

**INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF LAW**  
**MANAGEMENT & HUMANITIES**

**[ISSN 2581-5369]**

---

**Volume 5 | Issue 1**

---

**2022**

© 2022 *International Journal of Law Management & Humanities*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://www.ijlmh.com/>

Under the aegis of VidhiAagaz – Inking Your Brain (<https://www.vidhiaagaz.com/>)

---

This Article is brought to you for "free" and "open access" by the International Journal of Law Management & Humanities at VidhiAagaz. It has been accepted for inclusion in the International Journal of Law Management & Humanities after due review.

In case of **any suggestion or complaint**, please contact [Gyan@vidhiaagaz.com](mailto:Gyan@vidhiaagaz.com).

---

**To submit your Manuscript** for Publication at the **International Journal of Law Management & Humanities**, kindly email your Manuscript at [submission@ijlmh.com](mailto:submission@ijlmh.com).

---

# Pandemic and Lockdown: Impact on Human Life with Special Reference to Fundamental Rights and Directive Principles of State Policy of Indian Constitution

---

TANVI GOYAL<sup>1</sup>

## ABSTRACT

*The Corona Virus Disease or Covid-19 is a respiratory disease caused by the coronavirus and is spread through discharged droplets of saliva when a person sneezes or coughs. In pursuance of curbing the spread of the disease, India, along with other nations, declared a nationwide lockdown in March 2020 to ensure people quarantine themselves and reduce the rate of spread of the disease. The central Government took this measure under the National Disaster Management Act, 2006. While it helped reduce physical contact amongst people, it led to a curb in the movement of people and the right to dignity, thus impeding into the domain of fundamental rights provided under Article 21 of the Indian Constitution. Since all the activities have come to a standstill, the pandemic led to economic deterioration in an economy, especially shedding light on the deplorable condition of the migrant laborers of our nation. The measures taken by the Government seem to impede the revered fundamental rights of the citizens of the country, bringing into question Part III of the Constitution as well as Part IV with respect to the role of directive principle of state policy and the influence they have on the State when they attempt to deal with such emergencies. The executive and judiciary have been put in a dichotomous situation wherein, on the one hand, the executive is making laws in order to provide relief to the situation created by the virus.*

*On the other hand, the judiciary is making efforts to ensure that the State does not curtail the fundamental rights of the citizens. The paper attempts to understand how the pandemic has influenced the decision-making power of the Government, to what extent they have taken the help of directive policies, and how far they are justified in impeding a citizen's rights. It further highlights the legal recourse available to citizens to ensure their rights are upheld.*

---

<sup>1</sup> Author is an Assistant professor at MVP Law School, Nashik, India.

## **I. INTRODUCTION**

The Corona Virus Disease or Covid-19 is a respiratory disease caused by the coronavirus and is spread through discharged droplets of saliva when a person sneezes or coughs. In pursuance of curbing the spread of the disease, India, along with other nations, declared a nationwide lockdown in March 2020. The idea behind the Lockdown was to ensure people quarantine themselves and reduce the rate of spread of the disease. The Central Government took this measure under the National Disaster Management Act, 2006. While the intention behind the order was to ensure public safety, the same has been said to create several severe issues amongst the public.

The Lockdown included shutting offices, schools, closing state borders, etc. While it helped reduce physical contact amongst people, it led to a curb in the movement of people and the right to dignity, thus impeding into the domain of fundamental rights provided under Article 21 of the Indian Constitution.

Since all the activities have come to a standstill, the pandemic led to economic deterioration in an economy already going through a difficult financial phase. The pandemic saw a large number of people losing their jobs. It also shed light on the deplorable condition of the migrant laborers of our nation.

The measures taken by the Government seem to impede the revered fundamental rights of the citizens of the country. It brings into question Part III of the Constitution, such as the right to free movement, right to health, right to privacy, and even freedom of religion. It can, however, be said that the measures taken are not arbitrary but in pursuance of limiting the damage caused by the disease.

