Journal of Advances and Scholarly Research In Allied Education
Vol.23, Issue No.3 June 2026, ISSN 2230-7540

Healthcare Law And Policy Conflicts In India: A Study Of Rajasthan

Akansha Rathi[1]*,Prof. (Dr.) Aradhana Parmar[2]

1 Research Scholar, Faculty of Law, Maharishi Arvind University, Jaipur, Rajasthan, India

akansharathi95@gmail.com

2 Supervisor, Faculty of Law, Maharishi Arvind University, Jaipur, Rajasthan, India

Abstract: Healthcare governance in India exists at the intersection of constitutional law, statutory regulation, public policy, medical ethics, professional accountability, and service delivery. Although the Indian constitutional framework has progressively recognised health as an essential element of the right to life under Article 21, the practical implementation of healthcare rights continues to face serious legal, institutional, administrative, and financial challenges. The conflict between healthcare law and health policy becomes visible when legal rights are declared without adequate infrastructure, when public health schemes are implemented without enforceable remedies, when private healthcare establishments are expected to fulfil public obligations without clear reimbursement mechanisms, and when patients seek accountability within a fragmented regulatory system. Rajasthan provides a significant case study because it has attempted to move towards a rights-based health framework through the Rajasthan Right to Health Act, 2022. The Act represents an important legislative development in India's health rights discourse, but its implementation raises complex questions regarding emergency care, duties of private hospitals, State responsibility, grievance redressal, health financing, and regulatory capacity. This article critically examines healthcare law and policy conflicts in India with special reference to Rajasthan. It analyses constitutional principles, statutory provisions, judicial decisions, public health policies, patient rights, medical negligence jurisprudence, private sector regulation, digital health, and governance challenges. The article argues that healthcare reform in India requires an integrated rights-based governance model supported by adequate public investment, transparent regulation, participatory rule-making, strong grievance redressal, digital safeguards, professional accountability, and equitable service delivery.

Keywords: Healthcare Law, Health Policy, Right to Health, Rajasthan, Medical Regulation, Patient Rights, Medical Negligence, Public Health Governance, Article 21, Right to Health Act.

1. INTRODUCTION

Healthcare is a foundational requirement of human dignity, social justice, and democratic governance. A person's ability to enjoy liberty, education, livelihood, equality, and participation in social life depends substantially upon access to health services. In a welfare-

oriented constitutional system, healthcare cannot be treated merely as a commodity available only to those who can afford it. It is closely connected with the right to life, human dignity, equality before law, social security, and the obligation of the State to protect public welfare. In India, healthcare has developed through a complex combination of constitutional interpretation, statutory regulation, executive policies, public health schemes, judicial decisions, professional ethics, and institutional governance.

Healthcare law refers to the legal framework governing medical practice, patient rights, hospitals, public health, emergency treatment, medical negligence, professional misconduct, clinical establishments, biomedical waste, reproductive health, mental health, organ transplantation, digital health data, and health insurance. Health policy, on the other hand, refers to the decisions, programmes, guidelines, schemes, and administrative strategies adopted by the State to improve health outcomes and ensure healthcare delivery. Ideally, healthcare law and health policy should operate harmoniously. Law should provide enforceable rights, duties, standards, and remedies, while policy should provide the administrative and financial mechanism for implementation. However, in practice, a gap often emerges between legal ideals and policy realities.

India's healthcare system reflects several such conflicts. Courts have recognised the right to health as part of Article 21, yet public hospitals often suffer from overcrowding, shortage of specialists, lack of equipment, inadequate emergency services, and limited grievance mechanisms. The State announces health schemes, but patients may face exclusion due to documentation requirements, empanelment limitations, lack of awareness, or administrative delays. Private hospitals provide a large portion of healthcare services, but their regulation raises questions of affordability, transparency, emergency obligations, and accountability. Medical professionals are expected to follow ethical standards, but they also work under pressure due to infrastructural gaps, fear of litigation, and rising patient expectations. Digital health initiatives promise efficiency, but they raise concerns regarding consent, confidentiality, privacy, and data security.

Rajasthan is particularly important for studying healthcare law and policy conflicts because it has adopted a rights-based legislative approach through the Rajasthan Right to Health Act, 2022. The Act attempts to provide statutory recognition to the right to health and access to healthcare services. It also seeks to impose obligations upon the State and healthcare

establishments in relation to emergency care and health service delivery. However, the Act has generated debate regarding its scope, implementation, reimbursement to private hospitals, operational clarity, institutional capacity, and financial sustainability. The Rajasthan experience therefore illustrates the central challenge of healthcare governance in India: how to transform health from a policy promise into an enforceable and practical right.

