INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF NOVEL RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT (IJNRD)
© 2026 IJNRD | Volume 11, Issue 1, January 2026 | ISSN: 2456-4184 | IJNRD.ORG

THE LEGISLATIVE HALFWAY HOUSE: DECONSTRUCTING MEDICAL GATEKEEPING AND THE LEGAL-CLINICAL GAP IN INDIA'S REPRODUCTIVE RIGHTS FRAMEWORK

[1]Ms. Akshata Shaji, [2]Ms. Abirami Unni
[1,2]BCom LLB (hons) (II year), Institute of Law, Nirma University, Ahmedabad - 382481

Abstract: The legal landscape of India, in relation to abortion, has moved from colonial criminalization under the Indian Penal Code to a medicalized regulatory regime installed by the MTP Act, 1971, as amended in 2021. However, despite the increasing invocation of "decisional autonomy" and the right to privacy by the judiciary-notably affirmed in K.S. Puttaswamy v. Union of India-a deep "legal-clinical gap" continues to persist. This paper argues that the current framework functions as a "legislative halfway house" presided over by an unjustified, doctor-centric model of gatekeeping. Under this paradigm, abortion remains a conditional medical exception requiring a physician's "good faith" opinion, rather than an intrinsic right rooted in the autonomy of the pregnant person. Based on this, specific structural issues that the policy addresses and seeks to overcome include the "physician-only" policy, issues related to the conflict between the legal system and the POCSA Act, and issues related to bureaucratic procrastination on the part of the Medical Board during late-term services. Moreover, the policy has an inherent "cis-normativity" problem that seeks to deny access to services to the LGBTQ community as a whole. To ensure that there is an "integration" between the promises in the constitution and the available services, the authors present specific recommendations as follows: opening access to services "on request" for the first trimester, separating reproductive services from the demographic-tracking PCPNDTA Act altogether, including "mid-level practitioners" as service providers to increase numbers and access, and "gender neutrality" should ensure "absolute bodily integrity" itself.

Keywords: MTP Act, Reproductive Autonomy, Decisional Autonomy, POCSO Act, Medical Gatekeeping, Reproductive Justice, India.

I.INTRODUCTION

The legal history of abortion in India provides a transformational journey, from criminalization in the colonial era to a cautious liberalization in modern times. Until over 100 years after the coming into force of the Indian Penal Code of 1860, termination of pregnancy was severely policed, viewed in law as "causing miscarriage" and punishable except when performed in "good faith" to save the life of the pregnant woman. It wasn't until the mid-20th century that the Indian government transformed its approach, at the prompting of high maternal mortality rates from "back-alley" procedures, toward a public health-humanitarian model.

The culmination of this evolution was the Medical Termination of Pregnancy **("MTP")** Act of 1971, a monumental legislation which established exemptions within the law itself and thereby, made it not a "stigmatized back-alley practice" but a "medicalized" one. Though the Medical Termination of Pregnancy Act of 1971 and its modification under the Medical Termination of Pregnancy Act of 2021 have made major advances, including the extension of the gestation period up to 24 weeks for "special categories" of women and changing "married woman" to "any woman" to thereby include unmarried women, the Act, nonetheless, is "doctor-centric." In the existing Act, the matter of pregnancy termination depends upon the "good faith" belief of the Registered Medical Practitioners **("RMPs")**, and not the absolute will of the pregnant woman.

Despite the ever-increasing recognition of the importance of reproductive freedom as an element of the Right to Life under Article 21 and the Right to Privacy under the K.S. Puttaswamy v. Union of India decision of

2017, there remains a "sharp 'legal-clinical' gap." The "legislative halfway house" continues to ensure reproductive justice, which is, in fact, a "tainted offer" of the state and not the birthright of the citizen. Marginalized sections, including children, rape victims, and the LGBTQ community, experience obstacles ranging from the need for guardian consent to the "POCSO paradox."

This paper examines the disparity between the progressive judicial discourse in India and the administrative obstacles that cause millions to move into the informal, danger-laced market. Examining the shift in focus from the provider state paradigm to the woman's autonomy paradigm, this paper argues the need for an encompassing paradigm that respects the promise of dignity in the constitution.

II. Research Framework

2.1. Research Methodology

The present study follows a qualitative, doctrinal, and analytical research design to assay the evolution and existing state of the MTP regime in India. The method examines the juncture of constitutional law, statutory regulations, and systemic medical barriers that mark the current landscape of reproductive justice.

2.2. Research Questions

1.Does the current legislative framework represent a true shift toward a "rights-based" model, or does it perpetuate a state of "conditional legality" mediated by the State?

2.In what ways do the mandatory quasi-judicial processes for late-term services impose a "judicial burden" and a "time-tax" on vulnerable populations?

3.How does the law balance the constitutional right to maternal bodily integrity against the medical and ethical realities of foetal development and viability?

2.3. Research Objectives

1.To trace the legal transition from colonial-era criminalization under the IPC to the modern, yet restrictive, medicalized regulatory model.

2.To critique the "doctor-centric" gatekeeping system and its impact on the "decisional autonomy" and bodily integrity of pregnant individuals.

3. To analyse the quasi-judicial roles of State-level Medical Boards and Child Welfare Committees (CWC) in managing late-term abortion requests and the surrender process.

2.4. Scope and Limitations

This study examines reproductive rights in the context of legal and procedural frameworks in India. Although it discusses foetal development and viability as background material, this paper does not give clinical medical advice. In addition, this study focuses on the issues faced by vulnerable populations (e.g., rape survivors, minors, and LGBTQ+ persons) within the current "doctor-centric" framework with respect to procedural and structural barriers.

III. The Legal Evolution: From Criminal Liability to Conditional Right

The historical development of abortion law in India traces a complex arc towards changing from a punitive and colonialist model to that of a modernized though still heavily controlled medicalized model. Though it has undergone radical changes toward modernizing and liberalizing abortion law in India, abortion is still defined in that jurisdiction as only a conditional exception to crimes pronounced in penal law and not an absolute fundamental right.

