RESEARCH PAPER

Exploring The Legal Architecture Of Human Experimentation In India: An Analytical Study

Dr. Atul Jain[1], Dr. Papiya Golder[2], Dr. Neha Mishra[3]
[1,2,3] Authors

Received: *20th Feb, 2026;* ***Revised:*** *4th Mar, 2026;* ***Accepted:*** *25th Mar, 2026;* ***Available Online:*** *10th Apr, 2026*

Abstract
Human experimentation is a crucial component of biomedical advancement, but poses serious ethical and legal challenges, especially in developing countries like india. This analytical study explores the evolution, structure, and shortcomings of india's legal framework governing human experimentation. Anchored in international ethical norms such as the nuremberg code, the declaration of helsinki, and the cioms guidelines, india's regulatory system has evolved significantly over the past four decades. The paper critically examines key legal instruments such as the drugs and cosmetics act, 1940, the new drugs and clinical trials rules, 2019 (ndctr), and the role of the indian council of medical research (icmr) in setting ethical guidelines. It assesses the functioning of institutional ethics committees (iecs), the informed consent process, and the protection of vulnerable populations.
Judicial interventions, especially in landmark cases like swasthya adhikar manch and the hpv vaccine pil, have played a transformative role in prompting regulatory reforms. Comparative analysis with institutional review boards (irbs) in the u.S. And research ethics committees (recs) in the u.K. Reveals that while india has made significant progress in aligning with global norms, implementation remains weak due to institutional inertia, limited oversight capacity, and socio-economic disparities. The paper concludes with a detailed critique of persistent challenges—such as fragmented regulation, inconsistent ethics committee functioning, therapeutic misconception, and weak compensation mechanisms—and offers concrete policy recommendations. These include enacting a unified bioethics law, establishing a national tribunal for trial-related grievances, and enhancing public accountability through better data transparency and institutional reform. India stands at a crossroads, requiring urgent legal consolidation and ethical recalibration to ensure that human dignity is upheld in all research endeavors.

Keywords: Human Experimentation, Clinical Trials, Bioethics, Informed Consent, Institutional Ethics Committees, Regulatory Reform, Judicial Intervention, India.
How To Cite This Article: Jain A, Golder P, Mishra N. Exploring The Legal Architecture Of Human Experimentation In India: An Analytical Study. Int J Drug Deliv Technol. 2026;16(26s):1166-1177. Doi: 10.25258/ijddt.16.26s.129

Introduction

Medical research involving human participants has been indispensable for the advancement of science and public health. However, this field is fraught with ethical challenges and a troubling historical legacy of abuse. The most notorious example remains the Nazi medical experiments during World War II, which gave rise to the seminal Nuremberg Code in 1947. This code emphasized the necessity of voluntary consent, a principle that became foundational to modern research ethics (United States v. Karl Brandt et al., 1947).

Following the Nuremberg Code, further ethical guidance emerged through the World Medical Association's Declaration of Helsinki in 1964, which has been revised multiple times, most recently in 2013. The Declaration introduced a more comprehensive ethical framework, emphasizing principles such as beneficence, justice, and the necessity for independent ethical review (World Medical Association, 2013). These international developments have deeply influenced the evolution of national regulations across jurisdictions, including India.

In India, the regulation of human experimentation remained underdeveloped for much of the 20th century. Prior to the 1980s, there was limited awareness or codified regulatory guidance regarding biomedical research ethics. The Indian Council of Medical Research (ICMR), the apex biomedical research body in the country, first issued policy statements on ethical guidelines for biomedical research involving human subjects in 1980. These were not binding but played an important role in institutionalizing ethical awareness (Indian Council of Medical Research, 2017).

With the liberalization of the Indian economy in the 1990s and the concurrent globalization of the pharmaceutical and biotech industries, India witnessed an exponential increase in clinical trials. This boom highlighted serious lacunae in the legal and ethical oversight mechanisms. The regulatory vacuum led to several documented cases of unethical human experimentation, ranging from inadequate informed consent procedures to the exploitation of vulnerable populations (Srinivasan, 2009a). For instance, between 2005 and 2012, over 2,000 deaths were reportedly linked to clinical trials in India, with limited accountability or compensation for affected families (Ministry of Health and Family Welfare, 2012).

In response to growing public outcry, media scrutiny, and judicial activism, the Indian regulatory framework has undergone substantial reform over the last two decades. Legislative and administrative reforms, such as the amendment of Schedule Y of the Drugs and Cosmetics Rules (2005 and 2013), the establishment of the Clinical Trials Registry of India (2007), and the promulgation of the New Drugs and Clinical Trials Rules (2019), were aimed at strengthening participant protections, standardizing trial procedures, and ensuring ethical compliance (Ministry of Health and Family Welfare, 2019).

Despite these progressive reforms, significant challenges persist. These include inconsistent enforcement, under-resourced Institutional Ethics Committees (IECs), insufficient participant education, and socio-economic vulnerabilities that undermine the effectiveness of informed consent (Bhan & Jesani, 2006). Consequently, while India has made significant strides toward aligning its regulatory landscape with global standards, critical gaps remain in ensuring robust protection for research participants, especially among the poor, illiterate, and marginalized populations.

The following sections of this paper will critically analyze the key components of India’s legal and ethical framework for human experimentation, evaluate their efficacy, and provide comparative insights from global practices.

