) 1 SCC 608, <https://indiankanoon.org/doc/1509726/> (accessed 23 January 2026).

<sup>18</sup> *Rama Murthy v State of Karnataka* (1997) 2 SCC 642, <https://indiankanoon.org/doc/1959091/> (accessed 23 January 2026).

police officers, access to legal aid, and periodic judicial inspections.<sup>19</sup> This decision foregrounded gender as a constitutional variable in prison governance.

In *Sheela Barse v Union of India*, the Court further directed that children of women prisoners should not be forced to live in jail and emphasised rehabilitative measures for female inmates.<sup>20</sup>

These rulings anticipated later international standards such as the Bangkok Rules.

The plight of pregnant women and mothers in custody was comprehensively examined in *R.D. Upadhyay v State of Andhra Pradesh*, where the Court framed detailed guidelines on childbirth in prison, nutritional standards, crèche facilities, and the treatment of children residing with incarcerated mothers.<sup>21</sup> The judgment explicitly linked maternal and child welfare in prisons to constitutional obligations, making it one of the most significant gender-sensitive decisions in Indian penal jurisprudence.

### III. Protection from Custodial Violence and Abuse

Judicial concern for custodial violence—an issue disproportionately affecting vulnerable groups including women—has been a recurring theme. In *D.K. Basu v State of West Bengal*, the Supreme Court laid down mandatory guidelines for arrest and detention, including medical examination, intimation to relatives, and arrest memos.<sup>22</sup> These safeguards are vital for women detainees, who face heightened risks of abuse in custody.

Similarly, in *Nilabati Behera v State of Orissa*, the Court recognised public-law compensation for custodial deaths, reinforcing state accountability for violations of Article 21.<sup>23</sup> In *Bandhua Mukti Morcha v Union of India*, although arising from bonded labour, the Court articulated a broader conception of state responsibility for humane conditions in custodial and quasi-custodial institutions.<sup>24</sup>

In *Charles Sobhraj v Superintendent, Central Jail, Tihar*, the Court underscored that restrictions on prisoners must be reasonable and non-arbitrary, reaffirming that security

---

<sup>19</sup> *Sheela Barse v State of Maharashtra* (1983) 2 SCC 96, <https://indiankanoon.org/doc/1269016/> (accessed 23 January 2026).

<sup>20</sup> *Sheela Barse v Union of India* (1986) 3 SCC 596, <https://indiankanoon.org/doc/1878052/> (accessed 23 January 2026).

<sup>21</sup> *R.D. Upadhyay v State of Andhra Pradesh* (2007) 15 SCC 337, <https://indiankanoon.org/doc/1168110/> (accessed 23 January 2026).

<sup>22</sup> *D.K. Basu v State of West Bengal* (1997) 1 SCC 416, <https://indiankanoon.org/doc/1199182/> (accessed 23 January 2026).

<sup>23</sup> *Nilabati Behera v State of Orissa* (1993) 2 SCC 746, <https://indiankanoon.org/doc/1427624/> (accessed 23 January 2026).

<sup>24</sup> *Bandhua Mukti Morcha v Union of India* (1984) 3 SCC 161, <https://indiankanoon.org/doc/1324434/> (accessed 23 January 2026).

considerations cannot justify inhuman treatment.<sup>25</sup> These decisions collectively construct a rights-based framework applicable to women prisoners facing physical or psychological abuse.

#### **IV. Healthcare, Privacy and Bodily Autonomy**

Access to healthcare has consistently been recognised as intrinsic to Article 21. In *Parmanand Katara v Union of India*, the Court declared that preservation of life takes precedence over procedural formalities, obligating the state to provide immediate medical aid even to accused persons.<sup>26</sup> This principle has particular salience for pregnant prisoners, women with mental-health needs, and those requiring reproductive care.

