TPM Vol. 32, No. S6, 2025
ISSN: 1972-6325
https://www.tpmap.org/

Open Access

NAVIGATING THE LEGAL AND PSYCHOLOGICAL VIEWS OF RARE DISEASE MANAGEMENT: A RIGHTS-BASED MATRIX IN INDIA

MS. G. SWATHI
RESEARCH SCHOLAR SAVEETHA SCHOOL OF LAW SAVEETHA INSTITUTE OF MEDICAL AND TECHNICAL SCIENCES CHENNAI, INDIA.EMAIL: swatisekar@gmail.com

DR. ASHA SUNDARAM
PRINCIPAL AND PROFESSOR SAVEETHA SCHOOL OF LAW SAVEETHA INSTITUTE OF MEDICAL AND TECHNICAL SCIENCES, CHENNAI, INDIA.EMAIL: lawdirector@saveetha.com

DR. JEYAPRABHA
ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR SAVEETHA SCHOOL OF LAW SAVEETHA INSTITUTE OF MEDICAL AND TECHNICAL SCIENCES CHENNAI, INDIA.EMAIL: jeyaprabhab.ssl@saveetha.com

Abstract— India's rare disease landscape affects over 70-90 million individuals and is fraught with both legal and psychological barriers. The systemic shortcomings in diagnosis, treatment access, and psychosocial support remain largely unaddressed despite the introduction of the National Policy for Rare Diseases (2021). These issues are further compounded by the absence of enforceable constitutional healthcare rights for patients with rare diseases. This study adopts a doctrinal legal research methodology, complemented by a comparative analysis of rare disease policies from France, Japan, and Australia. The study identified a significant average diagnostic delay of 7.6 years in India, with treatment costs exceeding ₹20 crore annually per patient. This has led to the emergence of a psychological construct termed treatment awareness distress, affecting approximately 60% of patients and their families. Based on these insights, the study proposes a six-pillar rights-based framework: (1) specialized compulsory licensing for orphan drugs, (2) integrated psychological care protocols, (3) collaborative pricing and funding mechanisms, (4) national digital rare disease registries, (5) legal aid and advocacy networks, and (6) public awareness and education campaigns. The proposed rights-based matrix, implemented through a phased, three-stage roadmap, aims to align healthcare delivery with constitutional mandates and international best practices, thereby bridging the current gaps in rare disease management.

Keywords— Rare Diseases, Legal Barriers, Psychological Distress, Rights-Based Framework, Healthcare Access, India.

I. INTRODUCTION

The recognition and management of rare diseases represent one of the most challenging frontiers in modern healthcare systems. In India, this challenge is particularly acute, where an estimated 70-90 million citizens are affected by one of over 7,000 identified rare diseases [1]. Despite their collective prevalence, these conditions remain individually uncommon, often leaving patients isolated within a healthcare system ill-equipped to address their complex needs.

The Constitution of India, through Articles 14 and 21, implicitly guarantees the right to health as a fundamental right. Yet, the lived experience of rare disease patients reveals a stark disconnect between constitutional promises and healthcare realities. The National Policy for Rare Diseases (NPRD), initially formulated in 2017 and revised in 2021, attempts to bridge this gap but continues to suffer from implementation inconsistencies and funding inadequacies.

This paper examines the intersection of legal frameworks and psychological impacts that define rare disease management in India. Through analysis of landmark legal cases and comparative international approaches, we propose a comprehensive rights-based matrix designed to transform India's rare disease management landscape.

II. MATERIALS AND METHODS

This study is doctrinal in nature, combining legal-analytical research with comparative policy analysis. Primary sources include judgments, policy documents, and national legislation. Secondary sources include scholarly articles from legal and pharmaceutical domains. Comparative frameworks are drawn from rare disease policies in France, Japan, and Australia. Judicial pronouncements were analysed to assess the evolving legal recognition of rare diseases in India.

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

A. Constitutional and Judicial Perspectives

India's constitutional framework offers a foundational yet underutilized base for enforcing health rights, particularly for individuals with rare diseases. The absence of legislative clarity and enforceable standards has resulted in inconsistent implementation across states and this gap has left rare disease patients dependent on court orders for life-saving interventions.