The executive and judiciary have been put in a dichotomous situation wherein, on the one hand, the executive is making laws to provide relief to the situation created by the virus. On the other hand, the judiciary is making efforts to ensure that the State does not curtail the fundamental rights of the citizens.

This has also brought to attention the role of the directive principle of state policy and the influence they have on the State when they attempt to deal with such emergencies.

It is thus essential to understand how the pandemic has influenced the decision-making power of the Government, to what extent they have taken the help of directive policies, and how far they are justified in impeding a citizen's rights. It is also important to highlight the legal recourse available to citizens to ensure their rights are upheld.

**(A) Statement of Problem**

At the COVID pandemic, the State has attempted to provide recourse to curb the disease. However, the same has led to the violation of human rights, particularly the right to individual liberty and freedom. The courts have acted as a check, on the power of the State, under Part III of the Constitution, in a few cases. However, in most cases, the Government has had the upper hand in the situation of the country in the name of dealing with the pandemic. This has made fundamental rights more vulnerable.

**(B) Hypothesis**

The courts have not been able to strike a balance between the role of the Government in handling the pandemic and the protection of human rights as well as fundamental rights. The judicial approach towards the situation is not adequate and requires attempts on the part of the executive to keep in mind the directive principles to uphold citizens' fundamental rights.

**(C) Objective**

The laws passed by the Government in order to control the situation of the pandemic have gone much resulted in fundamental rights and human rights violations. Although the Supreme Court of India has tried to balance two sides of the extreme, still India has performed poorly in curbing the spread of the virus as well as protecting the rights of its citizens. The objective of the paper is to study the present discord between the rule of law, human rights, and democracy on one side and situation of pandemic and emergency on the other side, the intervention of the judiciary has also not helped much when it comes to ensuring rights are upheld, in the country.

**(D) RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

This research is doctrinal research. The primary source of information is secondary. The study is not empirical. Cases decided by the Courts, books, scholarly articles, magazines, and newspaper articles are relied upon to develop and examine the judicial approach with regard to fundamental rights and directive principles affected during the pandemic.

**II. PANDEMIC AND ARTICLE 21****(A) Right to life and personal liberty**

In a democratic society, each of us has a right to health, a right to privacy, a right to food, a right to Livelihood, and a right to education. Article 21 of the Constitution says – "No person shall be deprived of his life or personal liberty except according to procedure established by

law."<sup>2</sup>

This means that no one is illegally deprived of our liberty.

In the light of the current situation, the Fundamental Right under Article 21 entails the following.

The Hon'ble Supreme Court in *Peoples Union for Democratic Rights v. Union of India*<sup>3</sup> held that non-payment of minimum wages to the workers is a denial of their right to live with basic human dignity and violation of Article 21 of the Constitution. Although, at the beginning of the Lockdown, most migrants and another workforce faced a threat to their Livelihood, eventually, the Ministry of Home Affairs issued directives to all government authorities to ensure that employers pay wages to their workers. The payment must be made on the due date without any deductions. This also includes wages during the time the shops and offices remained shut. However, all institutions have not followed the said protocol, which has led to a lot of people losing their jobs or being paid deducted wages. The pandemic has thus hampered the right to Livelihood provided under Article 21 of the Indian Constitution.

Another aspect under Article 21 is the Right to Education and the Right to Food. The State Government is under an obligation to provide educational facilities at all levels, under all circumstances. However, due to the pandemic situation, the governments have suspended educational institutions in order to reduce social contact.

The pandemic has led to the trend of online classes in order to ensure that schools are covering the curriculum. However, India lacks technological infrastructure. Most students in India do not have access to phones or wi-fi, necessary to watch online classes. This has created a deprivation towards a specific section of the society and further reinforced excessive-class differentiation.

Furthermore, in rural parts of India, a factor that led to increased enrollment and attendance of students was the mid-day meal program. But due to the Lockdown and quarantine, students are not only missing out on their education but also the nutritious meals provided by schools.

Article 21 also includes the right to food. While state governments have assured availability of food stock at ration shops, with the social distancing norms, the migrants and other poor sections of the society have failed to get access to food at ration shops and fair price shops.

