

# The Review of Article 21 in connection of Right to Livelihood

Dr. Richa Gupta

Coordinator of Economics Department, School of Social Sciences and Humanities, Seshadri Road, Gandhi Nagar, Jain (Deemed to be University),

Email Id- richa@cms.ac.in

Dr. Jennifer Fernandez

Economics Department, School of Social Sciences and Humanities, Seshadri Road, Gandhi Nagar, Jain (Deemed to be University), Bengaluru

Email Id- jennifer7july@gmail.com

**ABSTRACT:** *Fulfilling only man's animal wants does not guarantee his right to live as a human being in any structured society. It is only safe when it is confident in its opportunity to produce from all available resources and is free of the restrictions that limit it. All personal freedoms are designed to achieve that goal. The ability to live is defined as the right to sustenance, water, a clean climate, education, medical care, and home in every civilized community. Article 21's definition of 'life' includes not just the concept of strong power creation, but also finer standards of life, like right to labor and right to be present. This is a constitutionally endangered right that altogether residents of India, including citizens and non-citizens, are entitled to. The human life, such as the freedom to work as protected by Article 21, is reserved alive, vibrant, and pulsing so that country might successfully develop toward the declared objective of constructing an equal civilization as anticipated by forefathers by enacting the India And spread and its Preamble.*

**KEYWORDS:** *Article 21, Constitution, Indian Constitution, Right to Livelihood.*

## INTRODUCTION

In Part III , Indian Constitution, Article 21 is one of most important articles guaranteeing human rights. As established in Article 12 of the Indian Constitution, fundamental rights outlined in Part III are enforceable in contradiction of state. The Government in addition to Parliament of India, as well as Government of each State, and regional and other authorities inside India's borders or jurisdiction of Government, are all considered to be states. As stated in Article 13, laws that are inconsistent with or derogate from right in order to pacify the some undesirable situation. The stset has given the power to interpret the laws with the consent of the Supreme Court or court itself responsible for given the explanation of the finding of the constitution.

As regards Article 21, specifies personal liberty is the basic right of an individual and nobody can have the power or authority to violate this right except under certain circumstances. The foremost problem is proper connotation of word 'existence' as described in that paragraph. "The basic right to life dealt with in Article 21 is most valuable of human rights, which make chain of freedoms.' Moreover, this article gave India's people more than they wanted from it. We're sure, if they want to do so in the future, they're able to give more. The founding fathers could not have visualized that there is so much promise in a short clause which they embodied in the Constitution. This Post is the first time a provision has achieved such significant progress. The journey begins in all its grandeur for large portion of Constituent Assembly, who were "unhappy" with Article 15, substance poured out by lesser mortals in Article 21, and the voyage begins in all its glory for large portion of Constituent Assembly, who were "unhappy" with breadth of Article 15, substance poured out by lesser mortals in Article 21 [1],.

It is self-evident that State could only divest of their life/personal liberty as use of law that is a lawful law. If a statutory law can legitimately divest a someone of personal liberty, it must meet following requirements:

method provided out by the law must be outcome of policymaking authority's proper use of legislative power, or, to put another way, only a knowledgeable legislature can adopt legislation. If process established by legislation is originate to be defined by an incapable administration, the law will be either born or incompetent in addition to ultra vires powers of legislature involved [2].

### ARTICLE 21 IN SETTINGS OF CONSTITUTION

This is written in a concise manner, requiring State not to divest anybody, not a citizen, or of his or her life or liberty unless the legal process is followed. It is self-evident that State can only divest somebody of life as well as personal liberty with operation of legislation, which is a lawful statute. If a statutory law could legitimately withdraw a person of his or her life/personal liberty, it must observe with following requirements: the process outlined by law must be product of the policymaking authority's proper exercise of legislative power. To put it another way, only a responsible legislature can pass such legislation.

If such legislation's procedure is determined to be determined by an incapable legislature, the law will be considered either born or defective, and it will be considered ultra vires the authority of the senate in issue. The result will be because such a groom-flowing mechanism and invalid law would have had no influence on any persons personal life and economic freedom administered by bend of Article 21; and if method provided forth by statute is determined to have created by a legislature authorized to pass such a legislation, it will have no consequence on any person's life and economic freedom governed by the sweep of Article 21, if that law were originate to interfere with any of constitutional privileges provided by Constitution, that law will turn null besides void and, in that case, the law endorsed by the knowledgeable legislature will still be unconstitutional [3].