The present article adopts a doctrinal and analytical approach. It examines constitutional provisions, statutory laws, judicial decisions, public health policies, professional regulations, and Rajasthan-specific legal developments. It aims to identify the major areas of conflict between healthcare law and policy and to suggest reforms for strengthening health governance in India, with special reference to Rajasthan.

2. CONSTITUTIONAL FOUNDATION OF HEALTHCARE RIGHTS IN INDIA

The Constitution of India does not expressly mention the right to health as a separate fundamental right. However, the Supreme Court of India has interpreted Article 21, which protects life and personal liberty, to include the right to health, medical care, emergency treatment, occupational health, reproductive autonomy, and dignified existence. This judicial interpretation has transformed health from a matter of administrative discretion into a constitutional obligation. The right to life has been understood not merely as animal existence but as a right to live with dignity, and healthcare is an essential condition for such dignity.

The Directive Principles of State Policy provide additional constitutional support for healthcare governance. Article 38 directs the State to promote social welfare. Article 39 requires protection of the health and strength of workers. Article 41 refers to public assistance in cases of sickness and disability. Article 42 requires humane conditions of work and maternity relief. Article 47 specifically places a duty upon the State to improve public health, raise nutrition levels, and improve the standard of living. Although Directive Principles are not directly enforceable like Fundamental Rights, they guide State policy and assist courts in interpreting constitutional obligations.

Indian courts have played an important role in strengthening the constitutional basis of healthcare rights. In *Parmanand Katara v. Union of India*, the Supreme Court emphasised that preservation of human life is of paramount importance and that doctors have a professional obligation to provide emergency medical care. In *Paschim Banga Khet Mazdoor Samity v.*

State of West Bengal, the Court held that failure of a government hospital to provide timely medical treatment amounted to violation of Article 21. In *Consumer Education and Research Centre v. Union of India*, occupational health was linked with the right to life and dignity. These decisions demonstrate that the judiciary has treated healthcare as an essential component of constitutional governance.

However, constitutional recognition creates a practical dilemma. Courts may declare health as a fundamental right, but the actual delivery of healthcare depends upon infrastructure, doctors, medicines, hospitals, ambulances, financing, public administration, and regulatory capacity. This is the first major conflict between healthcare law and policy in India. The law recognises the right, but policy and governance may not always provide the resources required for its realisation. Therefore, the right to health must be supported by effective public health planning, adequate budgetary allocation, institutional accountability, and enforceable standards.

3. STATUTORY FRAMEWORK OF HEALTHCARE LAW IN INDIA

India's healthcare legal framework is broad but fragmented. There is no single comprehensive health code regulating all aspects of healthcare delivery. Instead, different matters are governed by different statutes, rules, guidelines, and regulatory bodies. Medical education and professional regulation are governed by the National Medical Commission Act, 2019. Clinical establishments are governed by the Clinical Establishments (Registration and Regulation) Act, 2010 in adopting States. Medical negligence may be addressed through consumer law, tort law, criminal law, and professional misconduct proceedings. Public health emergencies may involve the Epidemic Diseases Act, 1897 and Disaster Management Act, 2005. Reproductive health is regulated through the Medical Termination of Pregnancy Act, 1971 and the Pre-Conception and Pre-Natal Diagnostic Techniques Act, 1994. Mental health is governed by the Mental Healthcare Act, 2017. Organ transplantation is regulated by the Transplantation of Human Organs and Tissues Act, 1994. Digital personal data is now governed by the Digital Personal Data Protection Act, 2023.

This multiplicity of laws creates both strength and difficulty. On one hand, specialised statutes allow detailed regulation of specific sectors. On the other hand, fragmentation leads to overlap, confusion, weak enforcement, and lack of patient-friendly remedies. A patient who suffers denial of treatment, overcharging, medical negligence, data breach, or violation of consent

may have to approach different authorities depending on the nature of the complaint. These may include hospital grievance cells, medical councils, consumer commissions, police authorities, health departments, human rights commissions, or constitutional courts. Such complexity creates barriers for ordinary citizens, especially poor, rural, illiterate, elderly, disabled, and socially disadvantaged patients.

The National Medical Commission Act, 2019 seeks to reform medical education and professional regulation. Its objectives include improving access to quality and affordable medical education, ensuring availability of adequate medical professionals, and promoting ethical standards. However, the regulation of medical education alone cannot solve healthcare governance problems unless it is linked with service delivery, rural postings, ethical practice, patient rights, and professional accountability.