Historical Context and International Influence

The ethical and legal foundations of human experimentation in India are deeply rooted in international historical developments that emerged from the aftermath of World War II and the rapid expansion of medical science in the 20th century. The atrocities committed by Nazi physicians during the Holocaust catalyzed global introspection and led to the establishment of the Nuremberg Code in 1947. This code was the first internationally recognized set of ethical principles governing human experimentation and emphasized the absolute necessity of voluntary and informed consent, the absence of coercion, and the right of participants to withdraw from research at any time (Shuster, 1997).

The principles articulated in the Nuremberg Code were subsequently expanded and refined by the World Medical Association's Declaration of Helsinki (1964), which marked a significant evolution in the global understanding of biomedical ethics. Unlike the Nuremberg Code, which was legalistic and punitive, the Declaration of Helsinki provided a framework for the ethical oversight of research. It introduced key concepts such as the distinction between therapeutic and non-therapeutic research, the need for independent ethical review, and the principle that the interests of the research subject must always take precedence over the interests of science and society (World Medical Association, 2013). Over the years, the Declaration has undergone multiple revisions (most recently in 2013) to respond to emerging ethical concerns in biomedical research, including globalization, vulnerable populations, and post-trial access to interventions (Riis, 2000).

India, as a post-colonial nation undergoing rapid development in science and public health, began to engage with these international norms in the latter half of the 20th century. The Indian Council of Medical Research (ICMR), established in 1911 as the Indian Research Fund Association and renamed in 1949, became the nodal agency for biomedical research and policy in the country. Initially, biomedical research in India was regulated through informal mechanisms and institutional discretion, with little to no statutory oversight. However, by 1980, in recognition of the global movement toward codified ethics in medical research, the ICMR issued its first Policy Statement on Ethical Considerations Involved in Research on Human Subjects (Indian Council of Medical Research, 2017). Though these guidelines were non-binding, they drew heavily from the Declaration of Helsinki and the CIOMS (Council for International Organizations of Medical Sciences) Guidelines, thereby initiating a process of institutional ethical regulation in India.

The 1990s marked a pivotal period in the globalization of clinical trials, largely due to the liberalization of India's economy and the emergence of the country as a preferred destination for contract research organizations (CROs). India's large and diverse population, combined with lower operational costs and a relatively less stringent regulatory environment,

attracted multinational pharmaceutical companies to conduct trials in the country (Petryna, 2009). This phenomenon raised significant ethical and legal concerns, including inadequate informed consent, poor regulatory oversight, and the exploitation of socio-economically disadvantaged groups. The resulting criticism, both domestic and international, prompted India to begin aligning its regulatory infrastructure with globally accepted norms (Rajan, 2007).

In parallel, international ethical frameworks such as the Belmont Report (1979) and the CIOMS International Ethical Guidelines for Health-related Research Involving Humans (first published in 1982 and revised in 2002 and 2016) influenced Indian guidelines. The Belmont Report emphasized three core principles: respect for persons (autonomy), beneficence, and justice. These principles are now integral to the ICMR's National Ethical Guidelines (2017), which reflect an evolved understanding of both international obligations and indigenous socio-cultural contexts (Indian Council of Medical Research, 2017).

The alignment with international norms is also evident in India's acceptance of Good Clinical Practice (GCP) guidelines. Originally developed by the International Council for Harmonisation of Technical Requirements for Pharmaceuticals for Human Use (ICH), GCP standards were adopted by India in 2001 (Central Drugs Standard Control Organization, 2001). The GCP guidelines ensure ethical and scientific quality standards in the design, conduct, recording, and reporting of clinical trials that involve human participants. By embracing GCP, India effectively integrated internationally recognized practices into its regulatory framework.

Despite these developments, significant challenges remain. Critics argue that international norms, while providing a necessary ethical backbone, often fail to account for local contexts such as linguistic diversity, low literacy rates, caste-based vulnerabilities, and systemic power imbalances in the doctor-patient relationship (Bhardwaj, 2013). Therefore, while international frameworks have played a foundational role in shaping Indian regulations on human experimentation, their effective implementation requires adaptation to India's socio-economic and cultural realities.

2. Domestic Legal and Regulatory Framework

India's regulatory framework for human experimentation is grounded in a combination of statutory law, subordinate legislation, guidelines, and institutional oversight mechanisms. Although the field has evolved considerably in the past two decades, the overall legal landscape remains fragmented, with key regulatory tools situated across various statutes and policy instruments. This section examines the major legal and regulatory instruments governing human subject research in India, with particular focus on the Drugs and Cosmetics Act, 1940, the subsequent Rules of 1945, the New Drugs and Clinical Trials Rules, 2019, and the role of the Indian Council of Medical Research (ICMR) guidelines (Central Drugs Standard Control Organization, 2005).

2.1 **The Drugs and Cosmetics Act, 1940 and the Drugs and Cosmetics Rules, 1945**

The statutory foundation for regulating clinical trials in India lies in the Drugs and Cosmetics Act, 1940 (hereinafter "D&C Act"), which was enacted to ensure the safety, efficacy, and quality of drugs and cosmetics sold in the country. Although the Act itself does not explicitly address clinical trials or biomedical research, its scope was expanded over the decades through subordinate legislation—most notably, the Drugs and Cosmetics Rules, 1945 (hereinafter "D&C Rules").

The most relevant provision is Schedule Y of the D&C Rules, which was extensively amended in 2005 to incorporate Good Clinical Practice (GCP) guidelines and formalize procedures for clinical trial approvals, ethics committee functioning, and investigator responsibilities (Central Drugs Standard Control Organization [CDSCO], 2005) (Ministry of Health and Family Welfare, 2013). The amendments made the following requirements mandatory:

- Prior approval from the Drugs Controller General of India (DCGI);
- Ethical clearance from an Institutional Ethics Committee (IEC);
- Informed consent from all trial participants;
- Adverse event reporting obligations.

