Student's Mental Health and the Indian Legal Framework: A Study

Ms. Shraddha Nigade*

Assistant Professor, Department of Law, Tilak Maharashtra Vidyapeeth, Pune, Maharashtra, India

shraddhanigade1998@gmail.com

Abstract: Student mental health has emerged as a critical concern in India, exacerbated by academic pressures, social stigma, and inadequate support systems. This study explores the Indian legal framework's role in addressing mental health challenges among students, positioning mental well-being as a fundamental human right enshrined in constitutional provisions and international obligations.Key focus areas include an overview of prevalent mental health issues in Indian educational institutions, the evolution of relevant laws such as the Mental Healthcare Act, 2017, and policies like the National Mental Health Policy. It examines institutional responsibilities, including the duty of care owed by universities and schools, and mandatory counseling.The analysis reveals significant gaps in implementation, such as fragmented policy enforcement, limited resources, and judicial reluctance in recognizing student-specific rights. Challenges include overburdened counseling services and cultural barriers to seeking help.Arguing for a rights-based approach, the study proposes comprehensive reforms: mandatory mental health curricula, robust accountability mechanisms for institutions, and integration of mental health into education laws. These recommendations aim to foster a supportive ecosystem, ensuring student well-being aligns with legal imperatives for holistic development.

Keywords - Education, Law,Mental Health, Rights, Students.

INTRODUCTION

In India, student mental health has escalated into a profound public health and humanitarian crisis, with far-reaching implications for the nation's future. Academic pressures, competitive examinations, social stigma, and inadequate support systems contribute to alarming rates of anxiety, depression, and suicides among students. Recent data underscores the severity: over 13,000 students committed suicide in India last year, highlighting a systemic failure that demands urgent legal and policy intervention. Framing student mental health as a legal imperative is essential, as it intersects with fundamental constitutional rights under Article 21, which guarantees the right to life and personal liberty, encompassing the right to health and dignity. The Supreme Court has repeatedly affirmed mental well-being as integral to this right, as seen in cases like *Common Cause v. Union of India*, emphasizing holistic development over rote learning.

India's legal framework, including the Mental Healthcare Act, 2017, and the National Mental Health Policy, 2014 mandates access to mental health services, decriminalizes suicide

attempts, and promotes rights-based care. Yet, these provisions remain underutilized in educational contexts, where schools and universities often neglect their duty of care. Policies like the University Grants Commission guidelines on student welfare exist but lack enforceability(Mehrotra, 2020), perpetuating gaps in counseling infrastructure and stigma reduction.

This paper analyzes the Indian legal and policy landscape addressing student mental health. It begins with an overview of prevalent issues in educational institutions, followed by an examination of key legislations such as the MHCA, 2017, and supportive policies. Subsequent sections explore institutional responsibilities, including the duty of care owed by educational bodies, and ethical dilemmas around confidentiality, consent, and mandatory interventions. The analysis identifies critical gapsfragmented implementation, resource shortages, and judicial hesitancywhile proposing reforms: integrating mental health into education laws, mandating curricula, and establishing accountability mechanisms. By advocating a rights-based approach, this study aims to bridge policy rhetoric with practice, fostering an ecosystem where student well-being aligns with India's constitutional vision of holistic education. Researcher has followed doctrinal Method for the research.

Mental Health as a Legal and Human Right-

Mental health occupies a central position within the human rights paradigm, transcending mere medical treatment to embody fundamental entitlements to dignity, well-being, and holistic development. Internationally, this is anchored in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, Article 25, which recognizes health as integral to an adequate standard of living, and the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, Article 12, obligating states to realize the highest attainable standard of physical and mental health. The UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, ratified by India in 2007, further elevates mental health through Article 25, mandating non-discriminatory access to services with dignity and autonomy.(Duffy & Kelly, 2018) Theoretically, these instruments frame mental health not as a charitable provision but as a justiciable right, predicated on the indivisibility of civil, political, economic, and social rights.