## **(B) Right to Health**

The right to health is not an explicit fundamental right that has been mentioned in the

---

<sup>2</sup> Article 21, Constitution of India

Constitution. The Constitution has manifested it as the responsibility of the executive rather than the legislator. Therefore, a duty has been imposed upon the Government to ensure that the right to health is being ensured amongst the people of the country. The National Health Policy, which was implemented by the Government in 1983 and has been updated ever since was a right move in this direction of providing physical and mental healthcare to the people. Right to health has been imposed as a duty since it finds its mention in a number of directive principles of state policy such as-

- (1) **Article 38:** *The State will secure a social order for the promotion of the welfare of the people. Providing affordable healthcare is one of the prominent ways of promoting welfare.*<sup>3</sup>
- (2) **Article 39 (e):** *This ensures that the health, as well as the strength of the workers, men, and women and the tender age of children, are not abused.*<sup>4</sup>
- (3) **Article 41:** *This Article in the DPSP imposes the duty on the State to provide public assistance in cases of unemployment, old age, sickness, and disablement.*<sup>5</sup>
- (4) **Article 42:** *This Article makes the provision for the benefit of the child and the mother, i.e., the maternity benefit.*<sup>6</sup>
- (5) **Article 47:** *This makes it the duty of the State to improve public health, securing justice, human conditions of work, an extension of sickness, old age disablement, and maternity benefits and also contemplated. Further State's duty includes the prohibition of consumption of intoxicating drinking and drugs injurious to health.*<sup>7</sup>
- (6) **Article 48 A:** *This ensures that the State shall endeavor to protect and impose the pollution-free environment for good health.*<sup>8</sup>

Apart from these being mentioned in the Directive Principles of State Policy, some other provisions related to health have been enshrined in the eleventh (11<sup>th</sup>), and the twelfth (12<sup>th</sup>) schedule of the Constitution of India wherein the Panchayats and Municipalities have been given the responsibility to ensure health and sanitation amongst its people.

The Supreme court, through several judgments, has extended the Right to Health under Article 21. In *Consumer Education & Research Centre v. Union of India*<sup>9</sup>, the Court had held that the

---

<sup>3</sup> Constitution of India, Art. 38.

<sup>4</sup> Constitution of India, Art. 39 (e).

<sup>5</sup> Constitution of India, Art. 41.

<sup>6</sup> Constitution of India, Art. 42.

<sup>7</sup> Constitution of India, Art. 47.

<sup>8</sup> Constitution of India, Art. 48 A

<sup>9</sup> (1995) 3 SCC 42 : AIR 1995 SC 922.

Right to Health and medical care is a fundamental right under Article 21.

Further, the Supreme Court in *Paschim Banga Khet Mazdoor Samity v. State of West Bengal*<sup>10</sup> widened the scope of Article 21 by imposing responsibility on Government to provide medical aid to every person in the country. The Court held that since India is a welfare state, it is the duty of the Government to uphold the welfare of people by providing medical aid. Article 21 imposes an obligation on the State to safeguard the right to life of every person. Preservation of human life is, therefore, of utmost importance and any failure of the Government to provide timely medical treatment to a person in need of it results in a violation of his right to life guaranteed under Article 21.

In terms of the pandemic, the Government has been earnest in its response towards ensuring quality healthcare to all in need, especially without any discrimination. There are, however, certain issues that need attention and response on the Government's part.

India ranks extremely low in terms of corona tests done per million population. The lack of adequate testing kits to check patients for Covid is a significant reason for such low testing. There is also a lack of human resources and laboratory preparedness.

The Government has failed in providing healthcare workers with adequate Personal Protective Equipment (PPEs). The reasons are varied, including heavy demand, limited access to supplies, hoarding, and misuse.

In the landmark judgment of *Consumer Education & Research Centre (CERC) and others v. Union of India and others*<sup>11</sup>, the Supreme Court, while defining the Right to Health of the workers working in a hazardous industry, stated that no workman's health could be compromised if the person has to work in a hazardous industry out of compelling necessity.

Therefore, the Government's failure to provide healthcare workers with adequate PPE is a grave violation of their Fundamental Right to health.