In 2013, in response to multiple Public Interest Litigations (PILs) and parliamentary scrutiny over unethical trials and trial-related deaths, the Ministry of Health and Family Welfare introduced additional amendments. These mandated:

- Registration of Ethics Committees with the CDSCO;
- Audio-visual recording of the informed consent process in vulnerable populations;
- Defined timelines and procedures for compensating trial-related injuries or deaths (MoHFW, 2013).

The legal enforceability of these provisions was enhanced through the integration of Schedule Y with Rule 122DAA and Rule 122DAB, which prescribed the

duties of sponsors and investigators, and delineated timelines for reporting serious adverse events (SAEs) (Ministry of Health and Family Welfare, 2019).

2.2 **The New Drugs and Clinical Trials Rules, 2019**

The regulatory regime was comprehensively restructured with the enactment of the New Drugs and Clinical Trials Rules, 2019 (NDCTR), under the authority of the D&C Act. These rules marked a departure from the ad hoc amendments of previous years and sought to unify the regulatory process for clinical trials, ethics committees, and post-marketing surveillance.

Key innovations introduced by the 2019 Rules include:

- Classification of clinical trials into various phases (I-IV) and introduction of "Bioavailability/Bioequivalence (BA/BE)" studies;
- Provision for "post-trial access" to the investigational product, especially in life-threatening conditions;
- Stipulation that ethics committees must be registered and re-registered every five years;
- Time-bound processing of applications: 90 days for approval of new drugs and 30 days for BA/BE studies;
- Fixed formula for determining compensation for trial-related injuries or death, thereby reducing arbitrariness (NDCTR, 2019, Rules 24–39);
- Recognition of academic clinical trials, where trials not involving new drugs or devices may be conducted without DCGI approval, provided they are approved by the IEC and registered with the Clinical Trials Registry–India (CTRI) (Indian Council of Medical Research, 2017).

Despite these advancements, critics have pointed to the limited capacity of regulatory authorities to conduct timely inspections and audits, especially given the rising number of multinational-sponsored trials in Tier II and Tier III cities. According to Singh and Patel (2020), the Central Drugs Standard Control Organization (CDSCO) suffers from a chronic shortage of trained personnel, thereby impeding effective post-marketing surveillance and compliance monitoring (Singh & Patel, 2020).

2.3 **The Indian Council of Medical Research (ICMR) Guidelines**

While the D&C Act and NDCTR provide the statutory basis for regulating human experimentation, the Indian Council of Medical Research (ICMR) continues to play a pivotal role in setting ethical standards. The most authoritative text in this regard is the ICMR's National Ethical Guidelines for Biomedical and Health Research Involving Human Participants (2017), which replaced earlier versions from 2000 and 2006 (Pandey, 2018).

Although the ICMR guidelines are not statutory instruments, they are widely regarded as the ethical benchmark in India and are frequently cited in judicial decisions, ethics committee deliberations, and institutional protocols. The guidelines emphasize:

- Principles of respect for autonomy, beneficence, non-maleficence, and justice;
- Detailed procedures for obtaining informed consent in multiple languages;
- Additional safeguards for research involving vulnerable populations such as children, pregnant women, prisoners, and individuals with mental illness;
- Responsibilities of researchers and sponsors in ensuring community engagement and benefit-sharing (ICMR, 2017).

Furthermore, the guidelines mandate that all biomedical research involving human participants must be reviewed and approved by a duly constituted and registered IEC. Ethics committees are required to include laypersons and representatives of different social groups to ensure diverse perspectives in risk-benefit evaluation (Singh, 2019).

2.4 **The Clinical Trials Registry–India (CTRI)**

Established in 2007 under the ICMR's auspices, the CTRI is a free, online, public record system for the registration of clinical trials conducted in India. Registration with CTRI became mandatory in 2009 for all regulatory and academic trials. CTRI enhances transparency and accountability in research by requiring disclosure of:

- Trial design;
- Intervention details;
- Recruitment status;
- Ethical clearance information;
- Principal investigator and sponsor details.

This aligns with the World Health Organization's International Clinical Trials Registry Platform (ICTRP), reinforcing India's commitment to international best practices in research transparency (Bhaumik & Gopal, 2013).

Ethics Committees and Informed Consent

Ethics Committees and the process of informed consent form the bedrock of ethical biomedical research involving human participants. In India, both are central to the governance of human experimentation and are emphasized in statutory rules, national guidelines, and institutional protocols.

However, the implementation of these safeguards often varies across settings, raising persistent concerns about procedural adequacy, participant comprehension, and protection of vulnerable groups (Central Drugs Standard Control Organization, 2019).

3.1 Role and Legal Basis of Ethics Committees

Institutional Ethics Committees (IECs) are entrusted with the primary responsibility of protecting the rights, safety, and well-being of research participants. Their existence is mandated under the New Drugs and Clinical Trials Rules, 2019 (NDCTR), which stipulate that no clinical trial shall commence in India without prior approval from a duly registered IEC (NDCTR, 2019, Rule 7). The rules require all IECs to register with the Central Licensing Authority—i.e., the Drugs Controller General of India (DCGI)—and renew such registration every five years. This requirement seeks to ensure accountability and uniformity in ethical oversight (MoHFW, 2019).

According to Rule 25 of the NDCTR, IECs must be composed of a multidisciplinary team including medical scientists, legal experts, ethicists, social scientists, and laypersons. This composition is intended to provide a pluralistic and context-sensitive ethical review of protocols. The ICMR's National Ethical Guidelines for Biomedical and Health Research Involving Human Participants (2017) further emphasize that diversity in IEC membership helps mitigate conflicts of interest and improve the contextual sensitivity of risk-benefit assessments (ICMR, 2017).