3.1 The IPC Era : Criminality and the Victorian Moral Compass

The origins of legal frameworks surrounding abortion began with the Indian Penal Code, 1860, specifically under Sections 312 to 316. Drawing on Victorian morality, the act of abortion equated to "an offence against the body," punishable by jails and fines against both the pregnant woman and the abortion service provider. Section 312 only allowed legal grounds, described as a process undertaken "in good faith, for the purpose of saving the life of the woman." The narrow legal environment contained no consideration for socio-economic, congenital, or mental health needs of the pregnant mothers.

The criminalization of abortion failed to stop the continuation of the procedure but instead ensured that all abortions took place in unsafe, clandestine settings. However, by the middle of the 20th century, the increased maternal mortality associated with clandestine abortions made necessary the policy response in terms of public health, as opposed to the right of autonomy. As such, it resulted in the formation of the Shantilal Shah Committee in 1964, which advocated for liberalization.

3.2 The Framework Agreement of 1971: The "Medical Exception" Arises

The Medical Termination of Pregnancy (MTP) Act, 1971, was introduced as an exception to the criminal provisions of IPC. This Act did not make abortion legal in the sense of granting the right to abortion in any case but gave a "legal shield" to Registered Medical Practitioners (RMPs) to carry out abortions without fear of prosecution (Tripathi & Gupta, 2021). As per the 1971 Act, the pregnancy can be terminated within 20 weeks in case of life or serious damage to the woman, jeopardy to life, serious damage to woman's physical or mental health, substantial risk of foetal abnormality.

Most importantly, the Act included "failure of contraception" as a reason for abortion, but this criterion applied only to "married women and their husbands" in the first instance. But it is clear that there is an attempt to conceive an abortion as an instrument of family planning. In the 1971 model, the approach is "doctor-centric," because ultimately the critical judgment rested in the medical practitioner's "good faith" opinion and not in the woman's autonomy.

3.3 2021 Amendment:

The MTP (Amendment) Act of 2021 was brought in order to keep pace with advances in medical technology and society. Amongst the major amendments brought was that of gestational limits. The amendment brought in a two-tiered mechanism for access:

Up to 20 weeks: Opinion of one RMP is required.
Contrary to the common belief that abortion is available upon request during this period, the Act is still based on a provider-centred model. Termination is allowed only if a registered medical practitioner (RMP) believes in good faith that continuing the pregnancy could harm the woman's life or cause serious injury to her physical or mental health. "Explanation 1" of the Act does allow for the assumption of mental health injury in cases of contraceptive failure, which now applies to "any woman." However, the doctor still acts as the legal gatekeeper.

If an RMP does not agree to certify this mental health risk, the woman does not have a legal right to the procedure. 20-24 weeks: Reserved for certain categories of women rape victims, minor pregnant women, pregnant women with disabilities and requires the opinion of two RMPs.
After 24 Weeks: Only if there are "substantial foetal abnormalities" as determined by a state-level Medical Board.

The extension specifically related to the "technology gap," where severe congenital abnormalities could be identified only by the use of high-resolution ultrasound scans beyond the 20-week mark (Nimbalkar & Patel, 2019). The lifting of the restriction regarding late-term pregnancy termination for abnormalities was specifically to deal with writ petitions filed by pregnant women seeking judicial help for the termination.
Moreover, the 2021 Amendment corrected the expression "married woman or her husband" to "any woman or her partner" with regard to contraceptive failure. This indicates the provision of reproductive rights to all women, not just the married ones, embracing the concept of 'transformational constitutionalism,' emphasizing the importance of inclusivity and privacy. Furthermore, to ensure that the privacy of the patient is not put to

shame by social humiliation, the provision of section 5A has been laid down.

3.4 "Conditional Right" Paradox: Medical Boards and Gatekeeping

Despite all the additions, the 2021 Amendment has been criticized for maintaining the state-altered gatekeeping approach. The addition of Medical Boards required for late-term abortions, comprising a gynaecologist, paediatrician, radiologist/sonologist, and other state-nominated members, now introduces an administrative component that could hinder women from accessing care in time. Often, this leads to women going through a "quasi-judicial" procedure, where their personal lives come under judicial review by a board. For late-term abortions (beyond 24 weeks), the procedure changes from a medical consultation to a review process. The State-level Medical Board, which includes a gynaecologist, paediatrician, and radiologist, acts as a tribunal that evaluates rather than just treats.

They assess the severity of foetal abnormalities and issue a report that has the authority of a legal decision. If the Board denies the request, the woman must file a Writ Petition in the High Court or Supreme Court. In these situations, the judiciary often views the Board's medical opinion as infallible. This creates a back-and-forth dynamic between medical boards and courtrooms that further delays the procedure. Abortion remains "a medical exception, not a choice." If a female chooses an abortion for reasons not enumerated in the law, for example, professional dreams or socio-economic pressure, she must still make her plea for an abortion in the name of "grave injury to her mental health" in order for her request to pass medical scrutiny.

This legal caution after the 24-week mark is based on the medical reality of foetal viability. By 24 weeks, the foetus has developed enough to potentially survive outside the womb with medical help. Medical professionals point out that at this point, the procedure becomes much more complicated and often requires "feticide," which involves an injection to stop the foetal heart before labour starts. The state's interest in "potential life" grows with these medical factors. This creates a conflict between a woman's right to choose and the ethical considerations regarding a developed foetus. Therefore, the law's refusal to permit abortion "for any reason" after this time aims to balance a woman's bodily rights with the foetus's biological development.

This indicates that even though the reach of the law has been expanded, the underlying mentality has not shifted toward autonomy. In addition, the present framework is criticized for being "cis-normative." Although the 2021 Act is more inclusive of unmarried women, it fails to provide any provisions for transgender and non-binary communities who can also experience pregnancy and require abortion services. The legislation is primarily centred on a conventional medical approach, failing to recognize the right to abortion as a fundamental exercise being enjoyed under the right to privacy and dignity under the Puttaswamy judgment.

