INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF HUMAN RIGHTS LAW REVIEW
An International Open Access Double Blind Peer Reviewed, Referred Journal

Volume 4 | Issue 3 | 2025 Art. 82

Who Decides Death? A Fine Line Between Choice and Coercion

Akanksha Singh
Law Student, 2nd Year,
BA.LL.B., Jagran Lakecity University, Madhya Pradesh

Recommended Citation
Akanksha Singh, *Who Decides Death? A Fine Line Between Choice and Coercion*, 4 IJHRLR 1170-1183 (2025).
Available at www.humanrightlawreview.in/archives/.

Who Decides Death? A Fine Line Between Choice and Coercion

Akanksha Singh
Law Student, 2nd Year,
BA.LL.B., Jagran Lakecity University, Madhya Pradesh

Manuscript Received	Manuscript Accepted	Manuscript Published
18 June 2025	20 June 2025	21 June 2025

ABSTRACT

The paper discusses the ethical, legal, and philosophical implications of the right to die, investigating closely the blurred line between choices made voluntarily and choices made via external coercion involving euthanasia and assisted suicide, as well as capital punishment. It critically interrogates the way in which individual autonomy can be exercised when it comes to end-of-life decisions within society, alongside medical ethics and in view of the role of the state. The paper explores definitions and implications of euthanasia, including voluntary, non-voluntary, and involuntary forms of euthanasia, as well as the legal contexts for the differential between euthanasia and assisted suicide. The paper brings in the development of passive euthanasia in the Indian legal system through landmark cases like (Aruna Shanbaug v Union of India, and (Common Cause v. Union of India and juxtaposes this with the legal contexts supporting euthanasia in Netherlands, Switzerland, Canada, and some U.S. states. This comparative analysis demonstrates the significant, ongoing discussion (on a global basis) as to whether choosing to end a life is an exercise of personal liberty, or the result of subtle coercive forces; the question of whether is it morally the role of the state to allow or prohibit individuals making these choices. The analysis discusses the elements of consent and informed consent and the socio-economic context to decisions we make around end-of-life decisions.

KEYWORDS

Euhanasia, Assisted Suicide, Right to Life, Constitutional Right.

"I think those who have a terminal illness and are in great pain should have the right to choose to end their own life, and those that help them should be free from prosecution."

- Stephen Hawking

1. INTRODUCTION

The question of who determines when someone dies is perhaps one of the most significant ethical, legal, and philosophical dilemmas of contemporary society. It obliges us to grapple with the fine line between individual autonomy and outside influence, especially at the junction of euthanasia, assisted dying and capital punishment. Some maintain that the right to die is necessary to experience personal freedom, and others assert individuals may be coerced into irreversible decisions based on social, economic and psychological pressures. The consideration of choice versus coercion, in issues of life and death, raises important issues related to human dignity, medical ethics, and the role that the state plays in directing mortality.

In the realm of euthanasia and assisted dying, the argument focuses on whether an individual has the right to alleviate suffering on one's own terms. Proponents will argue that terminally ill patients should have the right to determine a dignified death, rather than suffering unspeakable agony. Those opposed fear that legalizing assistance in dying may lead to a slippery slope where the elderly, disabled, and economically challenged may be pressured to end their life based on a societal expectation or financial burden. The degree to which it is an informed voluntary decision is a controversial issue.

Likewise, regarding capital punishment, the authority to execute someone rests with the courts. Some consider the death penalty appropriate punishment for the crime while others view it as irreversible punishment, done by a system that could be biased or have wrongfully convicted an innocent person, and that may even obtain confessions through coercive means. This also raises an ethical and legal discourse about whether the state even has the authority to decide who should die and who should live.

After all, who decides death is more than a legal question; it is a fundamentally human question. It represents ethical tenets, it represents cultural values, and it articulates the tension between self-determinism, and the gravitational forces directed at the population in general.

