Journal of Informatics Education and Research
ISSN: 1526-4726
Vol 5 Issue 3 (2025)

Public Health Emergency Laws: A Comparative Legal Review of Uttarakhand and Best Practice States in India.

Upreti P.[1], Alam T.[2]
[1]School of Law, Research Scholar, UPES, India Email- preetiupreti310@gmail.com
[2]School of Law, Assistant Professor, UPES, India. Email- talam@ddn.upes.ac.in

Abstract
The COVID-19 pandemic highlighted significant deficiencies in India's governance of public health emergencies, particularly at the state level where implementation responsibilities are concentrated. This research does a comparative legal review of Uttarakhand's public health emergency framework compared to model states like Kerala and Tamil Nadu, which are recognized for having thorough and rights-oriented health legislation. Based on Lawrence O. Gostin's Public Health Law Theory as the framework of evaluation, the paper analyzes legal preparedness, administrative clarity, enforcement tools, and rights protection under state statutes. The study suggests that Uttarakhand remains reliant on old colonial legislation, including the Epidemic Diseases Act of 1897 and the Disaster Management Act of 2005. These are not specific, flexible, or procedurally secure. In sharp contrast, Kerala's Public Health Act of 2023 and the amended Tamil Nadu Public Health Act of 1939 present customized and integrated legal constructs that support these decentralized, prevention-focused, and timely moral public health interventions. The paper highlights the utmost urgency for Uttarakhand to develop a specialized and revised Public Health Law that learns from the legislative innovations and institutional models adopted by its peer states. Recommendations involve incorporating multi-level governance mechanisms, community participation, improved surveillance infrastructure, and intrinsic rights guarantees to provide timely, effective, and equitable interventions for addressing subsequent public health emergencies.

Keywords: Public Health Emergency Laws, Comparative Analysis, Uttarakhand, Best Practice Models.

1.1. Introduction
Public health emergencies, such as the extensive and unprecedented difficulties brought about by the COVID-19 pandemic, have clearly underscored the essential role of strong and flexible legal systems in facilitating effective governmental responses.[1] In a nation as large and varied as India, which features a federal structure along with diverse geographical, demographic, and administrative landscapes, the ability and effectiveness in managing such widespread crises often demonstrate notable differences among the states. The legislative readiness of each state and the responsiveness of its administrative systems are vital in alleviating the health, social, and economic consequences of a crisis. Using Lawrence O. Gostin's public health law theory Duty, Power, and Restraint as a lens, the study analyses legislative provisions, implementation challenges, and contextual factors in Uttarakhand,

[1] Kiran Kumar Gowd, Donthagani Veerababu, & Veeraiahgari Revanth Reddy. (2021). COVID-19 and the legislative response in India: The need for a comprehensive health care law. In *Journal of Public Affairs*. https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/pa.2669

particularly its hilly terrain and resource constraints. The rationale behind taking Gostin's public health law theory is that is widely accepted framework for assessing the legal underpinnings of public health governance is offered by Lawrence O. Gostin's Public Health Law Theory. His theory is particularly applicable when public health emergencies necessitate striking a balance between the rights of individuals and the interests of society as a whole, a problem that Indian governments have faced head-on during pandemics like COVID-19.
Gostin highlights that a key component of a successful public health response is legal readiness. His theory emphasises how laws that are unambiguous, adaptable, and enforceable improve the government's ability to respond quickly and appropriately in times of crisis exactly the area where Uttarakhand's framework exhibits structural weaknesses. Through this lens, the study can assess whether state laws: Provide for prompt interventions, clearly define authority and responsibility, and Incorporate accountability mechanisms. A focus on striking a balance between civil liberties and police powers. The way that Gostin's theory articulates the state's police powers in connection to constitutional rights is among its most significant contributions. This balance is essential to India's federal and rights-based constitutional framework. This is beneficial: Compare Uttarakhand's legal resources and enforcement strategies with those of states like Kerala, which have maintained public compliance without going too far. Normative Framework for Assessing the Effectiveness of Public Health Law.