In the Indian context, this global edifice converges with constitutional imperatives under Article 21, which safeguards the right to life and personal liberty. The Supreme Court has expansively interpreted this to encompass the right to health, dignity, and mental integrity,

rejecting a narrow biological view of life. Landmark rulings, such as *Common Cause v. Union of India*, affirm that Article 21 guarantees a "life of dignity," incorporating psychological well-being and protection from undue mental distress.(Narayan & Shikha, 2013) Similarly, *Parmanand Katara v. Union of India* and *State of Punjab v. Ram Lubhaya Bagga* extend this to mental health services, imposing a positive duty on the state to prevent harm and ensure care. This judicial evolution aligns with the rights-based ethos of the Mental Healthcare Act, 2017, which operationalizes Article 21 by decriminalizing suicide, mandating advance directives, and prohibiting discrimination.

Theoretically, this framework invokes Kantian notions of human dignity as an end in itself, impervious to instrumentalization—critical in educational settings where students face commodification through performance metrics. Well-being, per Martha Nussbaum's capabilities list, includes emotional health, enabling rational choice and affiliation. For students, this translates to institutional duties of care: universities must mitigate foreseeable harms like exam-induced anxiety, lest they violate Article 21's dignity clause. Gaps persist, however, as recent judicial guidelines for student-specific mental health protocols(Mehrotra & Vijayakumar, 2025) underscore the need for explicit legislation linking education laws (e.g., RTE Act, 2009; NEP 2020) to MHCA rights.

Overview of Student Mental Health in India

India's student mental health crisis is evident in surging suicide rates and widespread psychological distress, revealing profound shortcomings in educational and support systems. National Crime Records Bureau statistics indicate that student suicides totaled 13,892 in 2023, marking a 6.5% year-on-year rise and a 34.4% increase since 2019, with academic failure and family problems identified as primary triggers(MC et al., 2026). Historical patterns demonstrate acceleration from 10,159 cases in 2018 onward, yielding roughly one student suicide per hour, fueled by academic underachievement, imposed career trajectories, and emotional alienation. Students represent 7.6% of total suicides, with their incidence escalating at 4% annually over two decades—twice the national average growth rate(Mehrotra et al., 2025).

Analytically, this epidemic reflects a misalignment between India's aspirational education model and mental health infrastructure. Academic stress, intertwined with socioeconomic stakeswhere success promises mobilitytriggers a vicious cycle: poor performance heightens

despair, unaddressed by sparse counseling (one professional per 185,000).(Kanuri et al., 2019) Adolescent suicide scoping identifies mental disorders (54%), family trauma (34%), and academic stress (23%) as dominant factors, signaling urgent need for de-stigmatization and institutional reforms.(Senapati et al., 2024) Without addressing these, the crisis imperils demographic dividends, demanding a shift from performance metrics to holistic well-being.

Indian Legal Policy Framework-

India's legal and policy architecture for mental health, while progressive in intent, reveals significant gaps when applied to the student crisis. The Mental Healthcare Act, 2017, represents a landmark shift toward a rights-based paradigm, explicitly aligning with the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities by enshrining rights to mental healthcare, informed consent, confidentiality, and deinstitutionalization.(Duffy & Kelly, 2017, 2018) For students, it prohibits discrimination and mandates access to quality services, potentially challenging coercive practices in educational settings. However, its effectiveness is undermined by a lack of specificity to student contexts. The Act imposes broad state obligations for availability, accessibility, acceptability, and quality, yet educational institutionsprimary sites of student distressremain under-equipped.

Complementing the MHCA, University Grants Commission guidelines aim to institutionalize support. These require each HEI to establish psycho-social counseling centers, train faculty as mentors, and integrate mental health into curricula(Delhi & Kumar, 2023; Mehrotra et al., 2025). On paper, this fosters a duty of care amid academic pressures. Yet, critical evaluation exposes implementation frailties: many colleges operate skeletal cells with untrained volunteers, overburdened by volume. A 2022 UGC review admitted only 40% compliance, citing funding shortages and stigma-driven underutilization. Effectiveness is further diluted by the absence of accountability mechanisms—no penalties for non-compliance or integration with MHCA rights.