More recently, the privacy jurisprudence articulated in *Justice K.S. Puttaswamy v Union of India* has profound implications for women in custody, especially regarding intrusive searches, surveillance, and reproductive choices.<sup>27</sup> Although not a prison case per se, its recognition of bodily autonomy strengthens constitutional challenges to degrading custodial practices.

The Supreme Court's suo motu proceedings in *In Re: Inhuman Conditions in 1382 Prisons* further directed states to improve medical facilities, sanitation, and grievance redressal mechanisms, highlighting chronic deficiencies affecting all prisoners, including women.<sup>28</sup>

#### **V. COVID-19 and Renewed Scrutiny of Prison Conditions**

The COVID-19 pandemic prompted unprecedented judicial intervention in prison administration. In *In Re: Contagion of COVID-19 Virus in Prisons*, the Supreme Court ordered states to consider decongestion through interim bail and parole, recognising the heightened vulnerability of inmates to disease outbreaks.<sup>29</sup> For women prisoners—many of whom are primary caregivers and undertrials—these directions had particular resonance.

High Courts across India, including the Bombay and Delhi High Courts, subsequently issued gender-sensitive directions concerning pregnant inmates, healthcare access, and temporary release policies, reflecting an emerging judicial awareness of differential custodial impact.

---

<sup>25</sup> *Charles Sobhraj v Superintendent, Central Jail, Tihar* (1978) 4 SCC 104, <https://indiankanoon.org/doc/1704514/> (accessed 23 January 2026).

<sup>26</sup> *Parmanand Katara v Union of India* (1989) 4 SCC 286, <https://indiankanoon.org/doc/498923/> (accessed 23 January 2026).

<sup>27</sup> *Justice K.S. Puttaswamy v Union of India* (2017) 10 SCC 1, <https://indiankanoon.org/doc/91938676/> (accessed 23 January 2026).

<sup>28</sup> *In Re: Inhuman Conditions in 1382 Prisons* (2016) 3 SCC 700, <https://indiankanoon.org/doc/1536280/> (accessed 23 January 2026).

<sup>29</sup> *In Re: Contagion of COVID-19 Virus in Prisons* 2020 SCC OnLine SC 343, <https://indiankanoon.org/doc/47110827/> (accessed 23 January 2026).

## VI. Undertrials, Legal Aid and Procedural Justice

Access to legal representation and speedy trial remain central to women's prison rights. In *State of Maharashtra v Manubhai Pragaji Vashi*, the Court reiterated the importance of legal aid as part of fair procedure.<sup>30</sup> Earlier, Hussainara Khatoun had already crystallised the constitutional mandate for free legal services to indigent prisoners.

In *Re: Prison Reforms and Implementation of Model Prison Manual*, the Supreme Court has recently monitored state compliance with the 2016 Manual, underscoring the judiciary's continuing supervisory role over prison administration.<sup>31</sup> These proceedings highlight the institutional dimension of reform, moving beyond case-specific relief to structural oversight.

## VII. Assessment of Contemporary Challenges

Despite this rich jurisprudence, empirical evidence reveals enduring deficits. NCRB data consistently records overcrowding, staff shortages, and inadequate healthcare infrastructure in women's enclosures. Reports of the National Human Rights Commission and civil-society organisations document problems such as limited mental-health services, lack of sanitary products, and inadequate childcare facilities—concerns directly addressed yet insufficiently remedied despite judicial pronouncements.

The gap between normative law and practice is partly attributable to India's federal structure, under which prisons fall within the State List, leading to uneven adoption of the Model Prison Manual and variable resource allocation. Courts have repeatedly lamented this unevenness, most recently in *In Re: Inhuman Conditions in 1382 Prisons*, where compliance affidavits revealed stark inter-state disparities.<sup>32</sup>

## VIII. Synthesis

Taken together, these twenty decisions illustrate a steady judicial trajectory from recognising prisoners' residual rights to articulating gender-sensitive custodial standards and structural reform mandates. The courts have addressed nearly every facet of women's incarceration—arrest procedures, healthcare, pregnancy and childcare, privacy, violence prevention, legal aid, and pandemic management. Yet the persistence of adverse conditions suggests that

---

<sup>30</sup> *State of Maharashtra v Manubhai Pragaji Vashi* (1995) 5 SCC 730, <https://indiankanoon.org/doc/1223530/> (accessed 23 January 2026).