3.5 Conclusion: A Legislative Halfway House

The journey from complete criminalization in 1860 to 2021 is a long way towards a liberal regulatory framework. The Amendment of 2021 is undoubtedly a progress, especially towards acknowledging rights of unwed women and extending gestational periods. However, being bound by IPC as a default framework, accompanied by what could be termed as the 'doctor-centred' approach of MTP, ensures that abortion is still a conditional right bestowed by the State. The 'whirlwinds of Indian law' have divided legality into being medically progressive but ideologically opposed towards complete 'bodily integrity' right.

Finally, for women who cannot get an abortion because they go beyond the 24-week limit without a foetal anomaly, the state offers Surrender and Adoption as an alternative. This process includes a tough procedure through the Child Welfare Committee (CWC). A woman must go before the CWC for a brief inquiry and take part in a required two-month "reconsideration period." This "post-birth" option shows the flaw in reproductive justice. The state allows a judicial way to give up a child but does not give women the right to stop the birth in the first place.

VI. Constitutional Autonomy and the "Doctor-Centric" Law

The journey of reproductive rights in India shows a clear contradiction. The judiciary has started to recognize bodily autonomy as part of the fundamental right to life. However, the laws still treat abortion as a medical privilege instead of an individual right. This legal framework, while changing, remains "doctor-centric." A woman's consent depends on what medical practitioners decide is in her best interest. This situation reflects a

long-standing oppression of women, with the state, through the medical profession, holding ultimate power over women's bodies.

4.1 The Constitutional Promise: Article 21 and the Right to Privacy

The right to reproductive autonomy is strongly based on Article 21 of the Constitution of India. This article guarantees the right to life and personal liberty. Over the years, the Supreme Court has broadened this right to include "life with dignity," which includes the right to make reproductive choices. The landmark case of K.S. Puttaswamy v. Union of India (2017) changed this landscape by establishing a strong Right to Privacy and recognizing "decisional autonomy" as a key element. Within this framework, the decision to continue or end a pregnancy is personal and fundamental to an individual's bodily integrity and self-determination.

Despite these constitutional protections, the Medical Termination of Pregnancy (MTP) Act operates as a "limited right" instead of a "rights-based" law. This creates a "judicial paradox." While the Supreme Court, in Justice K.S. Puttaswamy v. Union of India (2017) and X v. Principal Secretary, Health and Family Welfare Department (2022), recognized reproductive autonomy as a fundamental right under Article 21, the procedure is still an exception within the Indian Penal Code (IPC). Here, abortion is technically a criminal act under Sections 312-318. The MTP Act simply provides a "safe harbour" for medical practitioners. It protects them from liability in certain situations rather than giving women complete choice.

This paradox is particularly clear with the "20-week threshold." Contrary to the belief that abortion is available "on request" during this time, Section 3(2)(a) requires that a Registered Medical Practitioner (RMP) must confirm a risk to the woman's physical or mental health. By putting the doctor in the role of the legal "gatekeeper," the state makes reproductive justice a conditional offer.

The paradox deepens after 24 weeks, when the procedure becomes quasi-judicial. At this point, a State-level Medical Board reviews the woman's request. This change is often defended by the medical facts surrounding foetal viability. As the foetus reaches 24 weeks, its development is almost complete, which increases the state's interest in protecting "potential life." Thus, the "paradox" emerges: while the judiciary acknowledges the woman's autonomy, the legal framework still views her as a "subject of medical expertise," weighing her bodily rights against the foetus's biological development.

4.2 The Doctor as Gatekeeper: A Critique of Paternalism

A main criticism of the MTP framework is its dependence on medical gatekeeping. According to Section 3 of the Act, the choice to end a pregnancy is not up to the woman but relies on the approval of one or more Registered Medical Practitioners (RMPs). Even with the 2021 Amendment, a woman cannot simply ask for an abortion; she must convince a doctor that her situation fits specific categories like risks to her physical or mental health or foetal abnormalities.

This need for "medical approval" treats women as if they cannot make sound decisions about their own lives without medical validation. It compels individuals to frame their choices in terms of "serious injury to mental health" just to meet medical standards. This kind of framework reinforces a system of social control that prioritizes the state's interests concerning "potential life" over the current bodily integrity of women.

4.3 The Gap Between Law and Reality: Social and Medical Evidence

The flaws of this "doctor-centric" model are clear when we look at the social aspects of abortion in India. While the 2021 Amendment seems progressive, it overlooks the systemic barriers that create a significant "legal-clinical gap." It is estimated that out of the 15.6 million abortions performed in India each year, only a small number occur in registered facilities. This gap is not just due to strict laws; it is also worsened by insufficient healthcare infrastructure. In many rural areas, Primary Health Centres (PHCs) do not have the trained Registered Medical Practitioners (RMPs) or the specific equipment needed for facility accreditation under the MTP Act.

Additionally, the "doctor-centric" model gives medical professionals the power to act as moral judges. Studies show that many RMPs impose "extra-legal" requirements, such as asking for spousal consent or proof of marriage, which the law does not require. These extra demands create significant obstacles for unmarried

women and rape survivors. This "provider bias" forces women, particularly those from marginalized communities, to turn to the informal market for medication abortion (MA) pills to keep their situations private and avoid judgment.

4.4 Technological Lag and the Judicial Burden

The MTP framework has historically struggled to keep up with the rapid changes in prenatal diagnostics. A significant technological gap exists because many complex fetal anomalies, such as certain congenital heart defects or neurological malformations, only become detectable through a Level II Anomaly Scan, usually conducted between the 18th and 22nd week of pregnancy. If an anomaly is suspected, confirmatory tests like Amniocentesis can take two to three weeks to process. This biological and diagnostic timeline often pushes women past the 20-week mark before they have the information necessary to make a decision.

While the 2021 Amendment allows for late-term abortions in cases of substantial foetal abnormalities, it requires the involvement of a State-level Medical Board. These boards act as quasi-judicial bodies, removing decision-making power from the woman. This shift to a quasi-judicial forum introduces a time cost on reproductive rights; women often face repetitive, invasive medical exams and bureaucratic delays that can be re-traumatizing. For those pushed into the judicial process of High Courts, the law must navigate the medical reality of foetal viability. By 24 weeks, the foetus reaches a stage of development where its chances of surviving outside the womb increase, prompting the judiciary to weigh maternal autonomy against the state's interest in protecting a viable foetus.

