



The lethal intersection: Legalizing euthanasia for organ donation amidst India's healthcare crises and systemic vulnerability

Subhransu Satyabrata Jena

Research Scholar, Department of Law, Utkal University, Bhubaneswar, Odisha, India

Abstract

The article examines the complex medical and ethical issues surrounding the possible introduction of Organ Donation after Euthanasia (ODE) into the Indian healthcare system. It places this discussion within the changing legal views on euthanasia in India, highlighting developments from the Aruna Shanbaug case to the simplification of "Living Will" guidelines in 2023. While these legal changes seem to suggest the start of a new "Right to Die" philosophy, the article argues that these developments are still underdeveloped both conceptually and institutionally in India. They lack the strong safeguards needed for ethical practice.

By critically looking at the weaknesses in Indian healthcare, particularly the lack of universal palliative care, high out-of-pocket health costs, and the ongoing illegal organ trade, the article highlights the social and economic realities that make the idea of freedom in euthanasia complicated. It suggests that in such circumstances, the notion of "choice" may be skewed. Vulnerable people could face subtle or direct pressure due to financial difficulties and poor care options.

The analysis also raises concerns about the risk of medicalizing death for organ donation purposes. In a setting with limited resources, combining euthanasia with organ transplant systems could create pressures that exploit economically disadvantaged people. This would effectively turn them into mere suppliers of biological materials for wealthier patients. The article warns that this trend undermines the ethical commitment to human dignity and patient rights.

In conclusion, the author argues that without strict government oversight and a strong public health safety net, any attempt to decriminalize ODE in India could favor organ utility over the dignity of patients. This might lead to situations where people under financial strain feel forced to choose death to ease their burdens.

Keywords: Organ donation after euthanasia (ODE), passive euthanasia, medical ethics, Article 21, vulnerable populations, palliative care, bioethics

Introduction

In the sterile corridors of India's elite private hospitals, a new bioethical frontier is quietly emerging. The concept of Organ Donation after Euthanasia (ODE) ^[1]; where a patient's life is ended medically with the express intent of harvesting viable organs is being whispered about in academic circles. On paper, it looks like a "double win": ending terminal suffering while solving India's chronic organ shortage ^[2].

However, beneath this seemingly benevolent premise lies a complex web of ethical dilemmas and societal implications that demand careful scrutiny. The allure of ODE, particularly in a nation grappling with a staggering deficit of organ donors, presents itself as a potential solution to a dire problem. According to recent statistics, thousands of patients languish on waiting lists for lifesaving transplants, their hopes dwindling as the days stretch on ^[3].

But in a country where healthcare is often a luxury and medical debt is a death sentence, this "double win" risks becoming a predatory trap. Vulnerable populations, already burdened by socio-economic challenges, may find themselves coerced into making life-altering decisions under the guise of compassion ^[4]. The specter of financial desperation looms large, raising critical questions about informed consent and the true autonomy of patients faced with terminal illness.

As the dialogue around ODE gains momentum, it ignites passionate debates among ethicists, healthcare providers, and policymakers. Advocates argue it could revolutionize organ transplantation practices and provide a dignified exit

for those suffering unbearably. Yet, detractors warn of the potential for exploitation, where the line between choice and coercion blurs alarmingly ^[5].

Moreover, cultural attitudes towards death, organ donation, and medical intervention in India complicate this discussion further ^[6]. In a society where familial bonds and traditional values play pivotal roles, the acceptance of euthanasia and the subsequent harvesting of organs challenges deeply ingrained beliefs about life and death. This raises an essential question: Are we prepared to confront the moral ramifications of such decisions, or will we allow the desperation of the many to overshadow the rights of the individual?

Ultimately, as we stand at this crossroads of medical ethics and human rights, it is imperative for students, especially those studying medicine, law, and ethics, to engage with these issues critically. The potential for ODE to become a viable option in the healthcare landscape is not just a medical question; it is a societal one that requires us to balance compassion with caution, innovation with integrity. As future leaders in their respective fields, college students must be equipped to navigate these uncharted waters and advocate for a healthcare system that prioritizes both the dignity of life and the sanctity of death.