Gostin offers standards like effectiveness and test if the law genuinely advance public health, he also tests fairness if is it the same for all populations. Accountability and transparency, and least restrictive methods of his theory are standards to create an organised matrix for evaluating and contrasting public health legislation in various states. This enables the study to explore functional performance and rights-based scrutiny in addition to textual analysis.

Gostin's theory is very applicable to India's federal structure and plural legal culture, despite having been developed in the United States. His framework can be mapped to Indian laws like the Epidemic Diseases Act, Disaster Management Act, and state-specific Public Health Acts, as well as constitutional provisions like Articles 21, 47, and the Seventh Schedule. It offers a theoretical link between local governance dynamics and global best practices.

1.2. **Theoretical Framework of L. Gostin's Public Health Law Theory**

Lawrence Gostin's Public Health Law: Power, Duty, Restraint (2008) offers a normative framework for comprehending the function of law in public health, particularly in times of crisis. Gostin's theory emphasizes the duty of the government to protect public health, while also considering individual rights and ethical leadership. The framework is based on three fundamental principles: Duty, Power, and Restraint. These principles inform the creation, execution, and assessment of public health laws, ensuring they are effective, fair, and ethically justified. Below, each principle is elaborated upon, followed by a critical analysis of their application in India's COVID-19 response.

1. Duty

The concept of Duty emphasizes the responsibility of the state to safeguard the health and safety of its citizens. This encompasses proactive initiatives to avert, prepare for, and address public health dangers, including infectious disease outbreaks, natural disasters, and bioterrorism. Duty necessitates that governments ensure fair access to healthcare, efficiently allocate resources, and focus on vulnerable populations. It is based on the social contract, which establishes the state's duty to protect collective well-being in return for citizens' adherence to public health initiatives.

Key Features:
(i)Proactive Planning: Governments are required to create and sustain preparedness strategies, which entail surveillance systems, emergency response plans, and development of infrastructure.
(ii) Resource Allocation: Guaranteeing ample funding, staff, and medical resources to tackle health threats.
(iii)Equity: Focusing on marginalized and underserved communities to lessen disparities in health outcomes.
(iv)Public Trust: Fostering trust through open communication and engaging with the community to secure compliance with health guidelines.
Theoretical Underpinnings: Duty is consistent with utilitarian principles, aimed at optimizing population health results. It is also influenced by social justice theories that highlight fairness in the distribution of resources and protection of at-risk groups. Gostin contends that Duty serves as the cornerstone of public health law, as it establishes the state's ethical and legal responsibility to act in the public's best interest.
2. Power: The concept of Power pertains to the government's capacity to implement and enforce actions aimed at preventing or alleviating public health risks. This encompasses both coercive measures such as quarantine, compulsory vaccination, or restrictions on movement, as well as non-coercive strategies like health awareness campaigns. Power enables the government to take decisive actions during crises to safeguard the public, even if this means temporarily limiting individual freedoms.

Key Characteristics:
(i) Legal Authority: Explicit provisions in laws that permit the execution of actions like isolation, contact tracing, or mobilizing resources.
(ii) Coercive Measures: The power to enforce compliance, including fines or penalties for breaches of health regulations.
(iii) Flexibility: The capability to adjust measures according to the specifics and extent of the crisis.
(iv) Coordination: Mechanisms that are either centralized or decentralized to ensure cooperation among agencies and government bodies.
Theoretical Foundations: Power is based on the state's rightful authority to promote public welfare, often backed by the "harm principle," which permits the limitation of personal freedoms to avert harm to others. Gostin highlights that Power must be applied in a manner that is proportional and supported by clear legal frameworks to prevent misuse.
3. Restraint: Restraint constrains the state's exercise of power to guarantee that actions are proportionate, transparent, and uphold individual rights. This concept protects against authoritarianism and ensures that public health strategies conform to ethical and constitutional values. Restraint necessitates accountability measures, judicial oversight, and public engagement to preserve trust and legitimacy.