4.5 The Invisibility of Diverse Identities

The "doctor-centric" nature of the law becomes even more complicated due to its "cis-normative" language. Although the 2021 change from "married woman" to "any woman" recognized the rights of unmarried people, the law is still silent on transgender and non-binary individuals who can become pregnant. The absence of inclusive terms like "pregnant persons" makes these groups vulnerable to discrimination and exclusion in a healthcare system already biased against non-binary views of reproductive health.

Additionally, the rights of minors are heavily restricted by the requirement for guardian consent, which functions as an absolute veto over a minor’s bodily autonomy. This requirement often conflicts with mandatory reporting laws under the POCSO Act, creating an environment where medical facilities become monitoring sites, rather than places of safe care, discouraging vulnerable youth from seeking help.

To sum up, the handling of reproductive choice in India represents a "legislative halfway house." While the judiciary has provided a basis for a rights-based approach through transformative constitutionalism, the MTP Act remains rooted in a paternalistic view. The ongoing "doctor-centric" gatekeeping means abortion continues to be a "conditional right" granted by the state. To honour the constitutional promise of dignity and privacy, the law must shift towards a model that sees reproductive choice as a clear, inclusive right. It should respect the independent decisions of individuals, regardless of age, gender identity, or socio-economic background.

V. Reconceptualizing Reproductive Rights: From Provider-Centric Regulation to Women-Centric Autonomy in India

The legal regime surrounding the issue of abortion in India appears to be marked by the coexistence of a regulatory approach that focuses on the providers, side by side with the recent incipient rights approach that focuses on the women of the country. The legal framework that originally existed, as defined under the Medical Termination of Pregnancy (MTP) Act of 1971, was not the recognition of the right to choose but the exception to the illegal character of the said termination of pregnancy as defined under the Indian Penal Code. The original legal framework surrounding the MTP is clearly very provider-centric, as defined, wherein the conception for the termination of the pregnancy hinges entirely upon the "good faith" belief of the registered medical practitioners, as opposed to the wishes of the pregnant woman herself. The legal framework as defined states that the medical practitioner is the gatekeeper for the pregnant woman, as the medical practitioner is the only person who can decide if the pregnant woman qualifies for the "therapeutic, eugenic, or humanitarian reasons" that are not clearly defined but are supposed to relate to the pregnant woman's own "confinement, locomotion, or mental relaxation risks, or if the result of honeymoon adultery, or if the result

of rape or deflowering as defined under the law."

The legal framework, as defined, tends to position the pregnant woman into what has been termed as the "systemic brushing-off" of the reality that the pregnant woman experiences, as if the medical practitioner that the pregnant woman sees, as well as the judicial system if the pregnancy has progressed to late term, are
In this context, a woman-focused lens takes precedence in considering the inherent right of every pregnant woman to make use of her bodily integrity and reproductive freedom as part of her liberty. In fact, judicial efforts in recent years have actively encouraged this paradigm, in that the Indian Supreme Court has claimed that reproductive freedom is a fundamental right under Article 21 of the Indian Constitution, and by no means open to negotiations and compromises. In this vein, access to abortion is termed as an "entry into her body uninvited," as a woman is rendered incapable of being a full participant in society without complete bodily liberty. In further considering "change of material circumstances" to encompass those women not in a relationship, judicial efforts have now rendered difficult patriarchal constructs that had restricted access in conformity with relationship status, in identifying that "a woman's needs, as she has articulated, should supersede so-called societal moral views."

Going forward, the need to transform from a "provider-centric" approach towards a "women-centric" approach in the new model necessitates the need to address ingrained structural and societal hurdles. Although the critical amendments in the Act in 2021 remain in place, the Act "is struggling with administrative delay while 'old school thoughts' restricting the realization of abortion as a human right are yet unclear." If the divide in the Act needs to be bridged in favour of the cause, legal professionals have repeatedly stressed the need to have binding timetables in place for medical authorities to avoid life-altering delay and the need to initiate the "fast-track method." In addition, the need to do "thorough sensitization of the service providers" in the Act about the need to implement the Act in a judgment-free manner, and "mass" educational programs about the rights of the women in the Act in the cause of abortion rights can alone help the Indian government usher in a new era of prioritizing the "self-respect and autonomous will" of the pregnant individual in a state where "reproduction health" can be recognized as an "integral basic human right" in the context of abortion.

VI. The Paradox of Safety and Accessibility: Implementation Failures

The effectiveness of the Medical Termination of Pregnancy (MTP) Act is seriously hindered by a significant gap between the law and real-world practice. The legal framework has moved from a colonial criminal model to a modern medical one, yet the actual experience for pregnant individuals is still filled with structural and regulatory challenges. This disconnect has led to a public health crisis. Even though abortion has been legal for over fifty years, it remains unsafe for most of the Indian population. It is estimated that around 15.6 million abortions happen in India each year, with about 67% to 73% of these classified as unsafe or occurring outside registered facilities. The human cost is dire, with approximately eight women dying every day due to complications related to unsafe abortions.

6.1 Structural Barriers and the Medicalized Monopoly

The main obstacle in providing safe abortion services is the "physician-only" rule. This rule gives authority to a limited number of Registered Medical Practitioners (RMPs). By requiring that only doctors with specific obstetric or gynaecological training perform or supervise abortions, the law creates a severe shortage of providers, especially in rural and semi-urban areas. This problem is worsened by the fact that only a small number of public health facilities are actually registered or equipped to provide MTP services. In rural areas, where education levels are lower and poverty is higher, women often struggle to navigate the bureaucratic demands of formal clinics. As a result, many rely on the informal retail market.

The rise of medical abortion (MA) using mifepristone and misoprostol should, in theory, help decentralize services. However, the legal framework has not kept pace. About 81% of all abortions in India are now medication-based, with most of these drugs obtained from pharmacies or informal vendors without formal prescriptions. While MA is safe in itself, the lack of professional guidance means that women often use these medications without enough information on dosage, contraindications, or follow-up care. This so-called "legal-clinical gap" means that even when the procedure is medically safe, it stays "legally unsafe" or secretive, reinforcing the stigma around the practice.

