



International Journal of Law, Justice and Jurisprudence

E-ISSN: 2790-068

P-ISSN: 2790-0673

www.lawjournal.info

IJLJJ 2025; 5(1): 147-149

Received: 10-01-2025

Accepted: 16-02-2025

Md. Abdul Mannan Bhuyean
University of Information
Technology and Sciences
(UITS), Permanent Campus,
Holding No 190, Road No 5,
Block J, Moddho Nayanagar,
Baridhara, Dhaka, Bangladesh

Putting into practice of morality: Subjects of suicide and euthanasia with special references to Indian laws and judicial pronouncements

Md. Abdul Mannan Bhuyean

DOI: <https://www.doi.org/10.22271/2790-0673.2025.v5.i1b.174>

Abstract

Morally speaking, suicide and euthanasia are completely unacceptable; therefore, from a religious perspective, these practices are prohibited. Judgements have a crucial role in setting an example that serves as the foundation for the administration of justice in India's legal system. One of the most noticeable and invasive instances of the decade in which euthanasia and the right of an individual to die have been discussed is Aruna Ramachandra Shanbaug vs. Union of India (2011). A number of rights, including the right to a clean environment, the right to financial support, and many more, are part of the fortunate ultimate right to life. According to medical jurisprudence, the right to die has been shown to be predictable, and family members may soon take advantage of this right. This landmark ruling supported the approach and circumstances that allowed for the approval of reflexive euthanasia.

Keywords: Morality, suicide, euthanasia

Introduction

"Euthanasia is the scuffle amid existence and demise." It has been demonstrated that while death is not a divine ability, life is. Euthanasia and suicide stand out in the struggle for life and death. Euthanasia is not the deliberate killing of oneself, whereas suicide indicates a desire to end one's life or intentionally harm oneself. Suicide is driven by different factors than euthanasia. According to the guidelines established in Aruna Ramchandra Shanbug vs. Union of India (2011), unreceptive euthanasia is legal in India. However, suicide is considered an indictable misdemeanor under Section 309 of the Indian Penal Code.

Legislative or lawful rations as to suicide and euthanasia

The relevant provisions, as outlined in Section 306 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860, stipulate that anyone who commits suicide or aids and abets another person in committing suicide faces a maximum sentence of ten years in prison and a fine.

In accordance with section 309 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860, it should be noted that anyone who attempts suicide and commits any of these crimes faces up to a year in unpretentious captivity or may be subject to fines or both.

However, there are no comprehensive rules or depictions regarding euthanasia, which Indian case law has subsequently advanced. From a moral perspective, suicide or euthanasia is immoral and goes against social order and divinity. The legislative laws for suicide were redirected by scruples.

However, this belvedere has been challenged over time, primarily in the context of shifting social strategies on the path to mental wellness and personal autonomy.

Mental Healthcare Act, 2017

The Psychological Healthcare Act's draft represents a significant change in the way attempted suicide is legitimately treated. By assuming that those who commit suicide have a history of cerebral syndrome or blunt discomfort at the time of their suicide, this Act authorizes suicide decisions. Shining is a more humanitarian method of dealing with spiritual strength substances than tackling trials. It is recommended that they undergo overhaul and management instead.

Correspondence Author:

Md. Abdul Mannan Bhuyean
University of Information
Technology and Sciences
(UITS), Permanent Campus,
Holding No 190, Road No 5,
Block J, Moddho Nayanagar,
Baridhara, Dhaka, Bangladesh

Breakthrough Jurisdictional Verdicts

The Indian Supreme Court ruled in *P. Rathinam V. Union of India* (1994) that Section 309 of the Indian Penal Code was invalid, establishing a judicially established principle that compares the right to life under Article 21 of the Indian Constitution to the right to cease to exist on Earth. This remarkable moment is a significant step in understanding individual self-sufficiency in life-or-death situations.