2. UNDERSTANDING EUTHANASIA AND ASSISTED SUICIDE

Euthanasia and assisted suicide are two of the most contentious

subjects within the fields of medical ethics and human rights, as each confronts conventional understandings about life, death, and personal autonomy. Both practices involve the purposeful act of terminating life to reduce suffering but engage in different ways to carry out that act. Euthanasia is the intentional termination of a person's life, generally by a physician, while assisted suicide simply means to provide the individual a means to end their life. Not surprisingly, these two practices raise several significant and relevant legal, moral, and philosophical questions with regard to consent, coercion, and possible abuse.

Euthanasia is distinguished as voluntary, non-voluntary, or involuntary. Voluntary euthanasia is the act of ending the life of a competent person who has agreed to die, usually as a result of unbearable pain associated with a terminal condition. Non-voluntary euthanasia is the action of terminating a patient's life, without consent, when they do not have the mental capacity to provide such consent (for instance patients who have severe head trauma or are comatose), which poses a complicated ethical dilemma regarding how one should make that decision. Involuntary euthanasia, or the act of terminating life without consent, is widely considered a murder.

Conversely, assisted suicide refers to a situation where the patient is taking the medication prescribed by a physician to end his or her life. Assisted suicide has been legalized in some form in Switzerland, Canada, and several states in the United States, although strict rules are in place to ensure no improper use occurs. Concerns about whether people choosing assisted dying are doing so without some influence (such as depression, societal pressure, or financial hardship and/or finances) are still being discussed.

The discussions about euthanasia and assisted suicide occur in the context of the conflicting tensions between individual autonomy and the state’s duty to protect life. Proponents frequently underscore a person's entitlement to die with dignity; however, opponents caution that individuals could come to feel pressure or devalued by their circumstances. Legal and ethical boundaries regarding euthanasia and assisted suicide are still hotly contested across norms and legal frameworks.

3. LEGAL FRAMEWORK: INDIA AND GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES

3.1 Indian Legal Framework

India's legal position on euthanasia and assisted suicide is legally and philosophically rooted in the existence of a constitutionally protected right to life under Article 21. The right to die has,

however, been a contentious issue within criminal law and between the legislative and judicial branches of government. Under Section 115 of the Indian Penal Code (IPC), which is no longer used as the source of law since the codes would be replaced by the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita (BNS), it is a criminal act punishable by law to aid someone in their decision to die willfully, because this would be considered abetting a suicide. Active euthanasia is always unlawful because it is homicide. Despite this, passive euthanasia has developed, especially through court actions.The Supreme Court's decision in Aruna Shanbaug v. Union of India (2011) provided the first breakthrough in this area for euthanasia in India.

The Court held that passive euthanasia, where a previous decision is made to stop life support on behalf of a terminally ill person, or, in a person that is in a permanent vegetative state, may not be considered unlawful, if appropriate safeguards were adopted by the hospital or health care institution. This laid the foundation for a legal framework for euthanasia to exist under constraints. This was later buttressed in the case of Common Cause v. Union of India, decided in 2018, which stated for the first time that the right to die was, at its essence, the surface of the fundamental right to die with dignity as part of Article 21. Common Cause formally legalized passive euthanasia, and it introduced the idea of 'living wills,' allowing individuals to make their own decisions with respect to euthanasia.

Even though there are these judgments, India does not have euthanasia laws and has not passed laws governing the practice of euthanasia. The lack of existing laws generates inconsistency in the application and implementation of law. Healthcare providers remain hesitant about actions which may have consequences attached to it in the law and the variable application of cases that have no tie to law creates ambiguity. There are also issues of coercion in a country fraught with poverty, economic instability and inadequate affordable quality healthcare that could exert pressure on an individual towards the decision of euthanasia. Passive euthanasia which was legalized by the Indian superior court of law only in certain cases is the only euthanasia that is permitted, therefore active euthanasia and assisted suicide are still criminal offences; indicative of India's slow consideration of the moral and social issues inherent in individual choice.

3.2 International Legal Perspectives

The legality of euthanasia and assisted suicide is not uniform across the globe. Some countries allow euthanasia and assisted suicide in very specific circumstances, or have legalized assisted suicide in several states. Others have entirely banned both.

Among the few countries to have legalized both euthanasia and assisted suicide are the Netherlands, Belgium, Luxembourg, Canada and Colombia. Switzerland and some states in the US allow only assisted suicide. All jurisdictions impose strict safeguards to ensure voluntary and well-informed consent to prevent misuse for coercive purposes.