Furthermore, the inadequate medical infrastructure India is not ready to deal with such a level of a pandemic. It is essential to make every effort necessary on the part of the Government to ensure that the disease is curbed in due course and adequate health services are accessible to all, sans any form of discrimination.

### **(C) Right to Privacy**

The Right to Privacy has not been expressly mentioned in the Constitution. The Supreme court,

---

<sup>10</sup> (1996) 4 SCC 37.

<sup>11</sup> (1995) 3 SCC 42 : AIR 1995 SC 922.

in the case of *KS Puttaswamy v. Union of India*<sup>12</sup>, held that the right to privacy comes under the ambit of the right to life guaranteed under Article 21.

However, the right has been largely ignored or undermined by the State since the inception of the Lockdown. There have been several instances wherein the state governments have released the personal data of people that are in quarantine. This data includes their names, residential addresses, passport details, phone numbers, etc. Every citizen has the right to privacy with respect to their data. The 'Right to Privacy' can only be taken away by a procedure established by law.

Furthermore, the Government has launched the Aarogya Setu App. This app obtains data from the user about their health and keeps a record of their movement and health. The idea behind the app was to ensure people knew who around them was infected. However, the Aarogya Setu App impedes the right to privacy. Although the use of the app is voluntary, many institutions use this intrinsic data on a daily basis.

In ordinary circumstances, the sensitive data of the patient is usually kept private. However, the pandemic has overlooked privacy rights. The data can easily be stored for commercial gains. Privacy Enhancing technology, as per World Economic Forum, is when corporates access data without revealing confidential information. In order to protect its citizens' privacy, authorities in India too can find a way to implement the same here.

#### **(D) Right to Livelihood**

The Supreme Court has recognized the right to Livelihood as a part of the right to life enshrined in Article 21 of the Indian Constitution. The right to life was further elaborated In the judgment of *Olga Tellis v. Bombay Municipal Corporation*<sup>13</sup>, wherein the Court pronounced that the 'right to livelihood' emanates from the 'right to life, as no person can live without the means of living, that is, the means of Livelihood.

However, due to the Lockdown in India, the economy has come to a standstill. All the workplaces have been closed during the Lockdown in order to ensure social distancing and curb the spread of the virus. This, however, has created a restriction on Article 19, providing the right to trade and occupation. This, in turn, has led to the loss of Livelihood amongst many sections of society. The sector worst affected seems to be the most vulnerable section. i.e., the unorganized sector. Migrants, laborers, daily wage earners have lost not only their jobs but also the roof above their heads and food for survival. Another sector that has been hit by the

---

<sup>12</sup> (2017) 10 SCC 1

<sup>13</sup> 1986 AIR 180

pandemic is the gig economy. Since it involves temporary employment without any contractual obligations on the part of the employer, the employees were either let go or held back but paid reduced salaries.

On the other hand, the Government has taken measures to secure the Livelihood of people working in the organized sector. Steps have been taken to ensure that people get appropriate wages. Efforts have also been directed to ensure that no one should be kicked out of their job apart from making it compulsory for every company to allow work from home.

Further, the Government has announced to pay the entire provident fund contribution of those who earn less than Rs 15,000 per month in companies having less than 100 workers as, despite the efforts, they are still at risk of losing their jobs.

Eventually, as the days passed, Government took measures to secure the Livelihood of the unorganized sector as well. They provided cash transfers to low-income households. Low-wage earners were given wage support. Poor households were provided with food and cooking gas. A lot of tax deductions and incentives have also been announced in order to provide a sense of financial security to the people.

In addition, a lot of state governments have announced measures to support the health and well-being of lower-income households. They have made provision for direct transfers of both cash and food to the extent of almost 0.2% of GDP.

The worst to suffer in the said situation are the self-employed people, entrepreneurs, and MSME Sector. However, according to the Government, the measures adopted are not exhaustive, and further steps shall be taken in the future to mitigate the financial burden resulting from the Lockdown.