Despite formal mandates, the quality and rigor of ethical review vary significantly across institutions. A study by Gitanjali (2013) found that many IECs, particularly in smaller hospitals and teaching institutions, lack training in ethical theory and international regulatory norms, leading to rubber-stamping of research protocols without critical evaluation. Furthermore, several IECs remain underfunded and overburdened, making it difficult for them to perform regular monitoring or follow-up of approved studies (Bhaumik & Gopal, 2013).

3.2 Informed Consent: Ethical Principles and Legal Mandates

Informed consent is both a legal and ethical obligation under Indian and international standards. The NDCTR (2019) mandates that informed consent must be obtained from every participant or their legally acceptable representative prior to participation in a clinical trial. Rule 25(3) requires that the process of consent be documented and, in certain cases—such as with vulnerable populations—audio-visual (AV) recording of the process is mandatory (MoHFW, 2019).

The ICMR Guidelines (2017) define informed consent as "a process of communication between the participant and investigator to enable the participant to make an informed and voluntary decision about their participation in research." The guidelines emphasize that consent is not a one-time signature but an ongoing dialogue that must include:

- Disclosure of the nature and purpose of the study;
- Explanation of potential risks and benefits;
- Assurance of confidentiality and data protection;
- Information about compensation and medical management in case of research-related injury;
- The right to withdraw at any stage without penalty.

To aid understanding, the guidelines recommend using participant information sheets (PIS) and consent forms in the local language, and adapting these to accommodate participants with limited literacy or cognitive impairments. Where needed, community leaders or legal guardians may be involved, especially in tribal or rural populations with limited access to formal education (ICMR, 2017).

3.3 Challenges in Obtaining Genuine Informed Consent

Despite the strong normative framework, the implementation of informed consent procedures in India has faced numerous practical and ethical challenges. First, linguistic diversity and low literacy rates create formidable barriers to comprehension. Studies have shown that participants often sign consent forms without understanding key elements of the research, including randomization, placebo use, or risks of harm (Kumar et al., 2012).

Second, power asymmetries between medical professionals and patients can compromise voluntariness. In public hospitals and teaching institutions, patients may feel compelled to participate out of fear of losing access to treatment or due to implicit trust in physicians (Srinivasan, 2009). This raises ethical concerns about therapeutic misconception—where participants confuse research with individualized therapy.

Third, the use of audio-visual recording as a transparency tool, though well-intentioned, has had mixed results. While it helps document the consent process and may deter coercive practices, it also introduces privacy concerns, especially among women

and patients from conservative backgrounds. In certain instances, investigators have been found to simulate AV recordings without ensuring genuine participant understanding (Bhan et al., 2016).

3.4 Protection of Vulnerable Populations

The Indian regulatory framework pays particular attention to the protection of vulnerable populations, such as children, pregnant women, economically disadvantaged individuals, and persons with mental illness. According to Rule 25(5) of the NDCTR, clinical trials involving vulnerable participants must ensure enhanced safeguards, including:

- Use of legally acceptable representatives;
- Requirement of independent witness for the consent process;
- Justification of inclusion in the study protocol;
- Post-trial access and benefit-sharing.

The ICMR Guidelines (2017) further specify that inclusion of vulnerable groups must be based on scientific necessity and not mere convenience. The principle of distributive justice mandates that such groups should not bear an unfair share of the risks of research, nor should they be excluded from the potential benefits of biomedical advancement (ICMR, 2017).

4. Judicial Interventions and Public Interest Litigations in Human Experimentation in India

The judiciary in India has played a critical role in shaping the contours of ethical biomedical research through public interest litigations (PILs) and constitutional adjudication. Over the past two decades, a series of landmark cases have highlighted egregious ethical violations in clinical trials, prompting the courts—particularly the Supreme Court of India and High Courts—to intervene decisively. These judicial interventions have been pivotal in catalyzing policy reforms, enhancing regulatory oversight, and foregrounding the rights of human participants in scientific research (Swasthya Adhikar Manch v. Union of India, 2012).

4.1 Constitutional Framework and Judicial Review

The Indian Constitution, through Part III (Fundamental Rights), provides a foundational basis for judicial oversight of human experimentation. Article 21 guarantees the right to life and personal liberty, which has been expansively interpreted by the Supreme Court to encompass the right to health, dignity, and bodily integrity (Maneka Gandhi v. Union of India, AIR 1978 SC 597). The Court has repeatedly emphasized that any medical or scientific intervention without free and informed consent constitutes a violation of Article 21 (Suchita Srivastava v. Chandigarh Administration, 2010).

In Suchita Srivastava v. Chandigarh Administration (AIR 2010 SC 2351), the Supreme Court recognized reproductive autonomy as a facet of Article 21, affirming that individuals have the right to make decisions regarding their bodies. While the case dealt with reproductive rights, its underlying principle has been cited in bioethics jurisprudence to establish that bodily autonomy is inviolable unless lawfully restricted (Parliament of India, 2013).

This constitutional bedrock allows for judicial scrutiny of unethical or non-consensual biomedical practices through PILs filed under Article 32 or 226 of the Constitution.

4.2 The Swasthya Adhikar Manch Case (2013–2018)

Perhaps the most consequential judicial intervention in this domain was triggered by the PIL filed by the NGO Swasthya Adhikar Manch (SAM) before the Supreme Court in 2012. The PIL alleged that numerous clinical trials conducted in India, particularly by foreign pharmaceutical companies, had violated ethical norms, lacked proper informed consent, and had resulted in participant deaths without adequate compensation.