The Clinical Establishments Act, 2010 is significant because it aims to regulate hospitals, clinics, diagnostic laboratories, and other healthcare establishments through registration and minimum standards. Yet implementation varies across States and often faces resistance from private providers. Rajasthan has adopted clinical establishment regulation, but effective enforcement requires regular inspection, standard treatment protocols, transparency in charges, patient rights display, emergency obligations, and grievance redressal. Merely requiring registration is insufficient if quality and accountability are not monitored.

The Consumer Protection Act, 2019 also plays an important role in healthcare accountability. After the decision in *Indian Medical Association v. V.P. Shantha*, medical services came within the scope of consumer protection in many circumstances. Patients can seek compensation for negligence or deficiency in service. However, medical negligence litigation is often slow, technical, and expensive. There is also tension between patient accountability and doctors' concern about defensive medicine. Therefore, healthcare law must balance patient protection with professional autonomy.

4. HEALTH POLICY FRAMEWORK AND GOVERNANCE CHALLENGES

The National Health Policy, 2017 provides the broad policy framework for healthcare development in India. It emphasises universal access to quality healthcare without financial hardship, preventive and promotive healthcare, primary care strengthening, public health expenditure, digital health, human resources, and regulation of private healthcare. The policy

reflects the aspiration to move towards universal health coverage. However, a policy document is not the same as an enforceable legal right. This creates another major conflict: policy promises may not always create legal remedies for individuals.

Ayushman Bharat is one of India's most important health initiatives. It includes Health and Wellness Centres, now known as Ayushman Arogya Mandirs, and Pradhan Mantri Jan Arogya Yojana, which provides hospitalisation coverage to eligible families. Such schemes are important for reducing financial barriers to healthcare. However, insurance-based healthcare models raise questions regarding package rates, empanelled hospitals, exclusion of outpatient care, fraud control, quality of services, claim rejection, and the balance between public and private sector participation. Health insurance can improve access to hospital care, but it cannot replace investment in public health infrastructure.

Digital health has also become central to healthcare policy. The Ayushman Bharat Digital Mission seeks to create digital health records, registries, and interoperable platforms. Telemedicine guidelines have enabled remote consultation by registered medical practitioners. These developments are particularly useful in States like Rajasthan, where geographical distance and shortage of specialists affect access to care. However, digital health also creates legal concerns regarding privacy, informed consent, data security, cybersecurity, liability, and exclusion of patients without digital literacy or internet access.

A major governance challenge in India is the unequal distribution of healthcare resources. Urban areas often have better hospitals, specialists, diagnostic services, and private healthcare options. Rural and remote areas frequently depend on primary health centres, community health centres, district hospitals, or informal providers. In Rajasthan, geographical spread, desert terrain, tribal belts, and long distances make accessibility a serious issue. Therefore, healthcare policy must be decentralised, region-sensitive, and infrastructure-based rather than merely scheme-driven.

5. HEALTHCARE LAW AND POLICY CONFLICTS IN INDIA

The first major conflict is between constitutional recognition and resource limitation. The judiciary recognises health as part of the right to life, but hospitals may lack beds, doctors, medicines, oxygen, blood, diagnostic facilities, or ambulances. This creates a gap between legal entitlement and actual access. A legal right without adequate infrastructure may generate

frustration rather than justice. Therefore, health rights must be accompanied by financial commitment and administrative capacity.

The second conflict is between public health obligations and private healthcare autonomy. Private hospitals argue that they cannot be compelled to provide unlimited free or emergency services without reimbursement. Patients and rights-based movements argue that healthcare is not an ordinary commercial activity and must carry social responsibility. The State must balance these concerns through clear laws, fair reimbursement, transparent empanelment, standard packages, and accountability mechanisms.

The third conflict is between medical professional discretion and legal accountability. Doctors require professional autonomy to diagnose and treat patients according to medical judgment. However, patients require protection against negligence, exploitation, unnecessary procedures, lack of informed consent, and unethical conduct. The law must therefore distinguish between genuine medical error, negligence, gross negligence, and misconduct. Excessive criminalisation may harm medical practice, while absence of accountability may harm patients.

The fourth conflict is between policy schemes and enforceable rights. Public health insurance schemes may provide benefits, but patients may not always have an enforceable remedy when claims are denied, hospitals refuse treatment, or services are unavailable. Rights-based legislation attempts to solve this problem, but such legislation must define duties, remedies, and institutional responsibilities clearly.