Articles 14, 19, and 22 of the Indian Constitution are key articles that would control such regulation as anticipated with Article 21 and in light of such law would also have reviewed. Article 14 guarantees everyone in India equality under the law or equal protection under law. If procedure set forth in law in issue fails to pass criteria set forth in Article 14, the law will be of no use to the State in stripping the supporting people of his life or personal liberty as providing by Article 21. Article 19 provides that Indian people have right to exercise any occupation or to transmit on occupation, or service.

Article 19 explain under the sub clause of 6 as states that nothing in the performance of any existing law inasmuch as it imposes or prohibits State from founding any regulation that imposes or prohibits State from establishing any law that imposes or forbids State from founding any law that passes or prevents State from establishing any law that carries or prevents the State from establishing any law that carries or prevents the State form making any law which really imposes or prohibits State from establishing [4].

Article 22 lays forth procedure that must completed before an arrest/imprisonment is carried out. Insofar as individual involved is concerned, impairment of life and personal autonomy is on anvil unless process given for by any act established by the recent strong falls short of the criteria of Article 22. In other words, the basic right provided by Article 21 will be unaffected insofar because these individuals are anxious. Article 21 would to be interpreted in light of Part IV of the Indian Constitution's appropriate State policy guidelines.

The explanation of the article 37 states that fourth part of the constitution does no impose on the public forcefully, even by the government with a law passed in the assembly or by the honorable court and is responsibility of the State to extend these principles to legislative as well as to legislative capacity of the State to be directed and to be directed by them. Articles 39(a) and 41 set out the applicable Guidelines for our intent. Article 39 has been guide the government in support of the right of the people as irrespective of the gender,

everyone is free to possess the occupation of their choice and empowers the public for the ability and suitability of the economy and growth of the social welfare.

We will determine our accurate interpretation of the word "existence" as employed in Article 21, taking into account State's legal requirement arising from the aforementioned Public Policy Guidance principles under Articles 39(a) and 41. As a result, a joint interpretation of these clauses plainly suggests that, while adopting laws relating to deficiency of life of individual endangered by Article 21, the State must ensure that it does not fail to fulfil its constitutional requirement to establish appropriate arrangements for the respect to the right to work as well as the supply of appropriate livelihood means. It is sense of above constitutional arrangement that are answering moot issue of whether or not right to life or employment is protected by Article 21 [5].

### SALIENT STRUCTURES OF ARTICLE 21

It is factual that initially when article was approved for inclusion in the Constitution by the Constituent Assembly, the governing principals stressed term 'life' or term 'personal liberty' through a special orientation to imprisonment under any lawful and legitimate law as per the existing procedure. Yet the word 'deprivation of life' as used in its contemporary form by Article 21 cannot actually total disappearance of even corporeal nature. The word 'life' used in Article 21 has booked on a broader sense in light of a succession of Supreme Court decisions. For those who can have sufficient monetary support/ economic sustenance, life will be terminated or become worthless.

If an individual is ravenous and starves to live for self, it is not really happy. He'd be 'breathing,' but he wouldn't be 'have life.' For the sake of eking out a living, these desperate people are likely to perpetrate some sort of crime. The elected leaders could be said to written Article, which empowers State to deprive no one of their 'life' excluding under law-established measures, in order to prevent severe hunger among Indians. As a result, term "life" as used in Article 21 must obviously include right to a sufficient means of subsistence and occupation, so that the reduce the effective is not abridged to a semblance of true self and is only a moving skeleton. Of course, Article 21 is written in a negative tone, whereas Article 19 is written in a positive tone. That would negate validity and requirements of Article 21, which, as a fundamental right, guarantees every person residing in India right to an efficient in addition to dignified life in order to lead a happy and safe life [6].