The Indian Supreme Court's decision in the *P. Rathinam* case was overturned in a different case, *Gian Kaur v. State of Punjab* (1996), which declared that the right to life does not include the right to die. Although suicide is a tragic outcome that is often linked to psychological health issues, the Court determined that it does not set off contacts as normal.

The *Aruna Shanbaug* case was a turning point since it was the first time that emotionless euthanasia was recorded by the Court. The Supreme Court of India certified the pulling out of existence back in situations when patients were in a persistent vegetative condition (PVS), even though the appeal for aggressive euthanasia was dismissed. The Court highlighted the need for self-esteem in death and established guidelines for submissive euthanasia, emphasizing that assessments must be prepared under strict judicial control. Certain laws found in Articles 14, 21, and 32 of the Indian Constitution, as well as the legal principles outlined in Sections 306 and 309 of the Indian Penal Code, were imposed on the litigant in the aforementioned well-known and historic case. For clarity on the final declaratory section of the ruling, the Indian Supreme Court determined that the right to die is not a good way to end life in the context of PVS's life-threatening situation; rather, it speeds up the process of death. The right to die with dignity, reducing physical and mental suffering, should be part of the right to live with human self-worth.

Three surgeons were chosen by the Court to examine Ms. Shanbaug, and they were asked to do an echo around her physical and mental conditions. The Court brought up the subject of euthanasia in all its facets and supported passive euthanasia, even if it did not agree with Ms. Shanbaug's request to remove the therapeutic therapy. It defined "passive euthanasia" as stopping a patient's medication in order to end their life.

The right to die with dignity is a part of the right to live, the Supreme Court muttered. The Indian Supreme Court has ruled that passive euthanasia is acceptable if doctors' opinion is based on their knowledge of medicine and removing life support for the patient's best interests.

Along with approving the repeal of Section 309 of the Indian Penal Code, the Court clarified the issues surrounding euthanasia and established broad guidelines on the topic.

By upholding that the right to die with dignity is an essential component of the right to life under Article 21 of the Indian Constitution, the Indian Supreme Court extended the established legal principles established in the *Shanbaug* case, as stated in *Gian Kaur v. State of Punjab* (1996).

The Supreme Court agreed to allow people to express their preferences on end-of-life care by endorsing passive euthanasia and popularizing the idea of Advance Medical Directives, sometimes known as living wills. The ruling launched procedural safety measures to prevent misappropriation and emphasized the importance of self-rule, confidentiality, and dignity.

Contemporary Enlargements

Euthanasia research continues to progress, with ongoing discussions over active euthanasia continuing to be controversial. Despite ensuring that any decision regarding end-of-life care is taken with judicial scrutiny and medical direction, the legal framework developed over and completed with these instances emphasizes patient self-sufficiency.

Ethical Contemplations

This sermon's tension between moral principles and legal requirements remains a major theme. Even while suicide may be considered an immoral act under outdated morality, current legal theory is beginning to acknowledge it as a public health issue that calls for compassionate responses rather than punitive actions. The legal system's move toward decriminalization aligns with broader human rights concepts that support people's right to dignity and support when they face mental health challenges.

Conclusion

The way morality is applied in Indian law regarding euthanasia and suicide is an example of a dynamic development influenced by judicial analysis and social change. By emphasizing individual rights above antiquated moral frameworks, groundbreaking decisions have increasingly linked legal norms with constitutional ideals. The relationship between morality and the law will be a crucial area for legal growth and innovation as India continues to manage these complex concerns.

Not every issue we face in our daily lives can be solved by passing legislation. Mercy killing is an extremely uncommon and serious illness. Physicians only see patients with chronic illnesses who are contemplating euthanasia once every thousand cases. Though it is not appropriate in every situation, it is realistic to consider euthanasia when a patient has PVS (Persistent Vegetative State). The specific drudgery that led to the legislation of euthanasia in India must be quantified. The recurrence of the same has led to a resolution in nations where euthanasia is completely allowed. It is impossible to imply that the run-through is completely impermeable and error-free in those domains.