### **III. PANDEMIC AND ARTICLE 19**

#### **(A) Freedom of movement**

Article 19(1)(d) of the Indian Constitution confers every citizen the right to move freely throughout the territory of India, which is further supplemented by the "right to life and personal liberty" clause in Article 21.<sup>14</sup>

In the case of *Kharak Singh v. the State of U.P.*,<sup>15</sup> the Court defined the freedom of movement as a right which includes the right of a citizen may do whatever he likes, meet people of his own choices, speak to whomsoever he wants without any fear subject of course to the law of

---

<sup>14</sup> Article 19 and Article 21, Constitution of India

<sup>15</sup> 1963 AIR 1295, 1964 SCR (1) 332

social control.

The Lockdown imposed by the Government has made it mandatory to social distance. It includes the suspension of mass gatherings, quarantine measures, physical distancing, closure of non-essential businesses, and public spaces.

While the basic freedom to move has been curtailed for the greater good and protection of public health. At some places, there have been cases of excessive use of force by the police and other government officials in order to stop people from gathering in an area. It is important for the Government to ensure that any measure taken for the well-being of society is taken with utmost care on their part, without arbitrary use of power on behalf of the authorities.

The problem was further worsened due to the restrictions of movement placed on the vulnerable sections such as the migrant class. They do not have the option of quarantining themselves. With no access to Livelihood, income, food, or a home, they had no option but to leave their urban cities and head home to their respective villages. This is where the Government lacked in its duty as a welfare state. No transport was provided to the migrant workers. Even the food that was distributed was done at such a late period that there were cases of a number of laborers losing their lives due to hunger. The extreme measure to terminate transport services, as well as close state borders, led to irreversible damage on the migrants. Their fundamental rights of Articles 19 and 21 were grossly hampered and mismanaged. What made the situation worse was the fact that the courts decided to abstain from the issue and decided it best to leave the matters to the executive. As far as the vulnerable sections are concerned, the restriction on movement seemed to extend beyond any reasonable restriction provided under Article 19(6) of the Constitution.

Eventually, the Supreme court directed the Centre to provide food, water, medication, beds to the migrants. This has not been efficiently implemented by the Government and therefore interferes with the right to food and shelter of the migrant workers, which is also incorporated under Article 21 of the Indian Constitution.

### **(B) Right to access information**

Democracy is characterized by the free flow of information and thoughts. The same has been recognized by Article 19 of the Indian Constitution as well as upheld in the case of *Bennet Colman v. UOI*<sup>16</sup> and *Secretary, Ministry of information and broadcasting v Cricket assn. Of Bengal*<sup>17</sup>.

---

<sup>16</sup> 1973 AIR 106, 1973 SCR (2) 757

<sup>17</sup> 1995 AIR 1236 1995 SCC (2) 161

However, during the pandemic, there was a curb on the dissemination of information amongst the public. While this was done to avoid any fake news being circulated and creating panic amongst the people, it is necessary on the part of the Government to ensure that the restriction is reasonable and does not overstep the reasonableness of the criteria provided under Article 19(6) of the Indian Constitution.

In order to tackle the issue of fake news asking circulations in the society, the Central Government passed an order instructing all media houses to verify facts with the Government before publishing or telecasting anything on their news channels. However, the order was said to be very ambiguous and created confusion. The Supreme Court could, however, not intervene since they are not allowed to impose reasonable restrictions on Article 19. All the courts have the power to review the restrictions and decide on their reasonableness.

#### **IV. PANDEMIC AND ACCESS TO JUSTICE**

The Constitution has duly recognized the right to equal access to justice under Article 39 A of the Indian Constitution. It also falls within the ambit of Articles 14 and 21. While deciding upon a couple of Transfer Petitions, with several parties seeking transfer of civil cases from or to the State of Jammu and Kashmir while the remaining two seek transfer of criminal cases from the State to Courts outside that State, the Supreme Court held that Article 21 does not mean "life" only in a physical sense of being. It also refers to a bundle of rights that makes life worth living. Thus, the Court stipulated that the Article also includes one's right to access justice in order to protect one's right to life.<sup>18</sup>

Due to the pandemic and the Lockdown, all the courts in the country were ordered to shut down. From the Supreme Court to the district courts, all courts stopped functioning for the period of the pandemic.