<sup>31</sup> *Re: Prison Reforms and Implementation of Model Prison Manual* (2023) SCC OnLine SC \_\_\_, <https://indiankanoon.org> (accessed 23 January 2026).

<sup>32</sup> *In Re: Inhuman Conditions in 1382 Prisons* (Compliance Orders), <https://indiankanoon.org> (accessed 23 January 2026).

adjudication alone cannot substitute for sustained legislative reform, administrative commitment, and independent oversight.

The analytical picture that emerges is therefore one of normative robustness but institutional fragility: constitutional principles and judicial directives are abundant, but their translation into everyday prison administration remains incomplete. For women prisoners, whose needs differ significantly from those of male inmates, this implementation gap assumes heightened significance, making continued judicial vigilance and policy innovation imperative.

### **Findings and discussion**

The foregoing analysis reveals that Indian constitutional jurisprudence has progressively recognised women prisoners as rights-bearing subjects entitled to dignity, equality, healthcare, and procedural fairness. Through landmark decisions such as *Sheela Barse v State of Maharashtra*, *R.D. Upadhyay v State of Andhra Pradesh*, and *D.K. Basu v State of West Bengal*, the Supreme Court has articulated gender-sensitive standards governing arrest procedures, custodial safety, maternity care, childcare, and legal assistance. These judicial interventions, read together with Articles 14, 15, and 21 of the Constitution, have transformed prisons from zones of administrative discretion into constitutionally regulated institutions.

A major finding of the study is the existence of a comparatively robust normative framework. Statutory instruments such as the Model Prison Manual, 2016, and India's endorsement of international standards like the UN Bangkok Rules demonstrate official acceptance of gender-responsive custodial governance. Judicial monitoring in recent years, particularly during the COVID-19 pandemic, further reflects an evolving institutional consciousness about overcrowding, healthcare deficits, and the special vulnerabilities of women inmates, especially pregnant prisoners and mothers of young children.

However, the discussion also underscores a persistent and troubling gap between legal mandates and practical implementation. Empirical data from the National Crime Records Bureau and reports of the National Human Rights Commission indicate continuing problems of overcrowding, shortage of female prison staff, inadequate mental-health services, poor sanitary conditions, and limited access to vocational and rehabilitative programmes. Many states have yet to fully adopt or operationalise the Model Prison Manual, resulting in uneven

standards of care across jurisdictions. The federal allocation of prisons to the State List compounds this disparity, as resource constraints and administrative priorities differ widely.

Another significant finding concerns the disproportionate number of women undertrial prisoners, reflecting systemic delays in investigation and adjudication. This reality weakens the rehabilitative rationale of incarceration and intensifies the social costs borne by women, who are often primary caregivers within their families. Despite repeated judicial emphasis on speedy trial and legal aid, structural bottlenecks in the criminal-justice system continue to undermine these guarantees.

The discussion suggests that judicial pronouncements, while normatively powerful, cannot alone secure transformative change without sustained executive commitment and institutional reform. Independent monitoring mechanisms, gender-sensitivity training for prison staff, enhanced budgetary allocations, and improved data collection on women's custodial experiences are crucial for translating constitutional promises into everyday practice. The study therefore concludes that while India's legal framework concerning women prisoners has evolved significantly, its effectiveness ultimately depends on consistent implementation, cooperative federalism, and a shift from a purely custodial model toward a rehabilitative and rights-oriented approach to incarceration.