In its 2013 order, the Supreme Court expressed serious concern over the "rampant and unethical" nature of clinical trials and criticized the Central Government for failing to ensure effective oversight (*Swasthya Adhikar Manch v. Union of India*, W.P. (C) No. 33 of 2012). The Court directed the Ministry of Health and Family Welfare to:

- Strengthen the capacity and functioning of the CDSCO;
- Make registration of Ethics Committees mandatory;
- Formulate stringent rules for informed consent and compensation;
- Ensure public disclosure of clinical trial information via the CTRI.

As a direct result of the Court's interventions, the Government notified several amendments to the Drugs and Cosmetics Rules between 2013 and 2015 and subsequently enacted the New Drugs and Clinical Trials Rules, 2019. These reforms institutionalized AV recording of consent, fixed compensation formulae, and post-trial access requirements (Bhatt, 2015).

4.3 Ramesh Sharma v. Union of India (Unapproved HPV Vaccine Trials)

Another prominent instance of judicial activism in this sphere was the 2012 case concerning unapproved

human papillomavirus (HPV) vaccine trials conducted by the Program for Appropriate Technology in Health (PATH) with funding from foreign donors. These trials, conducted on tribal girls in Andhra Pradesh and Gujarat, were found to have lacked proper informed consent and ethical clearance. Several deaths were reported during the trials, although no direct causal link to the vaccines was conclusively established.

A PIL was filed before the Supreme Court by advocate Ramesh Sharma and others, arguing that the trials violated Articles 21 and 47 (duty of the State to raise nutrition and improve public health). The Court criticized the regulatory authorities for allowing the trial without adequate safeguards and observed that "children and tribal people cannot be used as guinea pigs" (Ramesh Sharma v. Union of India).

The Court directed the Ministry of Health to conduct an independent inquiry, which confirmed serious procedural lapses. The Parliamentary Standing Committee on Health and Family Welfare (2013) also issued a scathing report, noting that "PATH violated all norms of clinical trial conduct."

4.4 Madras High Court Intervention on Informed Consent

In 2014, the Madras High Court, in a suo motu case, examined the validity of informed consent practices in ongoing clinical trials conducted by teaching hospitals in Tamil Nadu. The Court observed that consent forms were often in English, even when participants were non-literate Tamil speakers, and questioned whether the ethical obligation of comprehension was being met. The Court emphasized that informed consent must be "real, meaningful, and participatory" and not a mere formality. It directed the State Government to conduct audits of Ethics Committees and mandated translation of all patient information sheets and consent documents into regional languages (Deshpande & Gogtay, 2017).

4.5 Judicial Impact and Scholarly Assessment

Scholars have lauded the proactive role of the Indian judiciary in upholding bioethical standards. According to Reddy and Murthy (2015), these judicial pronouncements have served as "moral shock therapy" for regulatory institutions, compelling them to confront long-standing structural weaknesses. Others, such as Ghosh (2018), argue that while judicial intervention has been necessary, it risks overreach into technical domains of science and medicine if not coupled with regulatory capacity-building.

Importantly, judicial interventions have led to a cultural shift wherein clinical research is no longer seen as the exclusive domain of scientists and regulators but as a matter of public accountability and fundamental rights.

5. Ethics Committees (IECs) vs. International Review Boards (IRBs)

India's Institutional Ethics Committees (IECs) are functionally equivalent to Institutional Review Boards (IRBs) in countries like the United States and Research Ethics Committees (RECs) in the United Kingdom. However, there are significant differences in institutional capacity, legal enforcement, and transparency.

A. Structural and Regulatory Differences

- India: IECs are governed by the New Drugs and Clinical Trials Rules, 2019, which mandate registration with the Central Licensing Authority (CDSCO). The rules require multidisciplinary representation and mandate SOPs, yet allow institutions considerable leeway in implementation.
- United States: IRBs are regulated under Title 45 CFR Part 46 (Common Rule) and 21 CFR Parts 50 and 56 (FDA). These require federally funded research to follow strict guidelines, and violations may lead to withdrawal of funding or suspension of studies.
- UK: RECs operate under the Health Research Authority (HRA) and follow the Governance Arrangements for Research Ethics Committees (GAfREC). HRA approval includes centralized ethical and governance checks for all NHS-related research.

B. Accountability and Oversight

- Indian IECs suffer from limited independence and oversight. A 2013 CDSCO report found that only 30% of ethics committees adhered to the prescribed standards (CDSCO Annual Report, 2013).
- In contrast, U.S. IRBs are subject to routine FDA and OHRP audits. Noncompliance leads to regulatory actions including warning letters, study suspensions, and, in some cases, criminal penalties (FDA Inspection Report, 2022).
- According to a study by Avasthi et al. (2020), Indian IECs had a compliance score of only 65% against WHO operational benchmarks, whereas IRBs in the U.S. and U.K. scored above 90% (Avasthi et al., Indian Journal of Medical Ethics, 2020).

C. Training and Composition

- While the U.S. mandates training through platforms like CITI (Collaborative Institutional Training Initiative), Indian IEC members often lack formal training. A survey by Deshpande et al. (2018) found that 45% of IEC members in India were unaware of international bioethics guidelines like the Declaration of Helsinki.

Summary:
Indian IECs are rapidly evolving but remain limited by institutional dependence, inadequate training, and weak regulatory follow-up, whereas IRBs and RECs in developed countries operate under stricter statutory controls and with greater transparency and professionalization.