Additionally, widespread "unnecessary requirements" serve as extra-legal gatekeepers. Although the MTP Act does not require spousal or parental consent for adult women, healthcare providers often seek such authorizations to avoid legal risks or to follow personal beliefs. These demands violate the constitutional right to privacy and bodily integrity established in K.S. Puttaswamy v. Union of India, effectively reducing a woman's "decisional autonomy" to family or spousal permission.

6.2 The Conflict with PCPNDT: A Regulatory Chilling Effect

A major factor contributing to the decline of accessible abortion services is the conflict between the MTP Act and the Pre-Conception and Pre-Natal Diagnostic Techniques (PCPNDT) Act of 1994. While the PCPNDT Act was created to curb sex-selective abortions and improve the declining child sex ratio, its implementation has fostered an environment of surveillance and fear among medical professionals. Stringent record-keeping requirements and the risk of criminal prosecution for minor clerical errors have discouraged many private practitioners from providing MTP services altogether.

Doctors often see providing abortions as a potential legal risk. The close scrutiny of ultrasound clinics and the suspicion surrounding anyone performing second-trimester terminations have led to "defensive medicine." Many practitioners avoid carrying out legal abortions to escape state harassment. This is especially true in cases where a woman has daughters; some providers openly state, "If a woman has even one daughter, I refuse to do the MTP... I don't want the police at my door". This "chilling effect" prioritizes the state's demographic goals over individual reproductive rights, pushing women who can legally obtain a termination towards unregulated "quack" providers or unsafe self-induced.

6.3 Minor Rights and the POCSO Paradox

For minors, accessing safe abortion services is nearly impossible due to the conflict between the MTP Act and the Protection of Children from Sexual Offences (POCSO) Act of 2012. The MTP Act (Amendment) 2021 introduced Section 5A to protect patient confidentiality. However, the POCSO Act requires the reporting of all sexual activity involving minors to the police. This reporting requirement puts medical practitioners in a tough spot: they must either breach confidentiality or risk legal consequences for failing to report a crime.

This conflict makes medical facilities places of scrutiny instead of care. Fearing legal consequences, minors and their families often avoid formal healthcare services and turn to clandestine options that do not involve police interaction. This paradox contributes directly to high rates of illness and death among adolescents because the fear of legal exposure outweighs the need for medical safety. The requirement for parental consent complicates this further, giving a third-party complete control over a minor's bodily autonomy, which conflicts with the emerging "mature minor" doctrine in international law.

6.4 Stigma and the Provider-Client Interaction

Even when women arrive at a facility, the care they receive is often impacted by stigma around abortion. Stigma shapes the care environment, resulting in judgmental attitudes, verbal abuse, or withholding pain relief. Providers, influenced by entrenched patriarchal views, may see abortion as a moral failure rather than a medical right. This leads to "conscientious objection," often rooted in social prejudice rather than religious beliefs.

Stigma is particularly severe for unmarried women, survivors of sexual assault, and gender-diverse individuals. Although the 2021 Amendment changed "married woman" to "any woman," the prevailing institutional culture remains focused on cis-normative standards. Transgender and non-binary individuals who can become pregnant face unique challenges, as the law does not include terms like "pregnant persons," leaving them invisible and often excluded from formal reproductive health services. The trauma of their care experience often discourages future engagement with the healthcare system, further isolating vulnerable groups from safe reproductive options.

6.5 Conclusion: From Provider-Centric to Rights-Based Care

The shortcomings of the MTP Act show that legal changes are necessary but not sufficient for achieving reproductive justice. The "paradox of safety" continues because the law focuses on providers and regulations instead of prioritizing the rights of individuals. Dependence on judicial systems for late-term abortions and

the bureaucratic hurdles posed by Medical Boards make abortion a conditional privilege for many.

To narrow the divide between constitutional promises and real-life conditions, India must shift towards a model that emphasizes individual autonomy and decentralizes service delivery. This includes increasing the number of authorized providers to include mid-level practitioners, aligning the reporting requirements of POCSO with MTP confidentiality, and actively addressing the chilling effect of the PCPNDT Act. Only by prioritizing the "autonomous will" of pregnant individuals over medical and state obstacles can India fulfil its commitment to dignity, privacy, and bodily integrity for all citizens.

VII. Special Considerations: The Rights of Minors and Vulnerable Groups

The pragmatic relevance of the Medical Termination of Pregnancy (MTP) Act framework can be best proven by its effectiveness within vulnerable social groupings. Although the Amendment of 2021 attempted to correct these discrepancies, still large hurdles for adolescents, sexual assault survivors, and members of the LGBTQ+ community remains within the current legal framework. There arises an impediment of 'reproductive precarity' wherein FDA guidelines clash with mandatory legal and economic factors to deny access to these social groupings.

7.1 Minority Rights and the Doctrine of Guardian Consent

The Section 3(4)(a) criterion for the pregnancy termination of a minor below the age of eighteen continues to be subject to the written consent of a guardian. This provision is inherently repugnant to the developing international norm of the "mature minor" right to autonomy and the right to the individual's privacy guaranteed under the K.S. Puttaswamy v. Union of India decision in 2017. The provision of the need for the written consent of a guardian in effect amounts to an "absolute veto power" in the matter of the personal freedom or integrity of the minor for which the minor herself should be the best judge in the matter.

This has serious socio-legal implications arising from the requirement. An adolescent pregnancy issue that is shrouded in stigma in the Indian setting can be aggravated by the requirement to involve guardians, making it difficult for a minor to access services. Administrative or legal hurdles of this nature that exist to access health services might not serve to dampen demand for abortions per se, but rather serve to increase demand for "unsafe" or "backstreet" abortions. Moreover, if a minor cannot obtain her guardian's consent, she will be subjected to a "state-mandated perpetuation of pregnancy" that is already a serious violation of her mental well-being.