In 2002, the Netherlands became the first country to legalize euthanasia, with the passing of the Termination of Life on Request and Assisted Suicide (Review Procedures) Act. The law stipulates that the patient must undergo unbearable suffering, no prospect of improvement to their condition, and the process must be reviewed by an independent medical board. Belgium and Luxembourg have comparable laws, which extend euthanasia rights to minors in certain circumstances. Canada legalized medical assistance in dying (MAiD) in 2016, and has since increased the criteria for eligibility and kept strict procedural requirements.

In Switzerland, assisted suicide is allowed under Article 115 of the Swiss Penal Code, so long as the individual is not acting from selfish motives. This has led to "suicide tourism" in which visitors come to Switzerland to obtain assisted dying, which raises ethical concerns about its commercialization. In the United States, states such as Oregon, Washington, and California have legalized physician-assisted suicide in the form of laws known as the Death with Dignity Act, which requires the patient to have a terminal illness and to ask more than once to take the option of assisted dying.

By contrast, many nations, including India, Pakistan, and most nations based on Islamic law reserve euthanasia and assisted suicide based on religious and ethical objections. The Vatican, along with several human rights organizations, has spoken out against such practices, based on the celebration of life and the potential for both religious and political abuses. The global debate remains polarized, with cultural, legal, and ethical challenges interwoven in the varying positions on the right to die.

4. JUDICIAL TRENDS AND CASE LAWS

4.1 Aruna Shanbaug Case (2011)

The case of Aruna Shanbaug v. Union of India (2011) was a landmark judgment that legalized passive euthanasia in India. Aruna Shanbaug was a nurse at KEM Hospital in Mumbai who had been in a permanent vegetative state (PVS) since 1973 when she sustained grievous injuries after being brutally assaulted by a member of the hospital's staff. For nearly forty years she remained in a comatose state and was cared for by the hospital

staff. In 2009, journalist and activist Pinki Virani filed a petition with the Supreme Court seeking permission to remove life support so Aruna could die with dignity.

The Supreme Court ruled against the petition on the basis that the hospital staff wished to care for Aruna, but acknowledged passive euthanasia in its ruling. In the case of someone who is in an irreversible coma or PVS, passive euthanasia could be permitted by the Supreme Court under judicial scrutiny. Guidelines were established that required the High Court grant passive euthanasia and create medical boards to assess the patient. This was a landmark case because the court distinguished between active and passive euthanasia and opened the door to future legislation on a legal right to die in India.

4.2 Common Cause Case (2018)

The Common Cause v. Union of India (2018) case marks a further step forward in euthanasia law in India based on the groundwork of Aruna Shanbaug. In this case the public interest litigation (PIL) was filed by the NGO Common Cause to recognize the right to die with dignity as a fundamental right under Article 21 of the Constitution. They also sought to allow for living wills, in order for individuals to plan their end-of-life care.In a landmark decision the Supreme Court acknowledged passive euthanasia and the right to grant advance medical directives (i.e., living wills) as part of the fundamental right to life and personal liberty.

The court determined that individuals should have the right to refuse medical treatment prolonging life if they are in a terminal illness or in a permanent coma. The Court provided procedural safeguards, including a review by a judge and permission from the medical board, to avoid the possibility of misuse.

The case represented a considerable bolstering of the legislative scaffold for euthanasia law in India, and promoted the concept that the right to life included the right to die with dignity. Further, the decision laid out end of life care for patients, families and practitioners, to avoid misunderstanding or miscommunication.

4.3 Key International Cases

(i) Airedale NHS Trust v. Bland (1993) – United Kingdom: In the case of Tony Bland, a victim of the 1989 Hillsborough disaster, was in a persistent vegetative state with no hope of recovery. After seeking permission from court to withdraw Tony's life support from the NHS Trust and Tony's family, the House of Lords decided upon ruling which allowed this in cases of irreversible PVS. This case led to the development of

passive euthanasia law in the UK after the ruling by the House of Lords.