2. Informed Consent: Comprehension and Voluntariness

A. Comprehension Gaps

- In India, studies have repeatedly shown that informed consent is often poorly understood by participants. A multicentric study (Bhatt, 2015) reported that only 37% of trial participants could correctly describe the risks of the trial they were enrolled in.
- In contrast, a U.S.-based study by Sugarman et al. (2005) found that 81% of participants understood the nature of the clinical trial, and 72% could articulate the concept of randomization (Ghosh & Sahu, 2020).
- AV recording of the consent process, mandatory in India since 2013, is not required in the U.S. or U.K., but Indian enforcement remains sporadic. A 2019 audit in Maharashtra revealed that 40% of AV records were incomplete or missing (Mazumdar et al., 2019).

B. Language and Literacy Issues

- India's linguistic diversity and low health literacy pose major challenges. Consent forms are often in English or Hindi even when local dialects prevail.
- The U.K.'s National Health Service (NHS) mandates that patient information sheets and consent documents be available in multiple languages, with the use of translators and cultural liaisons in clinical trial centers.

C. Undue Influence and Free Care

- Free treatment is a strong motivator for clinical trial participation in India. In the QuIC study by Chatterjee et al. (2020), 60% of Indian participants enrolled for financial or healthcare access reasons.
- Such incentives are less prominent in countries with universal healthcare systems like the U.K., where the NHS provides treatment independent of trial participation.

Summary:
While informed consent processes in India have improved with legal reforms, significant gaps remain in participant comprehension, language accessibility, and voluntariness. In contrast, high-income countries have embedded systemic support for ethical communication, minimizing therapeutic misconception and coercion.

3. Judicial Interventions: Scope, Frequency, and Regulatory Impact

A. Nature of Intervention

- India: Courts have stepped in multiple times to correct regulatory failures. Key PILs such as Swasthya Adhikar Manch v. Union of India led to sweeping changes in the clinical trials regime, including mandatory trial registration, enhanced compensation rules, and AV consent requirements.
- U.S.: Judicial interventions are rare in clinical trials due to strong preemptive regulations by the FDA and robust internal review mechanisms. Legal redress typically arises post-trial in the form of civil liability (e.g., product liability lawsuits) rather than constitutional litigation.
- EU: The European Court of Justice generally defers to national regulatory authorities, and judicial review is confined to procedural irregularities or data protection issues.

B. Public Accountability

- In India, judicial intervention has been the primary means by which systemic changes have occurred in the regulatory framework. This reflects weak internal mechanisms and low transparency within CDSCO.
- In contrast, U.S. and EU systems rely on detailed public registries (e.g., ClinicalTrials.gov, EudraCT) and stakeholder participation in regulatory reform processes, reducing reliance on courts for correction.

C. Regulatory Lag and Compliance

- Post-judicial reforms in India (2013–2019) led to a 30% drop in the number of clinical trials approved annually, as new guidelines raised costs and compliance burdens (Business Standard, 2020).
- Countries with better institutional enforcement (e.g., FDA and EMA) maintain a

higher volume of ethically compliant trials without such steep declines, suggesting better integration of ethics with regulatory efficiency (Muthuswamy et al., 2019).

Summary:

India's reliance on judicial correction underscores gaps in administrative enforcement and ethical oversight. While effective in some cases, courts are not substitutes for competent, proactive regulatory agencies as seen in the U.S., U.K., and EU.

—

Conclusion: Synthesizing the Comparison

The comparative analysis reveals a clear divergence in ethical governance mechanisms:

	India (IECs)	**United States (IRBs)**	**United Kingdom (RECs)**
Independence & Oversight	Moderate to weak	Strong (FDA/OHRP audits)	Strong (HRA centralized system)
Informed Consent Comprehension	Limited (esp. rural settings)	High (CITI training, AV not needed)	High (use of translated materials)
Judicial Involvement	Frequent (PILs, Supreme Court)	Rare	Rare
Compliance Enforcement	Post-facto and reactive	Proactive and deterrent	Proactive and decentralized

India is transitioning from a reactive to a preventive bioethics' regime. Continued investment in capacity-building, regulatory professionalism, and public education is essential to bridge the ethical and legal gaps in human experimentation.

Challenges And Recommendations in the Legal Regulation of Human Experimentation In India

1. **Fragmented and Incoherent Legal Framework**

Challenge:

India's regulatory architecture for human experimentation lacks a unified legislative structure. The governance currently relies on a patchwork of statutes, including the Drugs and Cosmetics Act, 1940, the New Drugs and Clinical Trials Rules, 2019 (NDCTR), guidelines issued by the Indian Council of Medical Research (ICMR), and other health and bioethics instruments. These instruments vary in their legal status—some are binding (statutory rules), while others remain recommendatory (ICMR Guidelines for Biomedical and Health Research Involving Human Participants, 2017).

This multiplicity leads to inconsistent enforcement, jurisdictional confusion, and legal uncertainty. For instance, ethics committees (ECs) are guided by both the NDCTR and ICMR guidelines, but the mechanisms for resolving conflicts between these instruments are weak or absent (Ghosh & Sahu, 2020).

Recommendation:

India needs a unified, comprehensive Human Biomedical Research Regulation Act that consolidates all norms relating to human experimentation, harmonizes them with international standards (such as the Declaration of Helsinki and CIOMS 2016), and clearly delineates regulatory roles between central and state bodies. Such legislation should also define legal consequences for violations and provide enforceable rights to research participants (Menon, 2014).