Key Features:
(i) Proportionality: Actions must be essential, effective, and as minimally intrusive as possible to achieve public health objectives.
(ii) Transparency: Policies, justifications, and outcomes must be clearly communicated to the public.
(iii) Accountability: Mechanisms such as judicial review or complaint procedures to rectify any misuse of power.

(iv) Rights Protection: Protections to preserve privacy, freedom of movement, and other constitutional rights.

Theoretical Underpinnings: Restraint is rooted in liberal democratic values, highlighting the need for balance between collective safety and individual freedom. It corresponds with human rights principles, ensuring that emergency actions adhere to international standards such as the Siracusa Principles, which stipulate that restrictions on rights must be lawful, necessary, and limited in duration.

1.3. Public Health Emergency Laws in Uttarakhand

The state of Uttarakhand is snuggled in the lapse of the Himalayas, the rugged terrains of Uttarakhand with cripple hearth care infrastructure have further worsened during the pandemic. In India, including Uttarakhand, public health crises are handled through a mix of national and state laws, with state regulations adapted to fit local situations. The key legal frameworks applicable to Uttarakhand's handling of COVID-19 comprise:

a. The Epidemic Diseases Act, 1897 (EDA):

This historic piece of legislation serves as a fundamental tool for managing public health crises in India. It grants state governments the authority to implement measures aimed at curbing the spread of dangerous epidemic diseases. According to Section 2 of the EDA, states can apply restrictions such as isolation, quarantine, and movement limitations when other measures fall short.

In Uttarakhand, the EDA was triggered to classify COVID-19 as an epidemic, allowing the state to enforce strict measures such as lockdowns and curfews. For example, on March 17, 2020, Pankaj Pandey, Secretary of Medical, Health, and Medical Education Department, declared that the Uttarakhand government had recognized COVID-19 as an epidemic under the EDA, enabling actions like regulating the sale of cold and cough medicines and requiring masks and sanitizers to be sold at maximum retail prices (MRP).

b. Disaster Management Act, 2005 (DMA):

The DMA establishes guidelines for disaster management, including health emergencies, by giving authority to both central and state governments to issue directives and enforce adherence. It was utilized during the COVID-19 pandemic to implement lockdowns and other containment strategies at both national and state levels. In Uttarakhand, the DMA was used to enforce COVID-19 regulations, and violations resulted in penalties. For instance, between March and May 2021, the Director General of Police in Uttarakhand reported acting against 299,000 individuals for breaching COVID-19 rules, which included 120,000 fined for not wearing masks, 168,000 for ignoring social distancing, and over 800 charged under the DMA.

c. Uttarakhand State-Specific Regulations:

The government of Uttarakhand released notifications and guidelines under the EDA and DMA, adapting national instructions to suit local circumstances. For example, the state's Health Department provided situation updates and health bulletins to manage public gatherings and implement containment measures. The Uttarakhand State Disaster Management Authority (USDMA) was instrumental in coordinating responses, issuing orders such as the lifting of state wide COVID-19 restrictions effective November 20, 2021, while still requiring masks in public areas and enforcing penalties for public spitting. TheCOVID-19 pandemic was addressed by the state government in a decisive manner, which helped in limiting its far-reaching impacts. The Uttarakhand State Government's Health Department, together with various other agencies, put in place a swift and well-organized plan to counter

the hassles created by the pandemic. Carefully and timely, the guidelines and recommendations made by the Ministry of Health and Family Welfare, Government of India, were adhered to.[2] An assortment of administrative and technical responses were implemented that not only involved preventive and mitigation measures but also attempted to confront the economic and social impacts of the pandemic. [3] Few of the legal measures that the government underwent during the covid-19 pandemic were:

1. Uttarakhand COVID-19 Regulations, 2020: Issued under the Epidemic Diseases Act, giving legal backing to quarantine and containment strategies.
2. Enforcement of Lockdowns and Curfews: Backed by Section 144 CrPC and Disaster Management Act, violations were prosecuted under IPC Sections 188, 269, and 270.
3. Monitoring of Media and Social Media: Fake news and misinformation were actively flagged and FIRs were registered.