The fifth conflict concerns digital health and privacy. Digital systems may improve efficiency, but health data is extremely sensitive. Misuse of health data can affect dignity, insurance, employment, reputation, and personal autonomy. Therefore, digital health governance must be integrated with privacy law, consent architecture, cybersecurity, and grievance mechanisms.

6. RAJASTHAN AS A CASE STUDY

Rajasthan provides a valuable case study because it reflects both the promise and difficulties of rights-based healthcare governance. It is one of India’s largest States by area and includes rural, desert, tribal, and semi-urban populations. Access to healthcare is affected by distance, transport, poverty, gender inequality, climate, and uneven distribution of health professionals.

Public hospitals serve a large population, while private healthcare remains concentrated mainly in urban centres.

The State has implemented several health initiatives over time, including free medicine schemes, free diagnostic services, health insurance schemes, maternal and child health programmes, and efforts to strengthen public hospitals. These initiatives reflect a welfare-oriented approach. However, welfare schemes are often dependent on executive priorities and budgetary allocation. They may not always create legally enforceable individual rights.

The Rajasthan Right to Health Act, 2022 represents an important shift from welfare policy to rights-based legislation. It seeks to recognise the right to health and access to healthcare services. It also addresses emergency treatment, public health institutions, designated healthcare centres, patient rights, and grievance redressal mechanisms. Its importance lies in the fact that Rajasthan became a leading State in attempting to give legal shape to the right to health.

However, the Act also reveals several policy conflicts. Private healthcare providers raised concerns regarding emergency treatment obligations, reimbursement, administrative control, and operational clarity. These concerns show that a right-based law must be supported by clear rules, financial planning, institutional capacity, and stakeholder consultation. If private hospitals are expected to provide emergency care, the reimbursement process must be transparent, timely, and fair. If patients are given legal entitlements, they must know where to complain and how relief will be provided. If the State imposes obligations, it must create the institutional machinery to implement them.

Rajasthan's experience demonstrates that the right to health cannot be implemented merely by passing a law. It requires detailed rules, trained authorities, budgetary support, monitoring systems, health infrastructure, grievance redressal bodies, public awareness, and coordination between public and private providers. Without these, the law may remain symbolic or become a source of conflict.

7. PATIENT RIGHTS AND MEDICAL NEGLIGENCE

Patient rights are central to healthcare law. They include the right to emergency treatment, informed consent, confidentiality, access to medical records, respectful treatment, transparency in charges, second opinion, grievance redressal, and non-discrimination. In India,

these rights are recognised through constitutional principles, professional ethics, consumer law, judicial decisions, and policy charters. However, implementation remains weak.

Medical negligence law has developed significantly through judicial decisions. In *Indian Medical Association v. V.P. Shantha*, the Supreme Court brought medical services within the consumer protection framework. In *Jacob Mathew v. State of Punjab*, the Court clarified that criminal liability for medical negligence requires a higher threshold of gross negligence. In *Samira Kohli v. Dr. Prabha Manchanda*, the Supreme Court discussed informed consent and patient autonomy. These decisions show that Indian law recognises both patient protection and the complexity of medical practice.

In Rajasthan, patient rights must be understood in the context of public hospitals, private hospitals, rural health facilities, emergency care, and health insurance. Patients often face barriers such as lack of awareness, fear of complaining, poor documentation, dependence on doctors, and absence of accessible grievance forums. Therefore, patient rights must be displayed in hospitals in simple language, including Hindi and local languages. Medical records should be provided promptly. Complaint systems should be time-bound and independent.

8. REGULATION OF PRIVATE HEALTHCARE IN RAJASTHAN

Private healthcare plays an important role in Rajasthan, particularly in urban areas such as Jaipur, Jodhpur, Udaipur, Kota, Ajmer, and Bikaner. Private hospitals provide specialist care, diagnostic services, surgery, emergency services, and tertiary treatment. However, the private sector also raises concerns regarding affordability, transparency, standardisation, and accountability.

Regulation of private healthcare must not be viewed as hostility towards doctors or hospitals. Rather, it is necessary for protecting patients and ensuring minimum standards. Regulation should include registration, minimum infrastructure norms, qualified staff, transparent billing, emergency care standards, biomedical waste compliance, infection control, medical record maintenance, and grievance redressal. At the same time, regulation should be fair, predictable, and non-arbitrary. Excessive bureaucratic control may discourage healthcare providers, while weak regulation may harm patients.