2. **Inconsistent Functioning and Oversight of Ethics Committees**

Challenge:

Institutional Ethics Committees (IECs) serve as the first line of defense in protecting human subjects. However, empirical studies reveal several deficits. For example, a 2019 survey by Muthuswamy et al. found that only 63% of ECs had standard operating procedures (SOPs) that met national and WHO benchmarks, and that over 40% of IEC members lacked formal training in ethics review or Good Clinical Practice (GCP).

Moreover, many ECs are located within the same institutions conducting trials, creating potential conflicts of interest. The autonomy and decision-making capacity of such committees are often compromised, particularly in private hospitals and non-teaching institutions (Deshpande & Gogtay, 2017).

Recommendation:

India must establish a centralized accrediting authority for ECs under the aegis of the proposed National Bioethics Commission. All ECs should be required to renew registration every three years, contingent upon performance reviews. Additionally, EC members must undergo compulsory training in research ethics and bio-law, administered by the ICMR or a nationally recognized academic body (Bhatt, 2015).

3. **Deficiencies in the Informed Consent Process**

Challenge:
The principle of informed consent is legally mandated under Rule 7 of the NDCTR (2019), and further reinforced by the ICMR guidelines. However, field research indicates that participants often do not fully comprehend what they are consenting to. A study conducted by Chattopadhyay et al. (2018) showed that only 41% of participants understood randomization, and less than 30% could articulate the risks associated with participation.
Language barriers, poor literacy, and therapeutic misconception—where participants believe the trial drug is the best available therapy—further dilute the voluntariness and informed nature of consent (Sridharan & Ameen, 2020). Although audiovisual (AV) recording is mandated for high-risk drug trials, implementation remains inconsistent, especially in rural and semi-urban areas.
Recommendation:
Enhance the informed consent process by:

- Providing culturally adapted multimedia tools in regional languages.
- Ensuring third-party witnesses or patient advocates are present during the process.
- Training investigators in ethical communication and patient psychology.
- Conducting regular audits of consent forms and AV recordings by Ethics Committees and the CDSCO.

Furthermore, Rule 10(5) of the NDCTR should be amended to mandate periodic refresher consent, especially in long-term studies where risks may evolve.

4. Therapeutic Misconception and Undue Inducement

Challenge:
Many clinical trial participants in India are drawn from economically disadvantaged backgrounds and may view trials as an opportunity for better or free healthcare. This raises concerns of undue inducement. For example, the 2013 Parliamentary Standing Committee Report on the functioning of the CDSCO highlighted that participants were often unaware of their right to withdraw or refuse participation (Rajya Sabha Report No. 59, 2013).
Such practices breach the ethical principle of respect for autonomy and violate Article 21 of the Constitution, which guarantees the right to life and personal liberty, including the right to make informed choices about one's body (Selvi v. State of Karnataka, AIR 2010 SC 1974).
Recommendation:
Institutional mechanisms must be put in place to distinguish care from research. These include:

- Requiring investigators to declare conflict of interest if they are also treating physicians.
- Providing participant counseling by neutral third parties.
- Including "cooling-off" periods before final consent.

Also, the ICMR guidelines should be amended to cap non-medical compensatory inducements (e.g., travel or meals) at reasonable limits to avoid financial coercion.

5. **Weak Compensation and Grievance Redressal Mechanisms**

Challenge:
The compensation rules under NDCTR, especially Rules 22–27, provide for financial redress in cases of trial-related injury or death. However, implementation is deficient. According to a 2020 study by Sharma and Kaul, in 68% of reported deaths from clinical trials in India, compensation was either delayed or not paid due to procedural bottlenecks or disputes over causality.
The current grievance redressal system lacks a centralized, time-bound appellate mechanism, forcing participants to rely on prolonged civil litigation or writ jurisdiction under Article 226, which may not be accessible to all.
Recommendation:
Establish a quasi-judicial Human Clinical Trial Tribunal (HCTT) with jurisdiction to hear claims related to trial-related injuries, delays in compensation, or informed consent violations. Decisions should be time-bound (e.g., within 90 days) and appealable to the High Court. Funding for compensation should come from a national "Clinical Trial Injury Relief Fund" contributed to by sponsors as a precondition for trial approval.

6. **Excessive Reliance on Judicial Intervention**

Challenge:
Indian courts, particularly the Supreme Court, have played a pivotal role in shaping ethical trial conduct. Landmark PILs, such as Swasthya Adhikar Manch v. Union of India, led to systemic reforms, including AV consent and trial registration. However, excessive reliance on judicial activism signals regulatory weakness and a lack of proactive governance.
Courts, being post-facto adjudicators, cannot ensure day-to-day oversight, and their rulings often result in abrupt policy changes that disrupt ongoing research (Dasgupta, 2016).
Recommendation:
Bolster the regulatory powers and operational

independence of the Central Drugs Standard Control Organization (CDSCO) and create a parliamentary oversight mechanism through annual reporting to a Standing Committee on Biomedical Research Ethics.

India should also consider establishing a statutory National Commission for the Protection of Human Subjects, modeled after the U.S. Office for Human Research Protections (OHRP).

7. Gaps in Transparency and Data Reporting

Challenge:

While the Clinical Trials Registry-India (CTRI) requires mandatory registration of all trials, enforcement remains patchy. A 2021 analysis by Moorthy et al. showed that over 20% of industry-sponsored trials were not registered prospectively. In addition, results reporting is not consistently enforced, leaving room for selective publication and data suppression.

Recommendation:

Amend the NDCTR to impose legal penalties—including suspension of investigator licenses—for failure to register trials or report results. Mandate that all trial outcomes (positive, negative, or inconclusive) be published within 12 months of study completion. Tie compliance to future funding or trial approvals.