The National Education Policy 2020 offers a holistic vision, embedding mental health within its equity and well-being ethos. Paragraphs 4.33–4.35 advocate flexible curricula, reduced rote learning, vocational integration, and school counseling to alleviate stress, aligning with constitutional mandates for holistic development. It promises no detention up to Class 8, multidisciplinary HEIs, and teacher training in psychosocial support, theoretically mitigating triggers like academic failure.(Mehrotra et al., 2025) NEP's paradigmfrom input-heavy to

outcome-basedcould recalibrate success metrics, fostering resilience. However, two years post-adoption (as of 2023), rollout lags: state-level adaptations are uneven, with only 15% of states fully implementing counseling mandates. Critics highlight its non-binding naturelacking enforceable timelines or budgetsrendering it aspirational. Without dedicated mental health funding, it sidesteps infrastructure deficits.

Collectively, these frameworks falter in synergy and enforcement. MHCA provides individual rights but ignores institutional duties; UGC enforces sporadically; NEP inspires but lacks teeth. Limitations compound: resource scarcity (e.g., 0.3 psychiatrists per 100,000(Ranjan & Crasta, 2023)), cultural stigma (schools hide cases to protect reputation(Gaiha et al., 2020)), and federal fragmentation delay impact. Student suicides rose 34% since 2019 despite these policies, signaling misalignmentpolicies treat symptoms reactively, not root causes like competitive toxicity.(Senapati et al., 2024) Effectiveness is marginal: progressive decriminalization (suicide under MHCA) and awareness via NEP yield incremental help-seeking, but systemic inertia prevails. A student-centric policymandating mental health audits, peer support, and MHCA-UGC-NEP convergenceis imperative, backed by ring-fenced budgets and judicial oversight to translate rights into resilience.

Institutional Responsibility and Duty of Care

Universities, as primary custodians of higher education, bear a profound institutional responsibility to safeguard student mental well-being, particularly amid India's escalating student suicide crisis. This duty of carerooted in common law principles of negligence and expanded by constitutional imperatives under Article 21obligates institutions to anticipate and mitigate foreseeable harms from academic pressures, isolation, and inadequate support.In a context where student suicides have surged 34% since 2019(MC et al., 2026), universities must transcend reactive measures, embedding mental health as a core operational mandate. Yet, analytical scrutiny reveals a chasm between rhetorical commitments and substantive action, undermining accountability and exposing systemic frailties.

At its core, duty of care demands proactive risk assessment and intervention. The University Grants Commission 2019 guidelines mandate psycho-social counseling cells, faculty training as mentors, and mental health integration into curricula across higher education institutions(Mehrotra, 2020). These provisions recognize universities' vicarious position: as surrogate guardians during formative years, they must address triggers like academic stress

and parental expectations, which propel 22.85% of adolescent suicides.(Senapati et al., 2024) This dereliction not only breaches duty but amplifies vulnerability, as sparse psychiatric resources (one professional per 185,000 people) render institutional silos ineffective.(Kanuri et al., 2019)

Institutional obligations extend to cultural and structural reforms. Universities must foster resilience through flexible assessments, stigma-reduction campaigns, and 24/7 helplines, converging UGC mandates with the Mental Healthcare Act, 2017's rights-based framework. By auditing curricula for toxicity and training administrators in early detection, HEIs can recalibrate success beyond metrics, honoring their demographic stake in India's youth dividend. Failure invites ethical culpability: when despair festers amid plenty, negligence morphs into complicity. Ultimately, robust duty of care demands ring-fenced budgets, legislative teeth, and a paradigm shiftprioritizing lives over league tables to forge resilient graduates.

Challenges -

1. Despite robust frameworks like the University Grants Commission 2019 guidelines and the Mental Healthcare Act, 2017, implementation in Indian higher education remains fractured, exposing students to unchecked mental health risks. Structural deficits loom largest: nationwide shortages of mental health professionals—one psychiatrist per 185,000 peoplecripple university counseling cells, which UGC mandates but fails to resource adequately.