Rajasthan requires a cooperative model of regulation. The State, private hospitals, medical associations, patient groups, civil society, insurers, and public health experts should participate in designing practical rules. The goal should be to ensure that no patient is denied emergency care, no hospital is forced into financial uncertainty without reimbursement, and no doctor is unfairly harassed for genuine clinical judgment.

9. DIGITAL HEALTH, TELEMEDICINE AND DATA PRIVACY

Digital health can play a transformative role in Rajasthan due to its geographical challenges. Telemedicine can connect patients in remote areas with specialists in district or tertiary hospitals. Digital records can improve continuity of care. Electronic referral systems can reduce delays. Video consultation can reduce travel burden. Digital monitoring can improve medicine supply, diagnostic tracking, and scheme implementation.

However, digital health must be governed carefully. Health data is sensitive, and patients must have control over how their information is collected, stored, shared, and used. The Digital Personal Data Protection Act, 2023 provides a legal framework for processing digital personal data. Healthcare institutions must adopt consent systems, privacy policies, security safeguards, access controls, and breach response mechanisms. In the healthcare context, privacy is not merely a technical issue; it is connected with dignity and trust.

Telemedicine also raises questions of liability, prescription standards, identification of registered medical practitioners, informed consent, documentation, and referral. It should not become a substitute for physical examination where physical care is necessary. In Rajasthan, telemedicine should be integrated with primary health centres, community health workers, ambulance services, and referral networks.

10. PUBLIC HEALTH, PREVENTIVE CARE AND SOCIAL DETERMINANTS

Healthcare law and policy should not focus only on hospitals and treatment. Public health includes prevention of disease, sanitation, nutrition, vaccination, safe drinking water, maternal care, child health, mental health, occupational safety, food safety, and environmental health. A rights-based healthcare model must include preventive and promotive care.

Rajasthan faces public health challenges related to heat stress, water scarcity, malnutrition, maternal and child health, tribal health, occupational diseases, road accident trauma, and rural

access. Therefore, health policy must be linked with social determinants of health. Safe water, nutrition, education, roads, employment, sanitation, and women's empowerment are essential for improving health outcomes.

The conflict between curative care and preventive care is a major policy concern. Governments often focus on hospitals, insurance, and treatment because these are visible interventions. However, long-term health improvement requires investment in prevention, primary care, community health, and public health surveillance. Rajasthan's healthcare policy should therefore balance hospital-based care with preventive governance.

11. CONCLUSION

Healthcare law and policy in India are passing through a transformative phase. The constitutional recognition of the right to health under Article 21 has created a strong normative foundation, and statutory laws regulate several aspects of healthcare delivery. However, the practical implementation of health rights continues to face serious challenges due to fragmented laws, weak infrastructure, limited public spending, uneven regulation of private healthcare, poor grievance redressal, and digital privacy concerns. The conflict between legal rights and policy implementation is most visible when patients are promised healthcare but cannot access timely, affordable, and quality services.

Rajasthan's experience is especially significant because the State has attempted to provide statutory recognition to the right to health through the Rajasthan Right to Health Act, 2022. This represents an important step in Indian health rights jurisprudence. However, the Act's success depends upon practical implementation. A rights-based law must be supported by rules, funding, infrastructure, trained personnel, transparent reimbursement, grievance redressal, and public awareness. Without these elements, the right may remain symbolic.

The study concludes that healthcare governance must be rights-based, patient-centred, professionally fair, and institutionally realistic. The State must strengthen public healthcare, regulate private providers fairly, protect patient rights, support medical professionals, and ensure that digital innovation does not compromise privacy. Healthcare is not merely a service sector; it is a constitutional commitment linked with life, dignity, equality, and social justice. Rajasthan can become a model for health rights governance if it successfully harmonises law, policy, regulation, and service delivery.

12. SUGGESTIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

- First, India should move towards an integrated healthcare law framework that harmonises constitutional principles, patient rights, professional regulation, digital health, public health, and private healthcare accountability. Fragmentation of healthcare laws creates confusion and weakens enforcement.

- Secondly, Rajasthan should operationalise its Right to Health framework through clear, detailed, and practical rules. These rules must define the scope of health rights, emergency care obligations, reimbursement mechanisms, grievance redressal authorities, duties of public and private hospitals, and accountability standards.