(ii) Washington v. Glucksberg (1997) – United States: In this case, the U.S. Supreme Court upheld a Washington state law banning physician-assisted suicide. The court ruled that the right to assisted suicide is not protected under the U.S. Constitution. However, the judgment did not restrict states from

introducing related legislation which led to the introduction and eventual legalization of physician-assisted dying legislation in states such as Oregon and California.

(iii) Carter c. Canada (2015) – Canada: The result of this case was the decriminalization of physician-assisted dying in Canada. The Supreme Court of Canada characterized the prohibition of assisted suicide as a violation of individuals' constitutional rights who are suffering from grievous and irremediable medical conditions. This case gave rise to the 2016 Medical Assistance in Dying (MAiD) statute in Canada, which legalized euthanasia and physician-assisted suicide. Euthanasia and assisted dying remain strictly regulated.

These cases highlight varying legal responses to euthanasia and assisted dying, as well as the complicated nature of the interplay between law, ethics, and human rights in different jurisdictions.

5. ETHICAL AND CONSTITUTIONAL CONTROVERSIES

The issues of euthanasia and assisted suicide arise without exception from the tension between an individual's right to self-determination and a governmental duty to protect its own citizens' lives. In the center of the issue is human conflict regarding the right to self-determination and autonomy versus morals, laws, and religion. The concept of morals becomes forefront to supporters who feel that a patient experiencing a terminal illness or unbearable suffering should not have to endure life in a physically painful state and should have the option to dignified death. Autonomy, self-determination, and beneficence—the consideration of the patients' emotional and physical pains— is part of this line of reasoning.

Additionally, opponents of euthanasia, such as religious or conservative groups, argue life is sacred, and that euthanasia could create a "slippery slope" which makes vulnerable people (such as the aged, disabled, or economically disadvantaged) at risk of being coerced into choosing their death based upon the pressures applied by society, or the nature and shortage of the medical resources offered.

Article 21 of the Indian Constitution constitutionally ensures the right to life, which has been interpreted generously to include the right to die with dignity (Common Cause v. Union of India, 2018). However, the mere act of euthanasia and assisted dying counteracts the state's duty to protect life, as enshrined in Article 21 itself. In addition, there are issues of misuse, consent, and absence of a comprehensive legal framework, which complicate the issue.

Around the world, jurisdictions have dealt with this debate in different ways. Again, countries like the Netherlands and Canada have legalized euthanasia under strict safeguards, while countries like India and the U.S., have taken a conservative approach to this issue. Society is continuously evolving on this issue as societies grapple with the moral, legal and medical issues associated with death and dying, and balance compassion with ethical obligations.

6. THE ROLE OF CONSENT AND COERCION IN END-OF-LIFE DECISIONS

6.1 Importance of Free and Informed Consent

Consent forms the basis of moral medical decision-making, especially regarding end-of-life care. The idea of informed consent supports a person's freedom of choice, which a person may choose to utilize in the decision to end pain and suffering related to euthanasia or assisted suicide. The principle supporting this type of consent derives from the legal and ethical concept of bodily autonomy, which specifies that individuals may refuse intervention and decline anything done to their body, without interference or objection.In order for consent to be valid for end-of-life decisions, the decision must be made voluntarily, the individual must be informed, and the individual must be competent.

Voluntarism indicates the individual is free from any outside pressure or coercion related to their decision. Informed consent means the patient understands their medical condition, prognosis, treatment options, and the resulting consequences of deciding to choose euthanasia or assisted suicide. Competency indicates the patient is in a mental state to make a rational, well-thought-out decision to decline care or continue care options.

Legal systems permitting euthanasia, like those in Canada and the Netherlands, have considerable safeguards to confirm informed consent. Thus, psychiatric evaluations, multiple physician approvals, and wait periods are additional protections. In Common Cause v. Union of India (2018), the Indian Supreme Court accepted the right to die with dignity, but clauses also

required a judge and doctor involvement to ensure that consent had not been misused.

Free and informed consent is paramount for ethical integrity in end of life options. It protects individuals from influence and allows individuals the right to make the deeply personal choices regarding suffering and dignity.

6.2 Risk of Coercion

The risk of coercion and undue influence creates an ethical and legal problem, even when consent is the main principle relating to euthanasia and assisted suicide. Coercion can take multiple forms (social, economic, on the part of family members, or by medical professionals) and can undermine an individual's ability to make a truly voluntary choice.

