****

**Housing and Land Rights Network (India)**

**Special Rapporteur on the Right to Adequate Housing:**

**Questionnaire on the Right to Life and the Right to Adequate Housing**

**Response from Housing and Land Rights Network (HLRN), India[[1]](#footnote-1)**

1. **Please provide any statistical indicators or other evidence regarding the health, mortality and morbidity consequences of inadequate housing and homelessness in your country on vulnerable groups, including documentation (visual or otherwise) of the lived experiences behind these numbers and of particular circumstances of which your organization is aware.**

**Deaths of Homeless Persons in India**

According to the Census of India 2011, India has more than 1.7 million homeless persons, of which 938,384 are located in urban areas. These figures, however, grossly underestimate the real number of homeless persons. Civil society organizations estimate that at least one per cent of the population of urban India (about 378 million) is homeless. Based on this estimate, it can be extrapolated that the population of the urban homeless is at least three million.

The Zonal Integrated Police Network (ZipNet) is an online portal of the police of eight states and Union Territories in India, which records “crime and criminal information in real time.”[[2]](#footnote-2) The portal also documents ‘Unidentified Dead Bodies.’ Experts working on issues of homelessness estimate that about 70–75 per cent of all unidentified deaths are deaths of homeless persons. Using the estimate of 70 per cent, Housing and Land Rights Network (HLRN) has calculated that between January 2010 and 31 May 2016, at least 23,846 homeless persons have died from a multitude of reasons: infectious diseases, chronic ailments, exposure to the cold, heat, and rain, violence, sexual abuse, murder, road accidents, and drug overdose.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **State/Union Territory** | **Unidentified Deaths between**  **1 January 2010 and 31 May 2016** |
| 1. | Chandigarh | 385 |
| 2. | Delhi | 20,874 |
| 3. | Haryana | 2,434 |
| 4. | Himachal Pradesh | 33 |
| 5. | Punjab | 103 |
| 6. | Rajasthan | 4,745 |
| 7. | Uttar Pradesh | 3,117 |
| 8. | Uttarakhand | 2,375 |
|  | Total Deaths | 34,066 |
|  | **Total Homeless Deaths** | **23,846** |

It is important to note that:

* Himachal Pradesh police joined the network in 2012; and,
* Documentation of ‘unidentified bodies’ is carried out more regularly by the Delhi Police.

Living on the streets without any form of shelter greatly increases the vulnerability of the homeless to abuse, sexual violence, injury, disease, mental illness, and death. Many of these deaths are preventable, especially if the homeless had access to adequate housing, food, water, sanitation, and healthcare facilities.

**Documented Deaths During and After Forced Evictions**

The Government of India does not document forced evictions or deaths resulting from evictions in the country; neither do most civil society organizations. In many instances, the forced eviction and demolition of homes without resettlement/inadequate resettlement results in people being forced to live in extremely inadequate conditions. This increases their morbidity and mortality, especially of older persons, infants, children, and persons living with chronic health problems.

From HLRN’s research and direct field experience, a few instances of injury and death that have occurred during or after evictions, are tabulated below:

**Injury and Death from Forced Evictions: 2009–2015**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Site of Eviction / Demolition** | **Injury / Deterioration of Health / Death** |
| C.P. Shekhar Nagar, Indore, Madhya Pradesh (2015) | Anand Totaram, a 26-year old man, died when a wall collapsed on him during a demolition drive by the Indore Municipal Corporation. |
| Shakur Basti, Delhi (2015) | Rukaiya Khatoon, a six-month old infant girl died as a result of a chest and head injury, incurred during the demolition of her home by the Railways in the peak of winter. |
| Gulbarga, Karnataka (2015) | About 80 children, and pregnant and lactating women were among the worst affected during an eviction drive by the Bangalore Electricity Supply Company Limited (with the assistance of the Bangalore Metropolitan Task Force).[[3]](#footnote-3) |
| Vinobhanagar, Bengaluru, Karnataka (2014) | As a result of the forced eviction from their homes, and the absence of resettlement and an adequate place to live, evicted families’ living conditions are abysmal. Six people have lost their lives due to accidents caused by vehicles running over them while they were sleeping on pavements.[[4]](#footnote-4) None of these cases have been investigated by the police. |
| Ejipura, Bengaluru, Karnataka (2013) | Soon after the demolition of their homes by the Bangalore Municipal Corporation (BBMP) in January 2013, one woman (55 years old) died as a result of exposure to the cold while another person (60 years) died from a rat bite incurred while sleeping on the street. Three children below six years died from diarrhea and influenza – as a result of the inadequate living conditions and the absence of resettlement or alternative housing by the state.[[5]](#footnote-5) |
| Topsia, Kolkata, West Bengal (2012) | The Government of West Bengal evicted 383 families for the construction of a fly-over in November 2012. Four pregnant women were reportedly hurt during the eviction process, and the baby of one pregnant woman, who suffered severe trauma, died after only three months of life.[[6]](#footnote-6)  Inadequate living conditions, including the absence of housing and being forced to live out in the open, resulted in 20 per cent of the families contracting malaria at their new sites of residence.[[7]](#footnote-7) |
| Baljeet Nagar, Delhi (2011) | Anveesh Kumar, a five-year old boy, lost sight in one eye, as a result of severe injuries sustained during a demolition drive by the Delhi Development Authority. He has not received any compensation from the state for the loss of his eyesight.[[8]](#footnote-8) |
| Homeless tents at Pusa Road, Delhi, (2010) | Sanjana, a one-year old girl, died from breathlessness while trying to escape injury during the demolition of the homeless shelter in which she lived with her parents.[[9]](#footnote-9) |
| Sectors 52 and 53, Gurgaon, Haryana (2010) | Approximately 50 people sustained minor injuries during the demolition of their homes by the state government.[[10]](#footnote-10) |
| Prabhu Market Camp and Prabhu Market Extension Camp, Delhi (2009) | Bannay Singh passed away in January 2010, from exposure to the cold. In the absence of any resettlement or alternative housing, he had been living on the streets for a year after the Delhi government demolished his home.  Sonu, a young man, committed suicide soon after the demolition of his home, as he could not afford the rent for alternative accommodation.[[11]](#footnote-11) |
| JJ Arjun Das Camp, Delhi (2009) | During the demolition by the Delhi government, an eleven-year old boy suffered from a chest injury. He died within a few months, as his parents could not afford his medical treatment.  Five children reportedly died soon after the eviction. |
| JJ Valmiki Camp, East Kidwai Nagar, Delhi (2009) | Janki, an elderly woman, narrowly escaped death, as she was trapped under a wall while attempting to safeguard her possessions during the demolition of her home by the Delhi government. She injured her knee in the process and now suffers from a permanent disability.[[12]](#footnote-12)  Anoop, a young man, fractured his right leg while trying to rescue his possessions during the demolition process.[[13]](#footnote-13)  Ram Singh lost his two-year old son during the eviction. The child was unwell and alone at home when the demolition began. Though he was rescued by neighbours, he died of shock within hours of the demolition.[[14]](#footnote-14)  Four persons, reportedly, lost their lives from shock and trauma in the aftermath of the forced eviction. |
| Bengali Camp, Delhi (2009) | Lakhan and Geeta, who lost their homes during a state demolition drive for the 2010 Commonwealth Games, died after a few months, reportedly from depression and psychological trauma.  Residents reported an increase in diseases after the loss of their homes. Dengue claimed two lives at the site.[[15]](#footnote-15) |
| JJ Camp, Prem Nagar, Delhi (2009) | Jai Ram, a young man, was injured during the demolition of his home, as a wire pierced his thigh. The angst and pain associated with losing his home resulted in his developing a fever in the aftermath of the demolition.[[16]](#footnote-16) |
| Swatantra Camp, Delhi (2009) | Babita Devi, a pregnant woman, was subjected to the bitter cold in an advanced stage of pregnancy, as Delhi government authorities demolished her home in the peak of winter. She gave birth 10 days after the forced eviction.[[17]](#footnote-17)  Pregnant women reported physical stress while struggling to save their possessions during the eviction drive.[[18]](#footnote-18) |
| Pusa Road, homeless shelter, Delhi, (2009) | The demolition of a temporary homeless shelter by the Municipal Corporation of Delhi on 24 December 2009, in the peak of winter, resulted in several injuries and subsequent deaths of the inhabitants.  During the demolition, police intimidated and beat up four lactating mothers, some of whom had two-day old babies.  At the time of the demolition, Tara Bai, a pregnant woman, was holding her one-and-a-half-year old daughter in her arms. The police hit her, and the force of the violence made Tara Bai lose her footing. She fell on her child, crushing her instantly.  Two adult homeless persons and two girls (aged three and one-and-a-half) lost their lives, as they succumbed to the cold, soon after the demolition of the shelter.[[19]](#footnote-19) |
| Kalasipalya, Karnataka (2009) | A 45-year old woman died due from hunger and disease contracted as a result of inadequate living conditions after the forced eviction from her home.[[20]](#footnote-20)  As a result of mosquito-borne diseases incurred while living in extremely inadequate conditions after the eviction, 13 people have died.  Displaced women are vulnerable to sexual harassment and abuse, as they do not have secure housing. |
| Rajeev Nagar, Karnataka (2009) | After the demolition of their homes, affected families have been living near vacant plots near Railway land. Children and older persons often fall ill as a result of their inadequate living conditions.[[21]](#footnote-21) |