- Thirdly, public health infrastructure must be strengthened. A right to health cannot be implemented without sufficient doctors, nurses, specialists, medicines, equipment, ambulances, diagnostic facilities, and hospitals. Special attention should be given to rural, tribal, desert, and remote areas.

- Fourthly, private healthcare regulation should be transparent and cooperative. Registration, standard treatment protocols, patient rights display, billing transparency, and emergency care obligations should be mandatory. However, reimbursement and compliance processes should be fair and timely.

- Fifthly, patient grievance redressal should be accessible at hospital, district, and State levels. Complaints should be resolved within fixed timelines. Patients should have access to medical records, information about charges, and independent review mechanisms.

- Sixthly, medical negligence adjudication should be improved through expert panels, mediation where appropriate, and time-bound consumer proceedings. Genuine negligence should be compensated, but frivolous complaints should be discouraged.

- Seventhly, digital health governance must ensure privacy, consent, cybersecurity, and inclusion. Rural and poor patients should not be excluded from healthcare because of digital barriers.

- Eighthly, Rajasthan should strengthen preventive public health through nutrition, maternal care, child health, water safety, sanitation, heat action plans, occupational health, and community health monitoring.
- Ninthly, legal awareness should be promoted among patients, doctors, hospital administrators, and public officials. Health rights and duties should be communicated in simple language.
- Tenthly, policy-making should be participatory. Doctors, private hospitals, patient groups, civil society, public health experts, insurance providers, and local communities should be consulted before framing rules and implementing reforms.

13. FUTURE SCOPE OF THE RESEARCH

The future scope of the study lies in examining the practical implementation of healthcare laws and policies in Rajasthan. Further research may assess the effectiveness of the Rajasthan Right to Health framework in ensuring affordable and accessible healthcare. The study can be expanded to analyse patient rights, medical negligence, and regulatory accountability in public and private hospitals. Future research may also explore the role of digital health, telemedicine, and data protection in healthcare governance. A comparative study with other Indian States may help identify best practices for strengthening healthcare law and policy implementation.

References

1. Balarajan, Y., Selvaraj, S., & Subramanian, S. V. (2011). Health care and equity in India. *The Lancet, 377*(9764), 505–515.

2. Baru, R. V. (1998). *Private health care in India: Social characteristics and trends*. Sage Publications.

3. Board of Governors in Supersession of the Medical Council of India. (2020). *Telemedicine practice guidelines: Enabling registered medical practitioners to provide healthcare using telemedicine*. Ministry of Health and Family Welfare, Government of India.

4. Central Pollution Control Board. (2016). *Bio-Medical Waste Management Rules, 2016*. Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change, Government of India.

5. Clinical Establishments (Registration and Regulation) Act, No. 23 of 2010, India.

6. Common Cause v. Union of India, (2018) 5 SCC 1.

7. Consumer Education and Research Centre v. Union of India, (1995) 3 SCC 42.

8. Consumer Protection Act, No. 35 of 2019, India.

9. Constitution of India. (1950). Government of India.

10. Digital Personal Data Protection Act, No. 22 of 2023, India.

11. Government of India. (2017). *National Health Policy 2017*. Ministry of Health and Family Welfare.

12. Indian Medical Association v. V.P. Shantha, (1995) 6 SCC 651.

13. Jacob Mathew v. State of Punjab, (2005) 6 SCC 1.

14. Medical Termination of Pregnancy Act, No. 34 of 1971, India.

15. Mental Healthcare Act, No. 10 of 2017, India.

16. National Health Authority. (2022). *Ayushman Bharat Digital Mission: Strategy overview*. Government of India.

17. National Medical Commission Act, No. 30 of 2019, India.

18. Parmanand Katara v. Union of India, (1989) 4 SCC 286.

19. Paschim Banga Khet Mazdoor Samity v. State of West Bengal, (1996) 4 SCC 37.

20. Pre-Conception and Pre-Natal Diagnostic Techniques (Prohibition of Sex Selection) Act, No. 57 of 1994, India.

21. Qadeer, I. (2011). *Public health in India: Critical reflections*. Aakar Books.

22. Rajasthan Right to Health Act, No. 7 of 2023, Rajasthan.

23. Ruger, J. P. (2007). Health, health care, and incompletely theorized agreements: A normative theory of health policy decision making. *Journal of Health Politics, Policy and Law, 32*(1), 51–87.

24. Samira Kohli v. Dr. Prabha Manchanda, (2008) 2 SCC 1.

25. World Health Organization. (2021). *Health systems governance for universal health coverage: Action plan and policy guidance*. World Health Organization.