The Legal Landscape: From Aruna Shanbaug to the "Living Will"

To understand the danger, we must first look at the law. India does not permit active euthanasia (where a doctor administers a lethal injection). However, through landmark

judgments like Aruna Shanbaug (2011) ^[7] and Common Cause (2018) ^[8], the Supreme Court legalized passive euthanasia, setting a significant precedent in the realm of medical ethics and patient rights ^[9]. This shift in the legal framework reflects a growing recognition of the importance of individual autonomy and the right to make informed decisions about one's own body, particularly in situations where individuals are no longer able to express their wishes due to severe medical conditions.

As of 2023, the procedure for "Living Wills" has been simplified and made more accessible to the general public ^[10]. An individual can now declare, in advance, that they wish to withhold life support if they fall into a persistent vegetative state, thereby allowing them to assert their preferences regarding end-of-life care. This legal provision was intended to uphold the "Right to Die with Dignity," which is a fundamental aspect of human rights that emphasizes the importance of personal choice in matters of life and death ^[11]. However, this well-meaning legislation has inadvertently created a legal gray area that warrants careful consideration and debate.

The introduction of Living Wills brings forth several critical questions and ethical dilemmas that need to be addressed ^[12]. For instance, while the intent is to respect an individual's wishes, the potential for misinterpretation or misuse of these directives raises concerns among medical professionals and families alike. The ambiguity surrounding the circumstances under which a Living Will can be enacted can lead to conflicts among caregivers, healthcare providers, and family members, especially when the patient's wishes are unclear or disputed.

Moreover, if passive euthanasia is streamlined and becomes more commonplace, the leap to "optimizing" that death for organ retrieval poses a dangerously short margin for error. This scenario introduces ethical considerations regarding the potential commodification of death and the risk that decisions about end-of-life care could be influenced by the desire to harvest organs rather than genuine compassion for the patient's suffering. Such a shift could undermine the foundational principles of medical ethics, particularly the Hippocratic Oath ^[13], which emphasizes the duty to do no harm.

As a human being, it is crucial to engage with these complex legal and ethical issues surrounding euthanasia and end-of-life choices. Understanding the implications of the current legal landscape not only prepares you for future discussions in medical, legal, and ethical forums but also encourages you to think critically about the value of human life, the rights of individuals, and the responsibilities of healthcare professionals ^[14]. Engaging with these topics not only fosters a deeper understanding of the law but also empowers you to contribute meaningfully to the ongoing dialogue about the rights of individuals in their most vulnerable moments.

The Reality of the Indian Patient: Vulnerability as a Variable

The "autonomy" celebrated in Western bioethics feels like a cruel joke when applied to the average Indian family. Consider these systemic "negatives":

Catastrophic Healthcare Spending: Over 60% of health expenses in India are out-of-pocket, a staggering statistic that reflects the inadequacies of the public healthcare system and the burden placed on individuals and families ^[15]. This

financial strain becomes even more pronounced when we consider that nearly 39 million people are pushed into poverty each year due to medical bills, highlighting the paradox of a nation's healthcare framework. In this environment, the so-called "choice" to opt for euthanasia takes on a grim significance; it is not merely a matter of dignity in dying but rather a desperate response to insurmountable debt ^[16]. The agonizing reality is that a patient may choose to die not because their pain is untreatable or their life is devoid of meaning, but because their family can no longer afford the ICU bed that could prolong their suffering ^[17]. This financial desperation often overshadows the ethical discussions surrounding euthanasia, transforming what should be a compassionate choice into a stark reflection of economic disparity and systemic failure.

The Lack of Palliative Care: India has one of the world's lowest access rates to hospice and pain management services, a critical gap in the healthcare infrastructure that has far-reaching implications for the dignity of dying ^[18]. When individuals express a desire for euthanasia, what they are frequently articulating is their yearning for relief from untreated pain and suffering, rather than a conscious desire to end their lives. Legalizing options for voluntary death without first establishing robust palliative care services is akin to offering a trapdoor to someone who simply needs a chair; it ignores the fundamental human right to live free from suffering ^[19]. The tragic irony lies in the fact that many patients would rather have the means to manage their pain effectively than face the grim alternative of euthanasia. Thus, any discussions around legalizing euthanasia must be intricately tied to a commitment to enhance palliative care services, ensuring that patients can access the comprehensive support they need during their final days.