**2. Explain how the protection of the right to life in your state's (region or area of work) constitution or human rights legislation extends to violations resulting from alleged failures of governments to adequately address homelessness or inadequate housing. Please provide examples of attempts to secure access to justice for such violations of the right to life and describe the result. Please provide references to any relevant cases or initiatives.**

According to Article 21 of the Constitution of India, “No person shall be deprived of his life or personal liberty except according to procedure established by law.” Under this and Articles 19 (1) (d), 19 (1) (e), and 19 (1) (g) of the Constitution, which provide for the rights to move, settle, and carry out trade, respectively, in any part of the country, the Constitution guarantees protection of the right to life, residence, and livelihood in India. However, it must be noted that there is no specific constitutional provision or national and state legislation that address the issue of homelessness or inadequate housing in the country. Though policies and schemes are available to address the issue of homelessness and inadequate housing, they are not legally enforceable and hence not sufficient to address the violation of housing rights of the majority of the people. Since India’s independence, there have been a host of urban and rural policies and schemes; some of these have been phased out, while others have been renamed or recently announced.

The current relevant policies related to housing in India include: the National Urban Housing and Habitat Policy, Indira Awas Yojana (renamed as Pradhan Mantri Awas Yojana–Gramin), National Urban Livelihoods Mission–Scheme of Shelters for Urban Homeless, Pradhan Mantri Awas Yojana (Housing for All–2022), Smart Cities Mission (SCM), and the Draft National Urban Rental Housing Policy and Model Tenancy Act.[[22]](#footnote-22)

India has certain laws that protect land rights. Some of these have been used for advocacy to address issues of inadequate housing. These laws include: the Slum Areas (Improvement and Clearance) Act 1956; the Panchayats (Extension to Scheduled Areas) Act (PESA) 1996; the Scheduled Tribes and Other Traditional Forest Dwellers (Recognition of Forest Rights) Act 2006; the Right to Fair Compensation and Transparency in Land Acquisition, Rehabilitation and Resettlement Act 2013; the Coal Mines (Special Provisions) Act 2015; the Mines and Minerals (Development and Regulation) Amendment Act 2015; and the Street Vendors (Protection of Livelihood and Regulation of Street Vending) Act 2014.

Notwithstanding these laws, policies, and schemes, many people in India face discrimination and threat to their human rights to adequate housing and land, mostly residents of informal settlements, the homeless and landless, Scheduled Tribes/indigenous peoples, Dalits, and minorities. In most cases, existing policies are used to evict people from their habitats rather than protecting their rights.[[23]](#footnote-23)

**Securing Access to Justice**

The Supreme Court of India in some of its judgements has linked the right to shelter with the right to life, stressing that the right to housing is implied under the right to life, and has attempted to secure access to justice for such violation of the right to life. The record of Indian courts, however, in the context of upholding the right to housing is a mix of positive and negative verdicts. In some cases, the right to housing, adequate rehabilitation, and compensation have been ordered, while in some cases evictions have been legitimized.

In the following cases, courts in India have upheld the right to housing by linking it with the right to life:

* ***Francis Coralie Mullin v. Administrator, Union Territory of Delhi and Ors*. (1981)**:[[24]](#footnote-24) This judgement is a very good example of the indivisibility of rights, with the right to live with human dignity as a common trend.
* ***Olga Tellis v. Bombay Municipal Corporation* (1985)**:[[25]](#footnote-25) The Olga Tellis judgement is the first Supreme Court decision to recognize explicitly that the right to livelihood forms an integral part of the right to life. This case was a pioneer in the field of housing rights worldwide.
* ***Shantistar Builders v. Narayan Khimalal Totame and Others* (1990)**:[[26]](#footnote-26) In this case, the Supreme Court examined the scope of the right to life, using the framework of basic needs.
* ***Chameli Singh v. State of U.P.* (1995)**:[[27]](#footnote-27) The Supreme Court unequivocally asserted in its verdict: “Right to shelter when used as an essential requisite to the right to live, should be deemed to have been guaranteed as a fundamental right.”
* ***State of Karnataka and Ors. v. Narasimhamurthy and Ors* (1995)**:[[28]](#footnote-28)The Supreme Court stated that: “Right to shelter is a fundamental right […]. To make the right meaningful to the poor, the State has to provide facilities and opportunity to build house. Acquisition of the land to provide house sites to the poor houseless is a public purpose as it is a constitutional duty of the State to provide house sites to the poor.”
* ***U.P. Avas Evam Vikas Parishad v. Friends Coop. Housing Society Ltd.* (1996)**:[[29]](#footnote-29) The Supreme Court affirmed that: “The right to shelter is a fundamental right, which springs from the right to residence under Article 19 (1) (e) and the right to life under Article 21.”
* ***Ahmedabad Municipal Corporation v. Nawab Khan Gulab Khan and Ors.* (1997)**:[[30]](#footnote-30)The Supreme Court directed the state to construct affordable houses for the poor.
* ***People’s Union for Civil Liberties v. Union of India and Others***:[[31]](#footnote-31) In this case, a series of orders were passed for ensuring food to the needy under various schemes. The case also included the issue of homelessness and resulted in several landmark orders regulating shelters for the homeless across India.[[32]](#footnote-32)
* ***Sudama Singh and Others v. Government of Delhi and Anr.* (2010)**:[[33]](#footnote-33) The High Court of Delhi in this case established that housing is a human right and also laid down responsibilities of the state towards fulfilling the right to housing and to resettlement.
* ***P.K. Koul and Ors. v. Estate Officer and Anr. and Ors*. (2010)**:[[34]](#footnote-34) The High Court of Delhi affirmed that: “…right to residence and to settle in any part of the country is assured to every citizen as a fundamental right under Article 19 (1) (e) of the Constitution of India… The right to shelter springs from this right and has been considered to be an integral part for a meaningful enjoyment of right to life under Article 21 of the Constitution of India.”

There are also other cases where courts have established the link between the right to life and the right to housing resulting in positive judgements. These cases include: *Delhi Dayalbagh Coop. House Building Society Ltd. v. The Registrar Cooperative Societies & Ors.*;[[35]](#footnote-35) *The Commissioner, Bangalore Development Authority and Anr. v. State of Karnataka and Anr.*;[[36]](#footnote-36) *R. Krishnasamy Gounder v. the State of Tamil Nadu;*[[37]](#footnote-37) *Ramesh Chandra Sahni v. State of U.P.*[[38]](#footnote-38); *Gopiram Agarwalla v. Smt. Bina Agarwalla and Anr*.;[[39]](#footnote-39) S*. Shangreikhai and Ors. v. Union of India and Ors*.;[[40]](#footnote-40) and, *Yamkhomang Haokip v. State of Manipur and Ors.*[[41]](#footnote-41)

Some examples of cases in which the courts in India have ordered evictions and removal of people from their place of living for “encroaching on government land” and hence denying the right to housing are the following:

* *Almitra Patel vs. Union of India* (2000);[[42]](#footnote-42)
* *Navniti CGHS vs. Lt. Governor* (2004);[[43]](#footnote-43)
* *Hem Raj vs. Commissioner of Police* (2005);[[44]](#footnote-44) and,
* *Unnamed Girl Child of 13 Days through its Mother the Natural Guardian Noori Sameer Mujavar v. State of Maharashtra and Others, 2016*: In this case though recognizing the housing need of those evicted, the state was absolved of its duty and obligation to provide housing to the affected families.

**3. Has the disproportionate effect of homelessness and inadequate housing on particular groups (e.g. persons with disabilities, indigenous peoples, women experiencing violence, etc.) been recognized by courts or human rights bodies in your country (region/area of work) as an issue of discrimination? Please provide examples.**

The disproportionate effect of homelessness and inadequate housing on particular groups such as persons with disabilities, children, women, and indigenous people has, in some instances, been recognized by courts, laws, and national human rights institution in India. Some examples are given as under:

* In ***Shantistar Builders v. Narayan Khimalal Totame***,[[45]](#footnote-45) the Supreme Court of India has made specific mention of children’s right to adequate housing by asserting that: “The Constitution aims at ensuring the full development of every child. That would be possible only if the child is in a proper home.”[[46]](#footnote-46)
* The **Persons with Disabilities (Equal Opportunities Protection of Rights and Full Participation) Act 1995**, upholds the right to housing and land of persons with disabilities. It states, “The appropriate Governments and local authorities shall by notification frame schemes in favour of persons with disabilities, for the preferential allotment of land at concessional rates for: (a) house…”[[47]](#footnote-47)
* In ***Ahmedabad Municipal Corporation v. Nawab Khan Gulab Khan and Others****,*[[48]](#footnote-48) the Supreme Court, while upholding right to residence and settlement in any part of India, asserted the protection of rights of Scheduled Castes and Schedules Tribes: “The State and consequentially the local authorities are charged with the constitutional duty to provide the weaker sections, in particular the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes with socio-economic and political justice and to prevent their exploitation and to prevent them from injustice. The Union of India has evolved Indira Avas Yojna Scheme exclusively to provide housing accommodation to the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes and separate annual budgets are being allotted in that behalf by Parliament and the appropriate legislatures in allied matters.”
* In the case of ***Millennium Educational Trust v. State of Karnataka and Ors.****,*[[49]](#footnote-49) the court asserted that, “‘Right to shelter’ cannot be looked only through the persons who make application for grant of housing site as a matter of right, the same has to be looked through the succeeding generation, specially children's right. A child’s right is to be brought up in a safe environment. The right to housing and security are interconnected. While poor housing condition affects the health, homelessness and frequent displacement are prone to impair the child’s learning. Though housing remains as fundamental as food and security, the issue has not yet received the priority it deserves.”
* The **National Human Rights Commission** in its publication *Know Your Rights Series: Right to Adequate Shelter*[[50]](#footnote-50)has acknowledged the issue of homelessness and outlined national and international laws and instruments for its redress. It has also mentioned, in the publication, landmark court judgements for the protection of housing rights of all, including women, children, persons with disabilities, older persons, minorities, persons with mental illness, and internally displaced persons.

**4. What measures does your organization promote or recommend to ensure access to justice for violations of the right to life resulting from homelessness and inadequate housing and to ensure that governments address these violations with appropriate urgency and commitment (e.g.: application of international human rights law; legal reform; institutional reform).**

HLRN recommends the following measures to ensure access to justice for violations of the right to life resulting from homelessness and inadequate housing:

1. The Government of India should develop a human rights-based national law (National Right to Adequate Housing Act) that covers rural and urban areas, and incorporates provisions of international law, guidelines, and human rights principles.
2. The government should incorporate the human rights framework—including the principles of indivisibility of human rights, gender equality, non-discrimination, progressive realization, non-retrogression, and participation—in the implementation and development of all policies/schemes.
3. All progressive orders of the Supreme Court of India and state High Courts on issues of housing, land, homelessness, and human rights should be implemented. Mechanisms to monitor implementation of orders should be developed at the state and local levels.
4. The government should develop human rights-based indicators to assess and monitor implementation of progressive policies/schemes on housing and land.
5. The government should take measures to ensure that law and policy processes are transparent and participatory, and involve affected people, social movements, local communities, independent institutions and experts, and civil society organizations.
6. The state and central government should work towards providing free legal aid, including for women, to ensure that those whose rights to adequate housing and land are violated, have adequate and timely access to remedy.
7. The state and central government should invest resources and time in promoting legal awareness on positive provisions in laws, including national and constitutional law as well as international law, with the aim of promoting their implementation. This should include training for judges, lawyers, police officials, and all other government employees responsible for law enforcement and policy development and implementation.
8. The government should recognize and protect women’s equal rights to adequate housing, land, property, and inheritance. It should take steps to promote awareness on, and ensure adequate implementation of, the Protection of Women from Domestic Violence Act 2005 and the Hindu Succession (Amendment) Act 2005. It should also ensure the adequate participation of women in all law and policy-making processes, including those related to housing and land.
9. All violations of the right to life and the right to adequate housing, including acts of forced eviction, land grabbing, and other violations of housing and land rights, should be investigated. Officials responsible for violating human rights and breaching local, national, and international law must be tried and prosecuted according to the law.
10. Measures should be promoted so that state and national human rights institutions work effectively to prevent housing and land rights violations, and provide adequate reparation and restitution to affected individuals, groups, and communities.
11. The government should implement recommendations of UN Special Procedures, treaty bodies, and the Universal Periodic Review in a timely manner, and ensure that international reporting timelines and schedules are adhered to and that all reports are prepared with the active participation of civil society.
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