The distinguish feature of the article 21 is to availability to all the person irrespective of their caste, gender and other discriminatory factor by, there is one condition impose on the provision explained in this section of the constitution and this condition is that all the rules and provision cannot be enjoy by a person who has not hold the citizen ship of the India by law, In fact, there are some provisions are explained in part tone as to explain the way to take citizenship by law or to left the citizen under the different condition . Depending upon these condition, one individual has right to go court in order to protect her right to life or even personal liberty, otherwise he has to be bound with the procedure of the law. In other words, the adverse injunction found in Article 21 has a greater scope of application, including non-citizens, whereas the positive decree found in Article 19(1) (g) only applies to a narrower group of Local banks. Unlike Article 19, there are no exceptions to Article 21 and it is not subject to any limitations. Unlike Article 19, this includes an automobile or any individual resident in India, regardless of whether or not a citizen.

When the right to travel is reduced to its most basic definition, it entails nothing but liberation from physical constraint or incarceration within the walls of a prison; that is, release from arrest and imprisonment, false incarceration, and unjust incarceration. We are powerless to claim that term remained meant to have solely this limited connotation. but, on the other hand, we find that in the Article 'personal freedom' is used as a compendious word to include in itself all the varieties of rights which constitute the 'personal freedoms' of man

protected by various deals with different species or characteristics of that right, "personal liberty" in Art. 21 integrates and contains residue [8].

The Supreme Court restated that "as we mentioned in summing up case of the petitioners, the key focus of their claim would be that the word 'life' contained in Article included the freedom to organize / right to convinced of satisfactory sources of subsistence," while commenting on the issue of whether word 'life' as originate to contain in Article 21 should comprise right to work or right to be fully convinced of satisfactory source of survival in case of Telis and others verses Bombay Municipal If they are expelled from their slum besides asphalt homes, we will be deprived of their real estate, and their eviction will rob them of their lives, which is unconstitutional.

There has only been one response to the question, and right to life established with Art. 21 has a broad besides far-reaching scope. This is to say that person can indeed be taken away or snuffed, such as by enacting and carrying out the death penalty, but only in accordance with the legal process. That is only aspect of living a good life. The correct to sustenance is an equally significant aspect of that right, since no one could survive without essentials of subsistence any resources of survival.

When right to food is not observed as fragment of fundamental of life, best way to divest a person of his right would be to withdraw him, to the point of abdication, of his means of living. Not only would such deprivation rob the existence of its useful material and purpose, it would also make it difficult to live. Nevertheless, such deprivation would not have to be compatible with the legal process if right to live were not well-thought-out part of right to life. That which alone makes life possible must be treated as an integral module of right to life, leaving aside what makes life livable.

Take away a person's right to a living and you've taken away his life. As a result, the rural populous fast migration to larger cities makes sense. They emigrate because they can't afford to live in the metropolis. The fight for survival, or war for life, is motivating factor for their abandonment of the village's hearths and houses. As a result, the evidence of a link between life and way of life is unmistakable. They will eat these things: Only a select few can afforded to live in luxury. Only if they have the source of income should they feed what they ought to. It has been said that right to work is man's most expensive freedom. It is most important freedom, as it endures and countenances a man to live and right to lifecycle is an important liberty.

Article of Constitution, that is the Directive State Policy Principle, delivers that State can direct its policy concerning ensuring that people, men as well as women alike, have right to acceptable means of living. Art. 41 provides that State shall make effective provision, within limits of its monetary ability in addition to growth, for securing right to work for unemployment or unmerited craving. Article 37 specifies that principles of Order, while not enforceable by Judge, are still central in the country's domination. If State has a duty to guarantee sufficient resources of living and right to work for people, it would be mere thoroughness to remove right to live from scope of right to life. The Government cannot be required by assenting action to deliver the people with sufficient means of livelihood or employment. Nevertheless, any individual who is disadvantaged of his right to maintenance except in compliance with a just and equitable legal procedure can challenge scarcity as offending right to life conferred by Art. 21.

The Supreme Court held the same view when making a decision in the case of Delhi Transport D.T.C v. Congress as "right to life requires , right to livelihood, and right to living cannot hold on to fancies of persons in power. Jobs from them is not a reward nor should their life be at their hands. Employment is the cornerstone of many human rights and right to work is just as human when work becomes the primary source of income. Fundamental rights may be mismanaged in consigning them to the uncertainty of unclear assumptions and ambiguous applications. That is going to be a parody of them. Therefore, both community and individual workers have an nervous interest in well-defined besides clear service conditions to extent possible.