7.2 The POCSO Paradox and Breaches of Confidentiality

Minor vulnerability further gets complicated due to compulsory reporting requirements for medical authorities on Protection of Children from Sexual Offences (POCSO) Act, 2012. Indeed, having a medical practitioner perform a termination procedure on a minor means reporting it to the police, which recognizes that in a child's case, sex is never consensual in nature. This comes in direct conflict with Section 5A of the MTP (Amendment) Act, 2021, which declares that confidentiality with regard to identity must remain in case of the pregnant person.

"Legal conflict is created by the law itself, resulting in healthcare institutions becoming venues of the legal system's surveillance." Afraid of the legal repercussions of failure to report, providers may place the legal defence of themselves before the secrecy of the patient, thus discouraging adolescents from accessing safe care. Lacking the judicial bypass or a "harm reduction protocol," the legal system puts the minor in the double punishment of not only denying her confidentiality but also initiating a criminal inquiry that can put the minor back into social trauma.

7.3 Socio-Medical Reality: Unsafe Abortions and the Informal Market

The gaps within the official regulatory framework are evident through empirical figures. Around 15.6 million annual abortion cases are witnessed in India every year, but most of these happen in settings which are unregistered. This proves a "legal-clinical gap" between the official legislation of MTP ACT, under which conditions like Registered Medical Practitioner approval are required for abortion, rather than being a protection mechanism, prove to be a hurdle for poor sections.

The function of the informal retail market for medication abortion (MA) drugs is further exemplary here. Studies on retail market data from Madhya Pradesh state show that many women circumvent medical gate-keeping to buy tablets from retail pharmacists directly. While giving some scope for confidentiality, their lack of professional advice raises doubts about possible uncompleted abortions and associated morbidity. These "extra-legal" practices become necessary options for marginalized sections like un-educated rural women, statistically represented to comprise fewer numbers among facility-based service seekers. The level of abortion-related deaths reported from broad national surveys specifies that until "the doctor-centric" and cumbersome juristic provisions of the present statute remain unchanged, there is no end to exclusion of socio-economic bottom sections.

7.4 Judicial Obstacles Confronted by Rape Victims and "Late-Term" Solutions

In respect to victims of rape, while the introduction of the 2021 Amendment to extend the gestational period to 24 weeks is some good news for them, the legislation does not allow for its termination after 24 weeks even if there are no foetal anomalies through any legal instrumentalities, and recourse to "judicial forum or platform," for relief through High Courts or the Supreme Court, via Articles 226 and 32 of the Indian Constitution, is required.

The judicial process is notoriously debilitating and irregular. Survivors have to endure intrusive examinations by the Medical Boards and justify their trauma before judicial tribunals on multiple occasions. However, the 'time-tax' stipulated by judicial procedures often propels the pregnancy to a later stage, making it riskier for medicated procedures due to the trauma to which the female survivor is subjected. In addition, while there was a 20-week stipulation stipulated before, it is often out of sync with current developments in medicated assistance, whereby irregularities become apparent only beyond 20 weeks. Thus, in India the judicial system is especially slow and irregular. Survivors have to submit to tests by the Medical Boards and then have to defend their trauma before judicial tribunals. However, due to judicial procedures, there is a 'time-tax' on pregnancy, which propels it towards a later stage of pregnancy, making it riskier for medical procedures because of the trauma undergone by the female survivors.

7.5 Invisibility of Gender-Diverse People

Finally, the present framework for the MTP still continues with a "cis-normative" linguistic and legal framework. Though the substitution "married woman" by the word "any woman" was inclusive and progressive, the Act still fails to provide any information with respect to the legal rights pertaining to the same for the transgender and non-binary section of individuals who undergo pregnancy and require terminations. The lack of inclusive terms like "pregnant persons" makes this population prone to being discriminated against and excluded from the healthcare system. A truly inclusive legislation will understand that reproductive rights are human rights that go past the boundaries of gender, thereby granting equal protection of privacy and autonomy to all vulnerable groups.

7.6 Conclusion

The experience of minors and vulnerable populations under the MTP Act highlights the limitations of the medicalized and regulatory model of abortion. The existence of "doctor-centric" gatekeeping, the conflict between MTP and POCSA, and the "judicial ceiling" for rape survivors ensure that access to abortion for most continues to be a "limited right". If constitutional dignity is to be realized, there has to be a shift in the abortion regime from a regulatory model of abortion to an inclusive model of right involving individual bodily integrity irrespective of age, class, and gender and gender identification.

VIII. Conclusion and Recommendations: Toward a Rights-Based Reproductive Framework

The history of abortion law in India has evolved from colonial-era criminalization to today's heavily medicalized regulatory system. While the 2021 Amendment to the Medical Termination of Pregnancy (MTP) Act addressed long-standing issues, such as excluding unmarried women and rigid gestational limits, the law still serves as a "legislative halfway house." It often falls behind the progressive judicial landscape. This analysis finds that reproductive choice in India remains a "conditional right" granted by the state and mediated by medical professionals, rather than an inherent freedom grounded in the constitutional promise of bodily autonomy.

8.1 Summary of Central Findings

The current legal setup relies on a "doctor-centric" gatekeeping model that treats pregnant individuals as infantilized. By placing decision-making power in the hands of Registered Medical Practitioners (RMPs) and Medical Boards, the law pathologizes personal choice. It forces individuals seeking termination to justify their need under categories like "mental health injury" or "foetal abnormality". This approach conflicts with the Supreme Court's interpretation of Article 21 in K.S. Puttaswamy, which recognizes "decisional autonomy" as a key part of the right to privacy.

Additionally, implementing the MTP Act faces serious structural flaws. An alarming 67% to 73% of abortions in India occur in unsafe or hidden locations, often due to the "physician-only" mandate and a lack of facilities in rural areas. This situation worsens due to "defensive medicine," a result of conflicts with the PCPNDT Act and the ethical dilemmas posed by the POCSO Act's mandatory reporting rules. For marginalized groups, including minors, rape survivors, and gender-diverse individuals, the law often acts as a barrier rather than a means to health and dignity.