One primary concern is economic coercion. In a society with a poor healthcare system, patients with chronic or terminal illnesses may feel they are burdening their families financially and may consider euthanasia. Similarly, if the individual's family is at, or below, the poverty line, in resource-deficient settings, hospitals or caregivers may, indirectly, signal or imply that euthanasia would ensure that funds are not exhausted in the futile treatment of conditions that will not improve the patient's well-being, allowing funds to be used for those who will improve and to free-up more inpatient medical resources. This raises ethical questions about whether or not euthanasia is a choice, or if it is forced through the conditions of the person's situation.

Family pressure to die is another potential source of coercion. Elderly or disabled individuals may create distress for their family members who are caring for them, and thus feel they need to choose euthanasia out of a care for their family member. This is especially concerning in collectivist family cultures in which filial duty and dependence on others is critical.

Furthermore, medical coercion can arise when doctors, either intentionally or inadvertently, sway patients' decisions by stressing suffering or downplaying other treatment approaches. To counterbalance these risks, in some countries that allow for euthanasia, there are legal structures that impose strict safeguards such as psychological assessments and oversight boards.

In India, passive euthanasia is permitted with strict protocols surrounding it. The legal system is intended to scrutinize against coercion, yet a risk remains without legislative protections. Addressing coercion in end-of-life decision making

will require strong legislative protections as well as transparency and public awareness, to ensure that end-of-life decision making is a true choice and ethically defensible.

7. CHALLENGES AND THE WAY FORWARD

7.1 Legal Challenges

The legal context of the right to die, specifically euthanasia and assisted suicide, continues to be complex and dynamic. Several ongoing challenges prevent a uniform legal framework. First, an obvious legal barrier is that India does not have a law addressing euthanasia. Passive euthanasia was recognized and living wills validated in the Supreme Court's opinion in Common Cause v. Union of India (2018), but the lengthy process of implementing passive euthanasia is cumbersome, given excessive judicial oversight and procedural clarity.

Second, it is challenging to define voluntary, non-voluntary, and involuntary euthanasia and to assess true informed consent. Additionally, a review of the legislation considers the possibility of misusing the process especially concerning at-risk populations, e.g. minority groups and those with disabilities. Religious and cultural beliefs also play a significant role in the governmental processes of making laws, especially in societies that maintain euthanasia to be immoral.

Internationally, the three countries with known laws on euthanasia - the Netherlands, Belgium, Canada - provide statutes allowing euthanasia, whereas other countries such as India and the United States have policies preferably keeping euthanasia restrictive. The international legal landscape regarding euthanasia is disparate in access to complete a dignified death and raises issues regarding "euthanasia tourism" where members travel to legal euthanasia jurisdictions. Development of euthanasia law will need to address the aforementioned legal issues by developing a valid, clear, robust, and internationally accepted framework that respects personal autonomy while having appropriate safeguards.

7.2 Ethical Dilemmas

Euthanasia and physician-assisted suicide raise a number of ethical issues, especially the notion of the sanctity of life or the individual's right to die with dignity. One of the most significant ethical implications is whether the act of taking a life, even with consent, can be deemed ethical. The perspective from religion and philosophy is often that life has sanctity and should not be terminated early, even in cases of great suffering.

Another concern is the slippery slope. People are concerned that

allowing euthanasia could lead to reports of euthanasia being provided, not just to persons that are terminally ill, but also for people who are not or who merely feel they are a burden to society. If euthanasia were to also be provided to persons with mental health conditions or disabilities, many are worried about ethical implications.

The issue of euthanasia also weighs heavily on medical ethics. Medical ethics emphasizes the responsibility of medical professionals to not only alleviate pain but also preserve life. Medicine as a profession often imposes stress on an individual's ethics to alleviate pain on one hand but also to follow the Hippocratic Oath, which says to not take a life. The debate of euthanasia also prompted ethical questions amongst the palliative care community, since, providing euthanasia might lessen the efforts of hospitals and medical professionals to improve pain management and end-of-life care. Ultimately, balancing these ethical issues involves legal structuring and community debate.