Handing control to a high-ranking officer is not necessarily a guarantee that authority will be exercised honestly, morally, professionally, evenly, and equally without the need for an employee's built-in defence, especially when moral principles have deteriorated. Officers who carry out their jobs honestly and conscientiously are also subjected to significant strains and pressures. As a result, in order to meet society's demands in accordance with the statutory structure, the contradictory arguments of employees' "public interest" vs "private interest" must be peacefully balanced. Article 21 states that no one's life or liberty may be taken away unless the method prescribed by law is followed. The term 'life' is used in a far broader sense. When the outcome of a governmental investigation threatens a person's authenticity or well-being, some of the finer aspects of society that make life worthwhile are threatened, so the same can only be risked by law contained in acceptable practices.

The Supreme Court underlined the same concept in India's LIC and others v. Consumer Education & Research Center as well as others 11, noting in paragraph 14 that Article 19 provides freedoms of abode and occupation in every area of the world, but also that Article 21, by establishing a full description of right to life, relates to employment. The Court concluded that Article 21's life and liberty protects one's well-being, but that its privation could not be overly broadened, foreseen, or extended to professionals, businesses that are detrimental to the human interest or have a negative impact on public morals or order. As a result, it remained determine that video game regulation or banning of pure or mixed chance video games and skills does not violate Article 21, nor is the practise arbitrary, uneven, or unjust [7].

### CONCLUSION

Now is the moment to assess the situation and bring the sheet down. As seen by a slew of Supreme Court decisions over the years, the term "life" as employed in Article 21 now incorporates not just concept of uncontaminated physical nature, but finer elements of life, such as right to vote and livelihood. This is an important privilege that is granted to all Indian citizens, as opposed to merely those who are safeguarded by Article 19(1). (g). The State should not meddle with this right unless it is through a pay system from a legitimate law passed by a good way of showing and which does not contradict with any other constitutional freedoms, particularly those given under Article 14 as well as 19, inasmuch as attainable to the individual asserting such a important human right.

Article 21 has written in a deleterious tone and could implemented in complete terms through a substantial phrase, as is case with basic human right decided to Indians under Article 19. Nonetheless, the fact is that state is barred from interfering with the freedom to labour or a decent standard of life granted underneath Article 21 to all Indians, citizens in addition to non-citizens alike, unless it follows a procedural legislation that is check of Part III of the Indian Penal code, and that the administration also has a clear responsibility to be directed by Article 21.. Vibrant and pulsating in order to allow the country to effectively achieve the specified goal of creating an equitable society as envisaged by the framers of the constitution before enacting the Indian Constitution and its Preamble.

### REFERENCES

- [1] S. Bose and Y. Mishra, "Notes On: Street Vendors in Kolkata: A Review," *Labor Law Journal*, 2013.
- [2] Dr. Bagade Basavaraj R, "MANAGEMENT OF URBAN WATER UTILITIES IN HUBLI - DHARWAD CITY: ISSUES & CHALLENGES," *Review Of Research*, 2017, doi: 10.9780/2249-894X.
- [3] S. R. Bhat, "Innovation and intellectual property rights law—an overview of the Indian law," *IIMB Management Review*, 2018, doi: 10.1016/j.iimb.2017.12.003.
- [4] S. Azeem and R. Sharma, "Article-9: Elements of the retail marketing mix: a study of different retail formats in India," *The Business & Management Review*, 2015.
- [5] M. O. F. Women, "Government of India Ministry of Women and Child Development," *Rapid Survey on Children (RSOC) 2013-14 National Report*, 2013.

- [6] H. Lerner, "Constitution-writing in deeply divided societies: The incrementalist approach," *Nations and Nationalism*, 2010, doi: 10.1111/j.1469-8129.2010.00435.x.
- [7] A. Mondal, "Free and Compulsory Primary Education in India Under the British Raj: A Tale of an Unfulfilled Dream," *SAGE Open*, 2017, doi: 10.1177/2158244017727037.