Informed Consent or Coerced Surrender? The concept of "informed consent" within the Indian healthcare system is fraught with challenges, primarily stemming from low health literacy rates that plague much of the population ^[20]. In this context, "informed consent" often devolves into a mere formality; it is whatever the doctor says it is, stripped of the genuine dialogue and understanding that should underpin such critical decisions. This power imbalance is compounded by a history of exploitation within the healthcare system, evidenced by the troubling prevalence of "organ commerce" scandals that have disproportionately affected the poor ^[21]. Vulnerable patients, often caught in a web of desperation, may find themselves subtly nudged toward euthanasia not out of their own volition but as a way to alleviate the burdens faced by their families or to serve the interests of wealthier recipients. The ethical implications of this scenario are staggering; it raises fundamental questions about the integrity of consent and the potential for coercion in a system that lacks transparency and equitable access.

Overall, the reality of the Indian patient reveals a complex tapestry of vulnerability, where financial constraints, inadequate care, and systemic exploitation converge to challenge the very notion of autonomy in healthcare ^[22]. As discussions around euthanasia and patient rights continue to evolve, it remains imperative that the focus remains on addressing these underlying issues, fostering an environment where patients are genuinely empowered to make informed choices free from the shackles of poverty and systemic inadequacies. The path forward must recognize that the sanctity of life and the dignity of dying

are intrinsically linked to the broader socio-economic context, demanding a thoughtful, compassionate, and equitable approach to healthcare policy and ethics ^[23].

The Systemic Negatives: A Breeding Ground for Abuse

If India moves toward Organ Donation Enhancement (ODE), it faces three major "lethal" risks that could fundamentally undermine the ethical integrity of its healthcare system and further endanger vulnerable populations ^[24].

Firstly, Instrumentalization stands out as a critical concern. In a healthcare environment where the focus shifts from patient-centered care to the commodification of human life, individuals may no longer be seen as holistic beings with unique stories, families, and aspirations. Instead, they risk being reduced to mere "sources of biological material" ^[25]. This paradigm shift can foster a chilling culture within hospitals and medical facilities, where medical professionals may prioritize the procurement of organs over the well-being of patients. The implication is profound: the essence of medicine a profession rooted in compassion and the sanctity of life could be eroded as healthcare providers may increasingly view their patients through a transactional lens, prioritizing the preservation of vital organs such as kidneys or livers for transplantation rather than addressing the comprehensive health needs of the individual.

Secondly, the specter of the Black Market Legacy looms large. India's troubling history with illicit "Kidney Colonies" serves as a cautionary tale, illustrating the dangers that arise when the demand for organs outpaces regulatory frameworks ^[26]. The potential enactment of ODE legislation could inadvertently create a legal façade that obscures the grim realities of forced organ harvesting, particularly among marginalized communities ^[27]. Vulnerable populations, often facing economic hardship, may find themselves preyed upon by unscrupulous individuals or networks who exploit their desperation. The legality of organ donation, paired with inadequate oversight, could pave the way for practices that mirror the very abuses that the system aims to eradicate, thereby perpetuating cycles of exploitation and suffering.

Lastly, the risk of State Abandonment cannot be overlooked. Should the government embrace ODE as a panacea for the organ crisis, it may inadvertently foster a dangerous complacency regarding its broader healthcare responsibilities ^[28]. The grim notion that society can solve its organ shortages through the deaths of its most critically ill citizens could lead to a chilling reduction in the urgency to invest in essential infrastructure such as a comprehensive national transplant registry. Furthermore, this mindset may diminish the impetus for establishing universal healthcare systems that prioritize prevention, early intervention, and equitable access to medical treatment. In this scenario, the state's moral obligation to protect and care for its citizens could be compromised, leading to a healthcare system that is not only inequitable but also fundamentally flawed in its approach to human dignity.

In summary, while the move toward Organ Donation Enhancement may seem like a pragmatic solution to a pressing issue, it is crucial to critically assess the potential systemic negatives that could arise. The risks of Instrumentalization, the re-emergence of a Black Market, and the peril of State Abandonment must be thoughtfully navigated to ensure that the pursuit of organ transplantation

does not come at the cost of ethical medical practice and the protection of society's most vulnerable members.