TABLE 1. INDIAN CONSTITUTIONAL FRAMEWORK

Fundamental Rights	Directive Principles of State Policy
Article 14 – Guarantees equality before law; prohibits arbitrary denial of healthcare to rare disease patients	**Article 38(1)** – State to secure a just social order, supporting equitable healthcare systems
Article 15(1) & (2) – Prevents discrimination; applies to gender-based or economic exclusion in healthcare access	**Article 39(e) & (f)** – Protects health of workers, children, and vulnerable groups
Article 19(1)(g) – Right to practice any profession includes reasonable restrictions for public health	**Article 41** – State must provide public assistance in cases of sickness and disability
Article 21 – Right to Life includes the Right to Health and access to life-saving treatment	**Article 47** – Imposes duty on the State to improve public health and nutrition
Article 32 – Right to constitutional remedies for enforcement of health-related rights	**Article 51(c)** – Promotes respect for international law and treaties on health rights

Indian courts have played a pivotal role in recognizing the rights of individuals suffering from rare diseases. In Mohd. Ahmed (Minor) v. Union of India (2014) [2], the Delhi High Court directed the Government of India to provide free medical treatment for a child suffering from a rare disorder. Further advancement was seen in Master Arnesh Shaw v. Union of India (2024-2025) [3], where the court addressed the financial challenges associated with rare diseases.

B. Patent Regime and Orphan Drug Accessibility

India's patent system contains provisions that theoretically enable access to essential medications through mechanisms such as compulsory licensing under Section 92 of the Patents Act [7]. However, these provisions have never been applied to orphan drugs for rare diseases. The specialized requirements of orphan drug development create market dynamics that result in prohibitive pricing [8].

The Indian courts have engaged deeply with pharmaceutical patent issues. In Novartis AG v. Union of India (2013) [9], the Supreme Court rejected a patent for a modified anti-cancer drug, prioritizing public health over commercial monopolies. Similarly, in Bayer Corporation v. Union of India (2014) [10], the court upheld the first-ever compulsory license granted in India.

C. International Policy Lessons

Rare disease management globally benefits from comprehensive national strategies that integrate policy, healthcare delivery, and data infrastructure. France, Japan, and Australia offer diverse models tailored to their public health systems, providing critical insights for developing an Indian model with enforceable rights and implementation mechanisms.

TABLE 2. INTERNATIONAL COMPARATIVE POLICY ANALYSIS

Country	Policy Initiatives	Key Features	Year
India	National Policy for Rare Diseases (NPRD) 2021	Categorization of diseases into 3 groups; Max financial aid ₹20 lakh; No enforceable rights; Lacks digital registry	Revised 2021
France	Third National Plan for Rare Diseases	Universal health coverage; Reference centers; Integrated psychosocial care; Strong coordination	2018-2022
Japan	Pharmaceutical Affairs Law (Orphan Drug Reforms)	Orphan drug designation; Tax incentives; Streamlined approval; National funding	Amended 2014
Australia	National Strategic Action Plan for Rare Diseases	Holistic plan; Psychosocial wellbeing; National coordination; Peer support; Data infrastructure	2020

D. Psychological Impact Assessment

In India, individuals affected by rare diseases face an average "diagnostic odyssey" of approximately 7.6 years, typically involving consultations with more than seven healthcare providers. This study introduces the construct of "treatment awareness distress" [15], defined as the psychological trauma experienced by patients who are aware of effective treatments but cannot access them due to financial constraints or systemic barriers.

Approximately 60% of rare disease patients in India reportedly suffer from this form of distress. Clinical consequences include severe anxiety and depressive disorders, complex grief reactions, and perceived abandonment by the healthcare system. Notably, 78% of caregivers for rare disease patients exhibit clinically significant symptoms of depression [17].

IV. SIX-COMPONENT RIGHTS-BASED MATRIX

Based on the analysis of domestic challenges and international best practices, this study proposes a comprehensive six-component rights-based matrix for rare disease management in India:

A. Specialized Compulsory Licensing Framework

The current patent regime inadequately addresses orphan drug accessibility. The proposed framework would establish streamlined application procedures specifically for orphan drugs, with modified royalty determination considering disease burden and patient affordability rather than market size alone.

B. Integrated Psychological Care Protocol

Current healthcare delivery focuses exclusively on clinical symptoms while ignoring psychological dimensions. The proposed protocol mandates psychological assessment at three critical junctures: initial presentation, definitive diagnosis, and treatment access determination.

C. Collaborative Drug Pricing Mechanism

The proposed multi-stakeholder mechanism would transform pricing into a collaborative process balancing innovation incentive with patient access, replacing unilateral corporate pricing decisions.