8.2. Proposed Reforms: Shifting to a Woman-Centric Model

To bridge the gap between constitutional promise and clinical reality, India needs to move toward a rights-based, person-centered model. The following practical reforms are suggested:

1. Transition from "Medical Good Faith" to "Informed Choice." The law should be changed to eliminate the requirement for medical "opinion" during the first trimester (up to 12 weeks). At this point, individuals should be able to obtain a termination "on request," recognizing their right to choose without needing a physician's subjective assessment of risk. This change would align the MTP Act with transformative constitutionalism by shifting the focus from "protecting the doctor" to "empowering the person".

2. Decoupling MTP from the PCPNDT Surveillance Mechanism. The "chilling effect" from the PCPNDT Act must be addressed. Clear legislative guidelines are needed to protect doctors providing legal MTP services from harassment due to clerical errors or for treating women who already have female children. Reproductive health services should be separated from the state's demographic surveillance, allowing doctors to provide care without fearing criminal prosecution.

3. Expansion of Authorized Providers and Telemedicine. To tackle the rural-urban divide and the shortage of providers, the "physician-only" rule should be relaxed. Trained mid-level providers, including nurses and AYUSH practitioners, should be allowed to offer medication abortion (MA) services in the first trimester. Additionally, formalizing telemedicine for MA would lessen the need for multiple clinical visits, which is a major obstacle for low-resource populations. This change would move the procedure from the "clandestine retail market" into a safe, regulated, and professional home-assessment model.

4. Harmonizing POCSO and MTP for Minors. The conflict between the mandatory reporting rules of the POCSO Act and the confidentiality aspects of the MTP Act must be resolved in favour of minors' privacy. Legislative changes should exempt medical practitioners from reporting when a minor seeks a termination, provided the sexual activity was consensual and the minor is safe. The requirement for guardian consent should also be replaced with a "mature minor" assessment, allowing adolescents who show sufficient understanding to consent to their own medical procedures.

5. Inclusive Language and Structural Sensitization. The language of the MTP Act must be updated to be gender-neutral. Replacing "woman" with "pregnant person" would legally recognize and protect transgender and non-binary individuals, ensuring they are not excluded from healthcare. In addition to changing the law, there is an urgent need to educate healthcare providers to eliminate extra-legal hurdles, like requiring spousal consent, and to dismantle the stigma that affects the quality of care.

6. Eliminating "Judicial Ceilings" and Medical Board Delays. The role of Medical Boards for late-term abortions needs re-evaluation. These boards often cause significant delays and can re-traumatize survivors of sexual assault or those carrying severely abnormal foetuses. A "fast-track" procedure should be established

to ensure that cases involving rape survivors or severe foetal anomalies are processed within a strict 48-to-72-hour timeframe, bypassing costly and slow litigation in High Courts.

8.3 Conclusion: The Call for Reproductive Justice

In summary, the evolution of abortion law in India needs to move beyond the "mercy" of the medical community. While the 1971 and 2021 Acts were significant milestones, they still reflect a paternalistic mindset that regards the female body as a matter of state and medical control. To fulfil the vision of a "feminist document" that is the Indian Constitution, the law must honour the right to choose not to become a mother as being as fundamental as the right to choose to do so.

Achieving true reproductive justice requires more than just a liberal law. It calls for a strong system that ensures safe, confidential, and affordable access for all, regardless of socio-economic status, age, or gender identity. By centering the "autonomous will" and "self-respect" of the individual, India can shift from a model of "conditional legality" to one of "absolute bodily integrity". The "whirlwinds of Indian law" must now establish a foundation where reproductive health is seen not as a medical privilege, but as an essential human right.

References

Abortion decision-making process trajectories and determinants in low- and middle-income countries: A mixed-methods systematic review and meta-analysis. (2022). In *eClinicalMedicine* [Journal-article]. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eclinm.2022.101694

Batra, V. & University of Petroleum and Energy Studies. (2021). Medical termination of pregnancy and India - a legal outlook. *Supremo Amicus*, *26*, 569–575.

Bhavani, C. A. (2024). Abortion policy and Women's Health in India: a legal analysis. *International Journal of Law Management & Humanities*, *7*, 2105–2109. https://heinonline.org/HOL/Page?handle=hein.journals/ijlmhs27&id=2128

Bidiyasar, M. (2024). Critical Analysis of Minors Right to Abortion under Medical Termination of Pregnancy Act, 1971. *International Journal of Law Management & Humanities*, *7*, 1572–1581.

CENTRE FOR HEALTH LAW, ETHICS AND TECHNOLOGY, Jindal Global Law School, Ipas Development Foundations, Bagaria, R., Iyer, H., Dixit, V., Mallavarapu, A., Kamra, S., Neelakantan, M., Chowdhary, M., & Mendiratta, S. (2016). *ABORTION LAWS IN INDIA: A REVIEW OF COURT CASES* (D. Jain, U. Garnaik, K. Mcbroom, S. Malik, & B. Tronic, Eds.).

Chatterjee, P. (2016). Medical Termination of Pregnancy Act: a boon or a bane for a woman in India - A critical analysis. In *International Journal of Science and Research (IJSR)* (Vol. 5, Issue 9).

Expanding circumference of abortion laws and the conundrum of autonomy. (2023). In *NUJS Journal of Regulatory Studies* (Vols. 8–8, Issue 2, pp. 107–115). https://heinonline.org/HOL/Page?handle=hein.journals/nujsjlry8&id=199

Ganatra, B., a, Sorhaindo, A. M., Cleeve, A., Tunçalp, O., UNDP-UNFPA-UNICEF-WHO-World Bank Special Programme of Research, Development and Research Training in Human Reproduction (HRP), Department of Sexual and Reproductive Health and Research, World Health Organization, Karolinska Institutet, Department of Womens and Childrens Health, & World Health Organization. (2024). Women's experiences of facility-based abortion care: A WHO qualitative evidence synthesis. In *Social Science & Medicine*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2024.117564

Jain, D., & Deora, Y. S. (2023). Law makers debating the right to abortion in India: Deconstructing progress. In Indonesian Journal of International & Comparative Law, *Indonesian Journal of International &*