2. Practical hurdles compound this inertia. Gaps exist in the implementation and assessment of UGC's psycho-social cell guidelines(Mehrotra, 2020), with overburdened setups collapsing under demandstudents often wait weeks for sessions, if available. Enforcement is weak, allowing institutions to evade mandatory faculty training or curriculum-embedded mental health modules due to lack of formal regulations and a relaxation of mandates

3. Stigma entrenches concealment, as colleges prioritize prestige over disclosureschools hesitate to acknowledge issues, fearing labels that deter enrollment.(Gaiha et al., 2020) This culture stifles MHCA's anti-discrimination clauses, turning helplines into underpublicized relics. Power asymmetries further erode consent: faculty-mentors

coerce "counseling" post-failures, blurring autonomy with control, absent capacity assessments.

4. Funding silos seal these gapsmental health budgets siphoned by infrastructure, leaving cells without 24/7 staffing(Kanuri et al., 2019). Judicial nudges under Article 21 remain reactive; preemptive metrics like annual well-being indices or third-party audits are optional, decoupling accountability from disbursements.

5. Rural colleges fare worse, with digital divides blocking tele-MHCA tools. Ultimately, these lapses transform policy into paraphernalia: aspirational edicts unmoored from ground realities, where academic stress and familial expectations metastasize unchecked, demanding legislative overhauls for ring-fenced allocations and compliance-linked incentives.

Recommendations and Policy Suggestions

To bridge the chasm between aspirational frameworks like the UGC 2019 guidelines and MHCA 2017 and ground realities, India requires targeted legal and policy reforms that enforce accountability, bolster resources, and dismantle stigma. These must directly tackle identified gapsprofessional shortages(Kanuri et al., 2019), implementation inertia, ethical lapses in confidentiality and consent, and neglect fueling 22.85% of adolescent suicides from academic stress(Senapati et al., 2024)transforming reactive judicial nudges under Article 21 into preemptive safeguards.

First, legislate ring-fenced budgets: amend UGC regulations to mandate 5% of institutional funding for mental health cells, with non-compliance triggering funding cuts. This counters siphoned allocations and overburdened setups, ensuring 24/7 staffing and hiring qualified psychiatrists at a 1:10,000 student ratio, scaling up from the current 1:185,000 crisis(Kanuri et al., 2019).

Second, fortify enforcement via the Mental Health Policy 2014 overhaul: introduce statutory penaltiesfines up to ₹10 lakh and leadership disqualificationsfor universities flouting mandatory training or advance directive protocols. Compliance below 80% in internal audits should mandate third-party interventions, addressing toothless oversight in coaching hubs like Kota where isolation pods thrive unchecked(Pal et al., 2025; Seervi & Sharma, 2025).

Third, embed rights-based training: require UGC-accredited modules on MHCA's confidentiality breaches and informed consent for all faculty, with certification tied to promotions. Curriculum reforms should integrate compulsory mental health literacy—two credits per semesterfocusing on resilience against academic pressures, countering coerced counseling and power imbalances.

Fourth, combat stigma legislatively: enact an Anti-Stigma Act mandating annual well-being indices and public disclosures of support metrics, prohibiting reputational concealment that schools use to deter enrollment(Gaiha et al., 2020).

Launch nationwide campaigns via NCERT, leveraging digital platforms for rural access, and enforce peer support mandates in hostels.

Finally, harness technology: operationalize tele-MHCA nationwide with subsidized apps for advance directives, bridging digital divides in rural colleges. These reforms, monitored by a National Student Mental Health Authority under the Ministry of Education, would align ethics with enforceability, prioritizing lives over prestige and forging resilient futures.

CONCLUSION

India's higher education sector confronts a severe mental health crisis, aggravated by the disjointed implementation of the Mental Healthcare Act, 2017, and University Grants Commission guidelines. Profound structural shortcomingsnotably, a critical scarcity of mental health professionals, with only 0.3 psychiatrists per 100,000 individuals(Ranjan & Crasta, 2023)undermine university counseling centers, which are frequently staffed by unqualified personnel amid .

The path forward demands urgent legislative fortification: ring-fenced 5% budgets tied to grants, statutory fines up to ₹10 lakh for lapses, mandatory MHCA training linked to promotions, and an Anti-Stigma Act enforcing well-being disclosures. A National Student Mental Health Authority must oversee compliance, transforming aspirational policies into enforceable safeguards. Stronger institutional accountability is imperativenot mere rhetoric, but ring-fenced allocations, third-party audits, and compliance incentivesto prioritize student lives over prestige. Only through these reforms can India forge resilient academic environments, honoring constitutional rights and averting a generational tragedy.