Conclusion: A Warning for the Future

Legality without equity is a weapon. In the West, the discussion around "Opting for Dignified Exit" is often framed as a matter of individual liberty. It portrays personal choice as a way for people to control their own lives and deaths, relying on established healthcare systems and social security. However, in India, this discussion needs to be viewed through the more urgent lens of social justice and equity. The reality is that India still faces widespread poverty, poor healthcare infrastructure, and deep-seated inequalities that leave many people marginalized. These conditions change the meaning and impact of "choice." Until India can ensure its citizens the "Right to Live with Dignity," which includes access to affordable and quality healthcare, effective pain relief, palliative care, and mental health support, it should not legislate a "Right to Die." Without these protections, this supposed right risks being empty or, even worse, coercive. In this situation, the right becomes dangerously linked to the economic value placed on individuals, especially concerning organ donation and the potential commercialization of human life. What is claimed as autonomy may actually hide pressures of economic and social obligation.

We must ask ourselves: Are we creating a system of mercy, or are we just building a more effective way to get rid of the poor? This question is not just for show; it needs urgent attention and moral consideration. In a society where the most vulnerable often suffer with little support, the choice of death can quickly turn from an expression of self-determination to a sign of desperation. The risk is that euthanasia and assisted suicide become default options in response to systemic failure. This presses us to face a tough ethical question: Are we truly respecting individual autonomy, or just offering death as a replacement for the care, dignity, and support that society has failed to provide? The general public, in particular, must be vigilant and engaged in this conversation. It is imperative that they advocate for a healthcare system that prioritizes their well-being and dignity, rather than one that views them through the lens of economic burden. As we consider the implications of ODE, we must ensure that our laws reflect a commitment to social equity, providing not just the option for a dignified exit, but also robust support systems that allow for a dignified life. The pursuit of justice must involve creating a society where every individual, regardless of their socioeconomic status, is afforded the respect and resources necessary to live life fully and meaningfully.

As we look toward the future, let us be clear: the path we choose now will have lasting repercussions. If we proceed with legislation that prioritizes legal frameworks over equitable access to healthcare, we may inadvertently pave the way for a society that values lives based on economic viability rather than intrinsic worth. The moral imperative is to strive for a comprehensive approach that champions both life and dignity, ensuring that every citizen is afforded the care they need to live not merely survive. It's time to engage in this critical dialogue, to elevate the voices of those who will be most affected, and to advocate for a future where the right to live with dignity is a universal guarantee, not a conditional privilege.