### **Conclusion**

This analytical study demonstrates that the protection of women's rights within the Indian prison system has undergone significant normative development through constitutional interpretation, judicial intervention, statutory reforms, and the incorporation of international human-rights standards. The Supreme Court's expansive reading of Articles 14, 15, and 21 has firmly established that incarceration does not extinguish fundamental rights and that gender-specific vulnerabilities—relating to healthcare, maternity, childcare, privacy, protection from abuse, and access to legal aid—must be addressed as integral components of humane custody. Instruments such as the Model Prison Manual, 2016, and India's engagement with the UN Bangkok Rules reflect an emerging policy consensus in favour of gender-responsive prison governance.

Nevertheless, the study also reveals persistent structural and administrative deficiencies that prevent the full realisation of these rights in practice. Overcrowding, shortage of trained female staff, inadequate medical and mental-health facilities, uneven state-level adoption of reform-oriented guidelines, and the continued overrepresentation of undertrial women highlight the distance between legal ideals and custodial realities. These shortcomings are exacerbated by federal disparities in funding and implementation, as well as by limited independent oversight and accountability mechanisms.

The conclusion that emerges is therefore one of cautious optimism tempered by institutional concern. While Indian courts have laid a strong constitutional foundation for the protection of women prisoners, sustained reform will require coordinated legislative action, executive commitment, and civil-society engagement. Moving forward, the emphasis must shift toward systematic implementation, regular monitoring, and the expansion of non-custodial alternatives for women offenders, ensuring that deprivation of liberty does not translate into deprivation of dignity, equality, or basic human rights.

### **Recommendations**

Effective protection of women's rights in Indian prisons requires coordinated legal, administrative, and policy reforms. States should uniformly adopt and implement the Model Prison Manual, 2016, with dedicated budgetary allocations for women-specific facilities, healthcare, and childcare services. Regular training programmes must be conducted to sensitise prison staff to gender and trauma-related issues. Independent inspection bodies and strengthened oversight by judicial authorities and human-rights commissions should ensure accountability and transparency. Greater use of non-custodial measures, bail, and community-based sentencing for women—particularly pregnant prisoners and primary caregivers—should be encouraged. Improved data collection and periodic public reporting on women's custodial conditions are also essential to guide evidence-based reform and policymaking.

### **Future scope**

Future research may focus on empirical field studies assessing living conditions, healthcare access, and rehabilitation programmes for women prisoners across different Indian states to capture regional disparities. Comparative analyses with international correctional models could offer transferable best practices. Further examination of the impact of recent judicial

monitoring and post-pandemic reforms would also be valuable, as would studies on alternatives to incarceration and their effectiveness in reducing recidivism among women offenders.

## References

1. National Crime Records Bureau, *Prison Statistics India 2022*, Ministry of Home Affairs, <https://ncrb.gov.in> (accessed 23 January 2026).
2. The Prisons Act, 1894, No. 9 of 1894 (India), available at <https://legislative.gov.in> (accessed 23 January 2026).
3. Veena Das, “Gender and Social Control in Colonial India” in *Critical Perspectives on Crime and Punishment* (Oxford University Press 2011), <https://global.oup.com> (accessed 23 January 2026).
4. Flavia Agnes, *Law and Gender Inequality* (Oxford University Press 1999), <https://academic.oup.com> (accessed 23 January 2026).
5. *Sunil Batra v Delhi Administration* (1978) 4 SCC 494, <https://indiankanoon.org> (accessed 23 January 2026).
6. *Sheela Barse v State of Maharashtra* (1983) 2 SCC 96, <https://indiankanoon.org> (accessed 23 January 2026).
7. *Justice K.S. Puttaswamy v Union of India* (2017) 10 SCC 1, <https://indiankanoon.org> (accessed 23 January 2026).
8. Ministry of Home Affairs, *Model Prison Manual 2016*, Government of India, <https://www.mha.gov.in> (accessed 23 January 2026).
9. Department-related Parliamentary Standing Committee on Home Affairs, *Prison Conditions, Infrastructure and Reforms* (2021), <https://rajyasabha.nic.in> (accessed 23 January 2026).
10. International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, 1966, <https://www.ohchr.org> (accessed 23 January 2026).
11. United Nations General Assembly, *Rules for the Treatment of Women Prisoners and Non-custodial Measures for Women Offenders (Bangkok Rules)*, 2010, <https://www.unodc.org> (accessed 23 January 2026).
12. Penal Reform International, *Global Prison Trends 2023*, <https://www.penalreform.org> (accessed 23 January 2026).
13. National Human Rights Commission, *Annual Report 2021–22*, <https://nhrc.nic.in> (accessed 23 January 2026).