In order to ensure access to justice by the public, the courts started a system of video conferencing in order to hear out petitions and deliver the necessary judgments.<sup>19</sup> Though the video conferencing infrastructure could use an upgrade, it is a step in the right direction since the courts decided to upgrade their system to ensure justice was provided to all, even in such difficult times.

For example, this right can be understood from the perspective of prisoners and the rights available to them as well. In the landmark case of *Charles Sobhraj v The Superintendent*,

---

<sup>18</sup><https://judicialreforms.org/access-to-justice-is-a-fundamental-right-guaranteed-under-article-14-21-of-constitution-sc-constitution-bench>, last visited 25 December 2020

<sup>19</sup> *Vilas Eknath Nandgude v. State of Maharashtra*, 2020 SCC OnLine Bom 535

Central Jail, Tihar<sup>20</sup>, Court held that fundamental rights are also available to prisoners. The Supreme Court stated that proper health facilities for prisoners, if not provided, would lead to violation of their fundamental rights.

The Prisons Act, 1894, provides for sanitary accommodation facilities as well as shelter and safe custody facilities. In addition, the Model Prison Manual, 2016 lays down detailed guidelines<sup>21</sup> for prisoners in case an epidemic breaks out. Some of the rules are as follows, a permanent segregation shelter for every infected prisoner, treatment of patient's clothing, and avoiding overcrowding in isolation wards and cells. The Delhi Prison Rules, 2018 also provide similar actions to handle epidemics in prison. States, therefore, must follow the said rules and uphold the rights of prisoners in case of such epidemics.

In *Re: Contagion of Covid 19 Virus in Prisons*<sup>22</sup>, the Supreme court, with a view to upholding the human rights and civil rights provided under the rules, agreed to grant interim bail to certain prisoners in order to declutter the prisons during the time of the pandemic.

Similarly, another class of people who seem to have suffered excessively during the pandemic is women. There has been a multi-fold increase in the number of domestic violence and sexual abuse cases that have been recorded during the Lockdown.

Research suggests the increase in the number of domestic violence cases during Lockdown can be due to compulsory stay-at-home orders by the Government. There is also a lack of external support or communication. The longevity of the Lockdown has created anxiety & uncertainty in the minds of the people as well as created an economic crisis.<sup>23</sup>

The patriarchal system imposes the burden of household chores entirely on the women. The fear of the disease has also led to households firing their house help. This has led to a double burden of all the work being imposed on the women, as well as women from the poorer sections of the society losing out on their job and, therefore, their income. This could increase aggression in vulnerable households and lead to cases of domestic abuse.

As the Lockdown has been extended, women who are already facing domestic violence may have to suffer more due to the Government's decision to open liquor shops. The Lockdown has thus worsened the condition of women.

It is thus imperative for courts to function in order to cater to all sections of society during

---

<sup>20</sup> (1979) 1 SCR 512.

<sup>21</sup> Model Prison Manual 2016, rule 13.73

<sup>22</sup> 2020 SCC OnLine SC 344

<sup>23</sup> Dhamini Ratnam, 'Domestic Violence during COVID-19 Lockdown Emerges as Serious Concern' Hindustan Times (26 April 2020) accessed on 6 May 2020.

these tough times and provide the necessary justice.

## **V. PANDEMIC AND FUNDAMENTAL DUTIES**

Article 51-A deals with the fundamental duties of a citizen. Article 51-A provides that every citizen should uphold and protect the sovereignty, unity, and integrity of India and also promote harmony and brotherhood.

The Bombay High Court, under an order, has stated that in times like this, the citizens must understand that citizens must promote harmony and brotherhood among all, and this might be the time for its immediate application<sup>24</sup>.

In *Javed v State of Haryana*<sup>25</sup>, it has been held that fundamental rights must be read along with directive principles of state policy as well as fundamental duties of citizens. They are not isolated in nature.