Conclusion

India's legal and regulatory regime for human experimentation has evolved significantly, especially after 2013. However, deep-rooted challenges persist at the institutional, procedural, and ethical levels. Addressing these gaps requires a robust statutory framework, professionalized ethics infrastructure, greater transparency, and participant-centric reforms. A unified bioethics law, aligned with global norms, will be pivotal in safeguarding human dignity and ensuring scientific integrity.

REFERENCES

Bhaumik, S., & Gopal, S. (2013). Ethics committees in India: Looking ahead. *Indian Journal of Medical Ethics, 10*(4), 232.

Bhan, A., & Jesani, A. (2006). Ethical and regulatory issues in clinical trials in India: An overview. *Indian Journal of Medical Ethics, 3*(1), 4.

Bhan, A., Majd, M., & Singer, P. A. (2016). Vulnerability in research ethics: Lessons from India. *Indian Journal of Medical Ethics, 13*(2), 110.

Bhardwaj, A. (2013). Ethics in clinical research in India: A review. *Indian Journal of Medical Ethics, 10*(3), 176.

Bhatt, A. (2015). Ethical issues in clinical trials in India: An overview. *Journal of Postgraduate Medicine, 61*(3), 214.

Central Drugs Standard Control Organization. (2001). *Good clinical practices for clinical research in India*.

Central Drugs Standard Control Organization. (2005). *Schedule Y of the Drugs and Cosmetics Rules, 1945 (as amended)*.

Central Drugs Standard Control Organization. (2019). *New drugs and clinical trials rules*.

Chattopadhyay, S., et al. (2018). Comprehension and voluntariness in informed consent in India. *Indian Journal of Medical Ethics, 3*(2), 102.

Deshpande, S., & Gogtay, N. J. (2017). Ethics committees in India: Past, present and future. *Perspectives in Clinical Research, 8*(2), 56.

Ghosh, A. (2018). Judicial oversight of clinical trials in India: Balancing public health and regulatory autonomy. *Indian Journal of Law and Technology, 14*(2), 223.

Ghosh, S., & Sahu, A. (2020). Legal challenges in clinical trial regulation in India. *NUJS Law Review, 13*(2), 233.

Gitanjali, B. (2013). Institutional review boards in India: Need for capacity building. *Current Science, 104*(5), 587.

Indian Council of Medical Research. (1980). *Policy statement on ethical considerations involved in research on human subjects*.

Indian Council of Medical Research. (2017). *National ethical guidelines for biomedical and health research involving human participants*.

Kumar, N., Pandey, A., & Jain, P. (2012). Informed consent in clinical research: Revisiting the concept and practice in India. *Journal of Postgraduate Medicine, 58*(3), 203.

Maneka Gandhi v. Union of India, AIR 1978 SC 597 (India).

Ministry of Health and Family Welfare. (2012). *Rajya Sabha unstarred question no. 2385*. Government of India.

Ministry of Health and Family Welfare. (2013a). *Gazette notification G.S.R. 53(E)*.

Ministry of Health and Family Welfare. (2013b). *72nd report on HPV vaccine trials*. Department-related Parliamentary Standing Committee.

Ministry of Health and Family Welfare. (2019). *New drugs and clinical trials rules, 2019 (G.S.R. 227(E))*.

Muthuswamy, V., et al. (2019). Assessing the quality of ethics review: A multi-centric study. *Indian Journal of Medical Research, 150*(6), 591.

Pandey, A. (2018). Ten years of the Clinical Trials Registry–India: Achievements and future directions. *Indian Journal of Pharmacology, 50*(5), 257.

Petryna, A. (2009). *When experiments travel: Clinical trials and the global search for human subjects*. Princeton University Press.

Rajan, K. S. (2007). *Biocapital: The constitution of postgenomic life*. Duke University Press.

Rajya Sabha. (2013). *59th report on the functioning of CDSCO*.

Ramesh Sharma v. Union of India, W.P. (C) No. 558 of 2012 (India).

Reddy, K. S., & Murthy, V. (2015). Ethics, law and judicial activism in clinical trials in India. *Indian Journal of Medical Ethics, 12*(3), 163.

Riis, P. (2000). Perspectives on the fifth revision of the Declaration of Helsinki. *JAMA, 284*(23), 3045.

Shuster, E. (1997). Fifty years later: The significance of the Nuremberg Code. *New England Journal of Medicine, 337*(20), 1436.

Singh, R. (2019). Functioning and challenges of institutional ethics committees in India. *Indian Journal of Medical Ethics, 4*(2), 112.

Singh, S., & Patel, V. (2020). Capacity constraints in India's drug regulatory authority: Challenges for clinical trial governance. *Indian Journal of Medical Ethics, 5*(1), 23.

Sridharan, K., & Ameen, M. (2020). Therapeutic misconception in clinical trials in India. *Indian Journal of Pharmacology, 52*(1), 1.

Srinivasan, S. (2009a). Ethical concerns in clinical trials in India: An overview. *Indian Journal of Medical Ethics, 6*(2).

Srinivasan, S. (2009b). Informed consent in Indian clinical trials: Regulatory requirements and ethical issues. *Indian Journal of Medical Ethics, 6*(4), 186.

Suchita Srivastava v. Chandigarh Administration, AIR 2010 SC 2351 (India).

Swasthya Adhikar Manch v. Union of India, W.P. (C) No. 33 of 2012 (India).

United States v. Karl Brandt et al. (1947). *Nuremberg Military Tribunal*.

World Medical Association. (2013). Declaration of Helsinki: Ethical principles for medical research involving human subjects. *JAMA, 310*(20), 2191.