In the case of euthanasia, the nation-state and its citizens undergo a profound change in the medical field with an eye toward the public-spirited perspective that advances the all-inclusive, unrestricted approach, which is crucial to the realization of a perspective that almost cherry-picks death over life. Currently, this consideration has been voted down for competitors, which is somewhat revolutionary. India wants to be able to answer this issue and fully understand its advantages and disadvantages. Euthanasia was not deemed illegitimate during the *Gian Kaur* case, although suicide itself was.

In its ruling in *Aruna Ramachandra Shanbaug v. Union of India*, the Supreme Court supported flaccid euthanasia and noted that, in exceptional circumstances, unreceptive euthanasia is legal, but vivacious euthanasia is not. Euthanasia ought to be possible with appropriate safety precautions. Any legislation intended to prevent neglect and the manipulation of euthanasia must take into consideration the recommendations made in the Law Commission of India's report as well as the tactics used in *Aruna's* case.

References

1. Beauchamp TL, Childress JF. Principles of biomedical ethics. 8th ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press; 2019.
2. Chand VK. Ethics and morality in Indian jurisprudence: A critical analysis of euthanasia and suicide laws. *Indian Law J.* 2015;4(2):45-67.
3. Das R. Right to die with dignity: A legal and ethical perspective. Lucknow: Eastern Book Company; 2020.
4. Dworkin R. Life's dominion: An argument about abortion, euthanasia, and individual freedom. New York: Vintage Books; 1993.
5. Feinberg J. The moral limits of the criminal law: Harm to self. Oxford: Oxford University Press; 1986.
6. Glover J. Causing death and saving lives: The moral dilemmas of euthanasia and abortion. London: Penguin Books; 1990.
7. Kant I. Grounding for the metaphysics of morals. Ellington JW, translator. 3rd ed. Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing; 1993. (Original work published 1785).
8. Kevorkian J. Prescription: Medicide-The goodness of planned death. New York: Prometheus Books; 1991.
9. MacIntyre A. After virtue: A study in moral theory. 3rd ed. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press; 2007.
10. Nair KR. Euthanasia in India: An ethical and legal study of the right to die with dignity. *J Indian Leg Stud.* 2017;5(1):33-49.
11. Sen A. The idea of justice. Cambridge: Harvard University Press; 2009.
12. Singer P. Rethinking life and death: The collapse of our traditional ethics. Oxford: Oxford University Press; 1995.
13. Steinbock B, Arras JD, London AJ. Ethical issues in modern medicine: Contemporary readings in bioethics. 8th ed. New York: McGraw-Hill; 2012.
14. Sumner W. Assisted death: A study in ethics and law. Oxford: Oxford University Press; 2011.
15. Tiwari P. Suicide and euthanasia: An Indian legal perspective in the light of moral theories. *Indian J Ethics Law.* 2019;8(2):55-72.
16. *Gian Kaur v. State of Punjab*, (1996) 2 SCC 648.
17. *Aruna Ramachandra Shanbaug v. Union of India*, (2011) 4 SCC 454.
18. *P. Rathinam v. Union of India*, (1994) 3 SCC 394.
19. Constitution of India, Articles 14, 21 & 32-Equality before Law, Right to Life & The Right to Constitutional Remedies.
20. Indian Penal Code, 1860, Sections 306 & 309-Abetment of suicide and Attempt to Commit Suicide.
21. The Medical Treatment of Terminally Ill Patients (Protection of Patients and Medical Practitioners) Bill, 2006.
22. Law Commission of India. 196th Report on Medical Treatment to Terminally Ill Patients (Protection of Patients and Medical Practitioners). Government of India; 2006.
23. Law Commission of India. 210th Report on Humanization and Decriminalization of Attempt to Suicide. Government of India; 2008.
24. The Mental Healthcare Act, 2017-Decriminalization of attempted suicide under Section 115.
25. World Health Organization. Preventing suicide: A global imperative. Geneva: WHO Press; 2019.
26. United Nations Human Rights Committee. General comment No. 36 on Article 6 of the ICCPR, on the

right to life; 2018.