In the case *State of Gujarat v. Mirzapur*<sup>26</sup>, the Supreme court held that when a court is interpreting the reasonableness of a restriction on any law or statute, then in such a situation, even the DPSP and Fundamental duties need to be taken into account.

According to a daily order in the case, *The Registrar High Court v The State of Maharashtra*<sup>27</sup>, the Court has stated that while the Court expects effective measures from the State authorities, it also expects the citizens to remind themselves of their fundamental duties to deal with the outbreak of COVID-19 pandemic. Therefore, by disregarding the Lockdown when certain sections of people took to the streets in large numbers, they are violating the basic fundamental duties mentioned in the Constitution. When they gather in huge numbers, they are not only breaking the rules but are paving the way for the spread of the disease. This is dangerous for others surrounding them.

## **VI. CONCLUSION**

The Doctrine of Necessity is a common law doctrine applied in difficult situations. Herein, the Government, by applying the 'principle of necessity, enforced the Lockdown as the only solution to curb the spread of COVID-19. Moreover, Article 31-B of the Constitution provides that certain acts can override fundamental rights, and these cannot be made unconstitutional on that basis. The Lockdown doesn't deprive the citizens of their fundamental rights as such. Even though certain activities have been curbed, the Government facilitates the availability of

---

<sup>24</sup> *The Registrar High Court v The State of Maharashtra Suo moto PIL No 10541 of 2020*

<sup>25</sup> [2003] 8 SCC 369.

<sup>26</sup> [2005] 8 SCC 534

<sup>27</sup> *Suo moto PIL No. 10541 of 2020*

essential goods that are the basic requirement for an individual's life. In addition, the Government provides food and relief materials to the weaker sections of the society. All medical facilities are available, and government officials are always ready to help those in need. Recently, the Government has arranged special trains and buses to transport the migrant laborers to their homes. It has efficiently optimized the use of technology in companies to facilitate work from home and used the same for online education in schools and universities. Hence, the Lockdown which the central Government has enforced is lawful and has a nexus with the common objective of reducing the spread of COVID-19 by maintaining social distancing norms. The arguments posed by people against the Lockdown highlighting the violation of fundamental rights don't have a harmonious backing. Therefore, the Fundamental Rights have not been violated or jeopardized. Many countries, including the USA and U.K. and appreciated India's efforts in fighting the COVID-19, and hence, we as citizens must also appreciate the measures and fight against the pandemic. Therefore, it is important that in tough and calamitous situations, everyone must come together, stand in unity, follow the measures and overcome the situation strongly.

\*\*\*\*\*

**VII. REFERENCES**

- Prisons In the Prevailing Paradigm Of COVID-19: An Indian Perspective Samiksha Agarwal
- COVID Disaster: Health and Human Rights Simran Sabharwal Shatakshi Arora
- On Lockdown and Fundamental Rights – A Reflection Naganathan Ramaswamy Iyer
- Tracing the Relevance of Fundamental Rights in the times of COVID-19: A comprehensive analysis- by Yatin Gaur

**Webliography**

- [www.timesofindia.indiatimes.com](http://www.timesofindia.indiatimes.com)
- [www.mondaq.com](http://www.mondaq.com)
- [www.theindiaforum.in](http://www.theindiaforum.in)
- [www.jurist.org](http://www.jurist.org)
- [www.ijme.in](http://www.ijme.in)
- [www.fra.europa.eu](http://www.fra.europa.eu)
- [www.indianexpress.com](http://www.indianexpress.com)
- [www.nluo.ac.in](http://www.nluo.ac.in)
- [www.sconline.com](http://www.sconline.com)
- [www.unsdg.un.org](http://www.unsdg.un.org)
- [www.hrd.org](http://www.hrd.org)
- [www.freiheit.org](http://www.freiheit.org)
- [www.ohrhc.org](http://www.ohrhc.org)
- [www.hhrjournal.org](http://www.hhrjournal.org)
- [www.frontiersin.org](http://www.frontiersin.org)
- [www.humananrights.dk](http://www.humananrights.dk)
- [www.thelancet.com](http://www.thelancet.com)

\*\*\*\*\*