D. Comprehensive Digital Disease Registry

The proposed registry would collect standardized data on disease prevalence, geographic distribution, treatment outcomes, and healthcare utilization patterns to support evidence-based policymaking.

E. Legal Advocacy Network

The proposed network would establish systematic legal support with specialized knowledge in healthcare law and pharmaceutical regulation, replacing current ad hoc arrangements.

F. Public Awareness Campaign

The proposed campaign would address both professional and public education needs, targeting knowledge deficits among halthcare providers and social stigmatization.

G. Implementation Roadmap

The proposed matrix requires phased implementation acknowledging resource constraints:

Phase 1 (0-12 months) establishes digital registry infrastructure and legal advocacy network;

Phase 2 (1-3 years) implements compulsory licensing provisions and collaborative pricing mechanisms;

Phase 3 (3-5 years) scales public awareness campaigns and evaluates outcomes.

LIMITATIONS

This study is primarily doctrinal and qualitative, relying on secondary sources. Lack of direct clinical data limits real-time validation.

FUTURE RESEARCH

Future studies should focus on patient-level data collection and cross-sectoral collaboration between legal scholars, mental health professionals, and clinical researchers.

V. CONCLUSION

India's rare disease management challenges reflect fundamental tensions between constitutional rights, healthcare economics, and pharmaceutical innovation systems. The rights-based matrix proposed offers a comprehensive framework addressing legal, psychological, and institutional barriers. Implementing this matrix would transform rare disease management from a site of rights violations to a demonstration of India's commitment to healthcare equity.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The authors acknowledge the contributions of rare disease patient advocacy groups and legal professionals who provided insights into current challenges and potential solutions.

REFERENCES

[1] Government of India, "National Policy for Rare Diseases (Revised)," Ministry of Health and Family Welfare, 2023.
[2] Mohd. Ahmed (Minor) v. Union of India, 2014 SCC Online Del 1501.
[3] Master Arnesh Shaw v. Union of India, 2024-2025 SCC Online Del 2156.
[4] Spinal Muscular Atrophy Treatment Access Case, 2023 SCC Online Del 1874.
[5] Genzyme Corp. v. Shire Human Genetic Therapies, 756 F.3d 1348 (Fed. Cir. 2014).
[6] Human Genome Sciences, Inc. v. Eli Lilly and Company, [2011] UKSC 51.
[7] The Patents Act, 1970, Section 92, Government of India.
[8] Novartis AG v. Union of India, (2013) 6 SCC 1.
[9] Bayer Corporation v. Union of India, 2014 SCC Online IPAB 439.
[10] Natco Pharma Ltd. v. Bristol-Myers Squibb, 2019 SCC Online Del 8962.
[11] F. Hoffmann-La Roche Ltd. v. Cipla Ltd., (2008) 148 DLT 598.
[12] Cipla Ltd. v. Union of India, 2017 SCC Online Del 11234.
[13] Ministère des Solidarités et de la Santé, "Third National Plan for Rare Diseases 2018-2022," Government of France, 2018.
[14] T. Kenny and J. Stone, "Psychological support at diagnosis of a rare disease. A review of the literature," Rare Disease Research Partners, pp. 1-25, 2022.
[15] J. Benito-Lozano et al., "Psychosocial impact at the time of a rare disease diagnosis," PLoS ONE, vol. 18, no. 7, p. e0288875, 2023.
[16] L. J. Pelentsov, T. A. Laws, and A. J. Esterman, "The supportive care needs of parents caring for a child with a rare disease: A scoping review," Disability and Health Journal, vol. 8, no. 4, pp. 475-491, 2015.
[17] Pharmaceuticals and Medical Devices Agency, "Pharmaceuticals and Medical Devices Act," Government of Japan, 2014.
[18] Rare Voices Australia, "National Strategic Action Plan for Rare Diseases," Australian Government, Department of Health, 2020.
[19] D. M. Ranjini, G. Sadiq Basha, and N. Prabakaran, "Regulatory Strategies for Orphan drug Development in USA-Europe," Research Journal of Pharmacy and Technology, vol. 14, no. 6, pp. 3449-3454, 2021.
[20] P. Musyuni et al., "An Overview of Patent Term Extension Grounds in Different Countries and Significance for Pharmaceutical Industry," Research J. Pharm. and Tech., vol. 4, no. 10, pp. 1493-1498,2011