14. *In Re: Contagion of COVID-19 Virus in Prisons* (2020) SCC OnLine SC 343, <https://indiankanoon.org> (accessed 23 January 2026)
15. *Sunil Batra v Delhi Administration* (1978) 4 SCC 494, <https://indiankanoon.org/doc/1424976/> (accessed 23 January 2026).
16. *Hussainara Khatoon v State of Bihar* (1980) 1 SCC 81, <https://indiankanoon.org/doc/274688/> (accessed 23 January 2026).
17. *Francis Coralie Mullin v Administrator, UT of Delhi* (1981) 1 SCC 608, <https://indiankanoon.org/doc/1509726/> (accessed 23 January 2026).
18. *Rama Murthy v State of Karnataka* (1997) 2 SCC 642, <https://indiankanoon.org/doc/1959091/> (accessed 23 January 2026).
19. *Sheela Barse v State of Maharashtra* (1983) 2 SCC 96, <https://indiankanoon.org/doc/1269016/> (accessed 23 January 2026).
20. *Sheela Barse v Union of India* (1986) 3 SCC 596, <https://indiankanoon.org/doc/1878052/> (accessed 23 January 2026).
21. *R.D. Upadhyay v State of Andhra Pradesh* (2007) 15 SCC 337, <https://indiankanoon.org/doc/1168110/> (accessed 23 January 2026).
22. *D.K. Basu v State of West Bengal* (1997) 1 SCC 416, <https://indiankanoon.org/doc/1199182/> (accessed 23 January 2026).
23. *Nilabati Behera v State of Orissa* (1993) 2 SCC 746, <https://indiankanoon.org/doc/1427624/> (accessed 23 January 2026).
24. *Bandhua Mukti Morcha v Union of India* (1984) 3 SCC 161, <https://indiankanoon.org/doc/1324434/> (accessed 23 January 2026).
25. *Charles Sobhraj v Superintendent, Central Jail, Tihar* (1978) 4 SCC 104, <https://indiankanoon.org/doc/1704514/> (accessed 23 January 2026).
26. *Parmanand Katara v Union of India* (1989) 4 SCC 286, <https://indiankanoon.org/doc/498923/> (accessed 23 January 2026).
27. *Justice K.S. Puttaswamy v Union of India* (2017) 10 SCC 1, <https://indiankanoon.org/doc/91938676/> (accessed 23 January 2026).
28. *In Re: Inhuman Conditions in 1382 Prisons* (2016) 3 SCC 700, <https://indiankanoon.org/doc/1536280/> (accessed 23 January 2026).
29. *In Re: Contagion of COVID-19 Virus in Prisons* 2020 SCC OnLine SC 343, <https://indiankanoon.org/doc/47110827/> (accessed 23 January 2026).
30. *State of Maharashtra v Manubhai Pragaji Vashi* (1995) 5 SCC 730, <https://indiankanoon.org/doc/1223530/> (accessed 23 January 2026).

31. *Re: Prison Reforms and Implementation of Model Prison Manual (2023)* SCC OnLine SC \_\_\_, <https://indiankanoon.org> (accessed 23 January 2026).
32. *In Re: Inhuman Conditions in 1382 Prisons (Compliance Orders)*, <https://indiankanoon.org> (accessed 23 January 2026).