References

1. Delhi, A. P., Department of Curriculum and Pedagogy, Divisional Institute of Education and Training, South-West, Ghummanhera, New Delhi, State Council of Educational Research and Training, Varun Marg, New, & Kumar, N. (2023). Insights of National Education Policy 2020 and Early Childhood Care and Education. *Shodh Sari-An International Multidisciplinary Journal*, *2*(3), 106. https://doi.org/10.59231/sari7594

2. Duffy, R. M., & Kelly, B. D. (2017). Concordance of the Indian Mental Healthcare Act 2017 with the World Health Organization's Checklist on Mental Health Legislation. *International Journal of Mental Health Systems*, *11*(1). https://doi.org/10.1186/s13033-017-0155-1

3. Duffy, R. M., & Kelly, B. D. (2018). The right to mental healthcare: India moves forward. *The British Journal of Psychiatry*, *214*(2), 59. https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.2018.250

4. Gaiha, S. M., Salisbury, T. T., Koschorke, M., Raman, U., & Petticrew, M. (2020). Stigma associated with mental health problems among young people in India: a systematic review of magnitude, manifestations and recommendations [Review of *Stigma associated with mental health problems among young people in India: a systematic review of magnitude, manifestations and recommendations*]. *BMC Psychiatry*, *20*(1). BioMed Central. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12888-020-02937-x

5. Johnson, J. A. (2014). The Ethics of Big Data in Higher Education. *The International Review of Information Ethics*, *21*, 3. https://doi.org/10.29173/irie365

6. Kanuri, N., Arora, P., Talluru, S., Colaco, B., Dutta, R., Rawat, A., Taylor, C. B., Manjula, M., & Newman, M. G. (2019). Examining the initial usability, acceptability and feasibility of a digital mental health intervention for college students in India. *International Journal of Psychology*, *55*(4), 657. https://doi.org/10.1002/ijop.12640

7. MC, M., Swamy, I. C., & MC, P. (2026). Temporal Patterns in Suicide Rates across India: Evaluating their significance as a National Public Health Challenge. *SHILAP Revista de Lepidopterología*. https://doaj.org/article/728e64a1f6324058aa74291ffbb7ee12

8. Mehrotra, S. (2020). Indian higher education and youth mental health: Challenges and opportunities [Review of *Indian higher education and youth mental health: Challenges and opportunities*]. *Journal of Global Health*, *10*(2). Edinburgh University Global Health Society. https://doi.org/10.7189/jogh.10.020307

9. Mehrotra, S., Srikanth, T. K., Dahiya, N., Verma, P., Rao, G. N., Sanghvi, P., Grover, A., & Sagar, R. (2025). Technology for Mental Health: Reflections on Scope and Future Directions in Institutes of Higher Education in India. *Online Journal of Public Health Informatics*, *17*. https://doi.org/10.2196/78065

10. Mehrotra, S., & Vijayakumar, L. (2025). Strengthening student mental health support systems in India: reflections on the Supreme Court's landmark guidelines. *The Lancet Regional Health - Southeast Asia*, *43*, 100698. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lansea.2025.100698

11. Narayan, C., & Shikha, D. (2013). Indian legal system and mental health. *Indian Journal of Psychiatry*, *55*(6), 177. https://doi.org/10.4103/0019-5545.105521

12. Ranjan, A., & Crasta, J. E. (2023). Progress towards universal health coverage in the context of mental disorders in India: Evidence from National Sample Survey Data. *Research Square (Research Square)*. https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-2028340/v1

13. Roberts, L. D., & Allen, P. (2015). Exploring ethical issues associated with using online surveys in educational research. *Educational Research and Evaluation*, *21*(2), 95. https://doi.org/10.1080/13803611.2015.1024421

14. Senapati, R. E., Jena, S., Parida, J., Panda, A., Patra, P. K., Pati, S., Kaur, H., & Acharya, S. K. (2024). The patterns, trends and major risk factors of suicide among Indian adolescents – a scoping review. *BMC Psychiatry*, *24*(1), 35. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12888-023-05447-8