7.3 Potential Reforms

In recognizing the issues associated with euthanasia and assisted suicide, reforms can be made through three suggestions. First, India should create an established legislative approach that draws a clear distinction between active and passive euthanasia as well as outlining procedural safeguards. The standardization and simplification of approval processes for passive euthanasia as established in Common Cause v. Union of India (2018), can make processes far more time-sensitive, meeting the dignity of dying with more immediacy.

Second, safeguards must exist to ensure that there is no coercion, alternative uses, or misuse throughout the legislative process. This could include mandatory psychological reviews, multiple physician approvals, and judicial oversight, if chosen. Awareness programs should also facilitate a positive insight for both health professionals and the general public on the ethics, legality and review of euthanasia while assisting with holding an informed decision at end of life.

Finally, strengthening and expanding palliative care provides an alternative to euthanasia, working to offer end of life patients sufficient control of their illnesses through palliative care interventions and pain management. There are euthanasia practicing countries with laws, like Canada and the Netherlands, established policies and regulatory approaches to studying the elements to ensure effective regulation and willingness for information to have meaningful laws while encouraging transparency and accountability.

A balanced approach that retains a respect for patient autonomy while ensuring safeguards to prevent potential abuse, regardless of being an associated request through euthanasia or assisted suicide, offers thoughtful considerations for the steps to be taken in addressing laws and legislation for end-of life care in India or other countries as it seeks to reflect humane, ethical and legally sound methods for legislation and issues for euthanasia or assisted suicide processes.

8. CONCLUSION

This highly controversial case of euthanasia and physician assisted suicide illustrates the complex philosophical, ethical, and legal issues that surround the ongoing discussions of end-of-life decisions. Euthanasia presents an individual autonomy-versus-social obligation challenge, provoking many questions regarding life, dignity, and death for lawmakers, physicians and ethicists to deal with. Proponents assert that individuals suffering from an incurable illness have the moral right to die with dignity, while some opponents warn about contractions related to the misuse of physician-assisted dying and/or euthanasia.

Questions regarding these moral dilemmas are compounded in a country like India that is informed by existing religious, cultural, and legal traditions, which often shape views about life and death. Though the Supreme Court declared passive euthanasia as lawful in Common Cause v Union of India (2018), India still has no clear legal framework in place to address end-of-life decision making. The divergence in euthanasia agency and law draws similar parallels in the global context, as some countries permit euthanasia with strict regulation, while others have a clear and forceful opposition. Ethical concerns remain of foremost discussion, including questions of coercion, voluntary consent, and the slippery slope argument. Death with dignity does represent ethical tension between the value of individual autonomy and the ethical commitment of protecting vulnerable populations from coercive exploitation.

As we look to the future, a clear legal structure, rigorous protections, and better facilities for palliative care are ways to mitigate many of these issues. Also crucial will be public awareness, medical ethics education, and judicial oversight in ensuring that end-of-life choices are matters of dignity, not obligation. Ultimately, the issue we are discussing is not just about the right to die, but about the meaning of life, the place of compassion in health care, and the shifting interaction of law and morality in a changing world.

9. REFERENCES

1) Case Laws

i. Aruna Shanbaug v. Union of India, (2011) 4 SCC 454.

ii. Common Cause v. Union of India, (2018) 5 SCC 1.

iii. Airedale NHS Trust v. Bland, [1993] 1 All ER 821 (UK).

iv. Washington v. Glucksberg, 521 U.S. 702 (1997).

v. Carter v. Canada (Attorney General), [2015] 1 SCR 331.

2) Statutes and Legal Provisions

i. Article 21, Constitution of India.

ii. Section 115, Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (replacing Section 306 IPC).

iii. Article 115, Swiss Penal Code.

iv. Death with Dignity Act, Oregon, United States.

v. Termination of Life on Request and Assisted Suicide (Review Procedures) Act, 2002, Netherlands.

vi. Medical Assistance in Dying (MAiD) Act, Canada, 2016

3) International Legal Documents

a) Termination of Life on Request and Assisted Suicide (Review Procedures) Act, Netherlands

b) Canadian MEDICAL Assistance in Dying (MAiD) Law, 2016