References

1. Shevelev A, Shevelev G. Commercialization of separated human body parts - Unpacking Instrumentalization approach. *Pace International Law Review*,2023;35(1):119. <https://doi.org/10.58948/2331-3536.1425>
2. Organ donation in India: Challenges and progress. <https://www.blkmaxhospital.com/blogs/donor-organ-deficit-what-india-can-do-to-overcome-this-crisis> (last visited Jan 20, 2026).
3. Ekanshintern. Nearly 3,000 Indians died waiting for organs in 5 years; over 82,000 still on transplant waitlist. *The Indian Express*, 2025. <https://indianexpress.com/article/india/nearly-3000-indians-died-waiting-organs-5-years-82000-transplant-waitlist-10414860/> (last visited Jan 20, 2026).
4. Promoting the health of vulnerable populations: Three steps towards a systems-based re-orientation of Public Health Intervention Research - *Sciencedirect*. <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1353829223000217> (last visited Jan 20, 2026).
5. Organ Procurement & Transplantation Network (OPTN). *HRSA*, 2025. <https://optn.transplant.hrsa.gov/professionals/by-topic/ethical-considerations/ethical-principles-in-the-allocation-of-human-organs/> (last visited Jan 20, 2026).
6. Kaur R, Schick-Makaroff K, Dang P, Sasaki A, Neves P, Mucsi I, *et al*. Navigating living kidney donation and transplantation among South Asian Canadians: the ACTION Project. *American Journal of Kidney Diseases*,2024;83(6):750-761.e1. <https://doi.org/10.1053/j.ajkd.2023.11.009>
7. AIR 2011 SUPREME COURT 1290.
8. AIR 2018 SUPREME COURT 1665.
9. Donley G. Parental Autonomy over Prenatal End-of-Life Decisions. *Minnesota Law Review*,2020;105:175. https://scholarship.law.pitt.edu/fac_articles/87
10. Maneeshkarki02. What is a living will, and the new Supreme Court order for simplifying passive euthanasia procedure? *The Indian Express*, 2023. <https://indianexpress.com/article/explained/explained-law/passive-euthanasia-india-laws-supreme-court-changes-in-living-will-guidelines-8404919/> (last visited Jan 20, 2026).
11. Right to life. *Wikipedia*, 2026. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Right_to_life (last visited Jan 20, 2026).
12. Gupta S, Kumar A, Mathur R, Gursahani R, Bhatnagar S, Deodhar J, *et al*. Indian Society of Critical Care Medicine and Indian Association of Palliative Care Expert Consensus and Position Statements for End-of-life and Palliative care in the Intensive Care unit. *Indian Journal of Critical Care Medicine*,2024;28(3):200–250. <https://doi.org/10.5005/jp-journals-10071-24661>
13. Miles SH. The Hippocratic Oath and the ethics of medicine, 2003. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780195162196.001.0001>
14. Naresh Shetty. Medical ethics and law. *Indian journal of orthopaedics*, 2023. <https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC10593724/> (last visited Jan 20, 2026).
15. Skladany M. Buying Our Way Out of corruption: Performance-Based incentive bonuses for developing country politicians and bureaucrats. *Yale Law School Legal Scholarship Repository*,2009;12(1):160. <https://digitalcommons.law.yale.edu/yhrdlj/vol12/iss1/4>
16. More than half a billion pushed into extreme poverty due to health costs. *UN news*. United Nations. <https://news.un.org/en/story/2021/12/1107752> (last visited Jan 20, 2026).
17. Nicoli F. A method in clinical ethics consultation: Between normative theories and applied ethics. *University of Insubria*, 2016. <http://hdl.handle.net/11383/2090527>
18. Maharaj J. The health, ethical and legal implications of non-adherence to treatment amongst patients infected with tuberculosis (the HEAL study). In: *Research Space (University of KwaZulu-Natal)*, 2021. <https://researchspace.ukzn.ac.za/handle/10413/19108>
19. Patients rights to self determination at the end of life. *American Public Health Association*. <https://www.apha.org/policy-and-advocacy/public-health-policy-briefs/policy-database/2014/07/29/13/28/patients-rights-to-self-determination-at-the-end-of-life> (last visited Jan 20, 2026).
20. Informed consent: A study of experiences and opinion of utilizers of health services from India – *science direct*. <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S02795369190199M> (last visited Jan 20, 2026).
21. JP Freire. Watchdog finds consumer harm and billions of taxpayer dollars wasted in health care fraud in Affordable Care Act Plans. *Ways and Means*, 2025. <https://waysandmeans.house.gov/2025/12/03/watchdog-finds-consumer-harm-and-billions-of-taxpayer-dollars-wasted-in-health-care-fraud-in-affordable-care-act-plans/> (last visited Jan 20, 2026).
22. *Academy B*. Urban violence, 2021. <https://doi.org/10.5871/urban/9780856726651.001>
23. Faessel V, Falk R, Curtin M. On public imagination, 2019. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429343599>
24. Abraham Tharakan. India moves to contain organ donation havoc. *CMAJ: Canadian Medical Association journal = journal de l'Association medicale canadienne*, 2012. <https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC3348204/> (last visited Jan 20, 2026).
25. *ShiftMed.com*. Healthcare as a commodity: The impact on human connection and patient outcomes. *Shiftmed Blog*, 2024. <https://www.shiftmed.com/insights/knowledge-center/healthcare-as-a-commodity-the-impact-on-human-connection-and-patient-outcomes/> (last visited Jan 20, 2026).
26. Simon Robinson/New Delhi. India's Black Market Organ Scandal. *Time*, 2008. <https://time.com/archive/6942449/indias-black-market-organ-scandal/> (last visited Jan 20, 2026).
27. Abouna GM. Organ shortage crisis: Problems and possible solutions. *Transplantation proceedings*. <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/18261540/> (last visited Jan 20, 2026).
28. Kathy L. Cerminara and Alan Meisel. End-of-life care. *The Hastings Center for Bioethics*, 2023. <https://www.thehastingscenter.org/briefingbook/end-of-life-care/> (last visited Jan 20, 2026).