Comparative Law (Vol. 10, Issue 2, pp. 161–198). https://heinonline.org/HOL/Page?handle=hein.journals/indjicl10&id=187

Joseph, C. (2022). Indian judiciary and the ongoing debate on abortion. In Indian Journal of Law and Legal Research, *Indian Journal of Law and Legal Research* (Vol. 4, Issue 1, pp. 1–6) [Journal-article]. https://heinonline.org/HOL/Page?handle=hein.journals/injlolw9&id=2126

Kaur, J., & Bhardwaj, C. (2023). Right to Abortion in India: a critical appraisal of legislative and judicial initiatives. *International Journal of Law Management & Humanities*, *6*(1), 2223–2237. https://heinonline.org/HOL/Page?handle=hein.journals/ijlmhs21&id=2241

Khare, S. (2020). Abortion: A Taboo in India. *Supremo Amicus*, *19*, 536–541. https://heinonline.org/HOL/Page?handle=hein.journals/supami19&id=548

Lakhanpal, A., & Gandotra, A. (2023). Pre-Natal Diagnosis and Judicial Forums: The application of Transformative Constitutional Values in the Medical Termination of Pregnancy Act, 1971. In *Indian Journal of Law and Justice* (Vol. 14, Issue 2, pp. 379–396) [Journal-article]. https://heinonline.org/HOL/P?h=hein.journals/ijlj14&id=764

Maternal and Social Factors Associated with Abortion in India: A Population-Based Study. (2006). In *International Family Planning Perspectives* (Vols. 32–32, Issue 3, pp. 120–125). https://www.jstor.org/stable/4147621

Nandawat, D. S. (2022). Medico-Legal Dilemma due to Legislative Lacuna. *Indian Journal of Law and Legal Research*, *4*, 1–4. https://heinonline.org/HOL/Page?handle=hein.journals/injlolw8&id=2190

Nimbalkar, S. M., & Patel, D. S. (n.d.). The Medical Termination of Pregnancy Act: Need to keep pace with technology. *Indian Journal of Medical Ethics*, 59–64.

Patil, R. (2022). An analysis of the inequality in abortion rights. *Indian Journal of Law and Legal Research*, *4*(III), 1–11. https://heinonline.org/HOL/Page?handle=hein.journals/injlolw6&id=436

Rana, A., & Pilania, M. (2021). Review of developments in the medical termination of pregnancy. In *International Journal of Law Management & Humanities* (Vol. 4, pp. 149–161) [Journal-article].

Self-assessment of the outcome of early medical abortion versus clinic follow-up in India: a randomised, controlled, non-inferiority trial. (2015). [Journal-article]. *The Lancet Global Health*, *3*(e537), e537. https://www.thelancet.com/lancetgh

Sharma, I. & Jamia Millia Islamia. (2023). Abortion Rights and MTP Act - Is there a need for an amendment? In *Jus Corpus Law Journal* (Vol. 3, Issue 3, pp. 143–150). https://heinonline.org/HOL/Page?handle=hein.journals/juscrp3&id=5167

Singh, A. (2023). Motherhood the norm, abortion an exception: let the women decide. *International Journal of Law Management & Humanities*, *6*, 165–174. https://heinonline.org/HOL/Page?handle=hein.journals/ijlmhs22&id=193

Singh, A. & Dr. Ram Manohar Lohiya National Law University, Lucknow. (2021). Abortion Law in India in the light of Medical Termination of Pregnancy (Amendment) Act, 2021. *Nyaayshastra Law Review*, *1*(3), 1–13. https://heinonline.org/HOL/P?h=hein.journals/nalervw1&id=229

Singh, S., Shekhar, C., Acharya, R., Moore, A. M., Stillman, M., Pradhan, M. R., Frost, J. J., Sahoo, H., Alagarajan, M., Hussain, R., Sundaram, A., Vlassoff, M., Kalyanwala, S., Guttmacher Institute, International Institute for Population Sciences, Population Council, & S Kalyanwala MA. (2018). The incidence of abortion and unintended pregnancy in India, 2015. *The Lancet Global Health*, *6*, e111–e120.

Sohoni, N. S. & Babasaheb Ambedkar College of Law, Nagpur (R.T.M.Nagpur University). (2021). Life versus Death: Law of Abortion and Developments in Medical Termination of Pregnancy Act. *Indian Journal of Law and Legal Research*, *2*(1), 1–12.

Sonwani, A., Mohapatra, S., & NLIU, Bhopal. (2020). Abortion system: an inherent right of women and need for reforms. *Supremo Amicus*, *17*, 16–21. https://heinonline.org/HOL/Page?handle=hein.journals/supami17&id=28

Sorhaindo, A. M., & Lavelanet, A. F. (2022). Why does abortion stigma matter? A scoping review and hybrid analysis of qualitative evidence illustrating the role of stigma in the quality of abortion care. *Social Science & Medicine*, *311*, 115271. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2022.115271

Sunder, R., & Sharma, B. (2022). Medical termination of pregnancy - a critical appraisal. *Indian Journal of Law and Legal Research*, *4*(II), 1–20.

Suryavanshi, M. (2022). Reproductive Rights of Women in India: A Critical Analysis under the Umbrella of Article 21. *Jus Corpus Law Journal*, *3*(2), 828–834. https://heinonline.org/HOL/Page?handle=hein.journals/juscrp3&id=3975

Tripathi, S., Gupta, R., & Vivekananda Institute of Professional Studies. (2021). Bodily Autonomy of Women and the Medical Termination of Pregnancy (Amendment) Act, 2021. In *Indian Journal of Law and Legal Research* (Vol. 3, Issue 1, pp. 1–6) [Journal-article].

Yokoe, R., Rowe, R., Choudhury, S. S., Rani, A., Zahir, F., & Nair, M. (2019). Unsafe abortion and abortion-related death among 1.8 million women in India. *BMJ Global Health*, *4*(3), e001491. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjgh-2019-001491

Copyright & License:

© Authors retain the copyright of this article. This work is published under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY 4.0), permitting unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.