I. Preventive and Mitigation Strategies in Public Health Management:

(i) Surveillance and Screening Measures under which due to Uttarakhand's vulnerable borders with Uttar Pradesh, Himachal Pradesh, and its international frontiers (China and Nepal), the state implemented screening stations at railway terminals, bus stops, and interstate boundary points. Secondly Uttarakhand employed both manual and digital methods for contact tracing, aided by local ASHA workers and health monitoring teams. Lastly Rapid Response Teams (RRTs) were deployed to identify and isolate contacts in both rural and urban settings.

(ii) Quarantine and Isolation firstly more than 130,000 individuals were placed in quarantine, mostly under home isolation, with oversight provided by health workers and local authorities.[4] During the initial stages of the outbreak, over 55 containment zones were created, managed according to micro-containment protocols and restrictions on movement. Lastly facilities of varying levels (CCC, DCHC, DCH) were established in accordance with ICMR and MoHFW guidelines, based on the severity of cases.

(iii) Testing and diagnostics was undertaken through numerous government and private labs received authorization for conducting tests. RT-PCR testing was increased substantially, especially in metropolitan areas. Additionally, mobile units (Mobile Testing Vans and Camps) were deployed to remote hill districts with restricted access to facilitate testing camps for suspected cases.

(iv) Initial Implementation and Decentralized Approach was deployed under which vaccination commenced through national initiatives with gradual coverage. Outstanding First-Dose Achievement in Isolated Areas under which the Dhari block in Nainital district was recognized as a model for achieving 100% first-dose coverage, largely due to effective mobilization at the panchayat level.[5] Lastly the Incentives and Information, Education, and Communication (IEC) Campaigns took place as an awareness initiative launched in Garhwali and Kumaoni languages to address vaccine hesitancy.

II. Administrative Coordination and Institutional Framework

---

[2] Available from: https://covid19dashboard.mohfw.gov.in.

[3] Peci A, Avellaneda CN, Suzuki K. Governmental responses to COVID 19 Pandemic. Rev Adm Pública. 2021;55(1):1–11.

[4] Pioneeradmin. (2021, May 20). Home isolation of Covid 19 patients streamlined in U'khand - Pioneer Edge | Uttarakhand News in English |. Pioneer Edge | Uttarakhand News Today | Dehradun News Today|. https://www.pioneeredge.in/home-isolation-of-covid-19-patients-streamlined-in-ukhand/

[5] BNT162b2 mRNA Covid-19 Vaccine in a Nationwide Mass ... (2021). https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/33626250/

(i) State Crisis Management Framework where the COVID Control Center was established in Dehradun to unify decision-making and share information. Secondly the Chief Minister's Office (CMO) facilitated coordination among various departments, combining health, home affairs, transport, and disaster management.
(ii) Decentralisation at the District Level, under the Epidemic Diseases Act and Disaster Management Act, district magistrates were empowered to enforce lockdowns, testing, and emergency procurement. For the block and village-Level Committees wherein the local monitoring and enforcement entities were established to coordinate supply chains and report violations of the COVID-19 rule.
(iii) Smart City Surveillance undertaken by the government to monitor crowd density and enforce curfews, integrated command and control centres were repurposed in Dehradun and Haldwani. Although adoption was slow in isolated hill regions, Aarogya Setu and Self-Reporting Portals were utilised for real-time tracking.

III. Economic Relief and Livelihood Support

(i) Support for Migrant Workers-Assisted in bringing back over 250,000 migrant workers from urban areas. Quarantine-based Livelihood Programs Skills were assessed at quarantine facilities, allowing for future integration into MGNREGA and MSME initiatives.
(ii) Employment and Skill-Based Interventions-Mukhyamantri Swarozgar Yojana (MSY) was introduced to promote rural entrepreneurship and help migrants reintegrate into the local economy through subsidized loans.
(iii) Special Focus on Hill Economy: Initiatives for agro-based industries, beekeeping, and eco-tourism received updated incentives following the pandemic.
(iv) Relief for the Unorganized Sector- One-time cash payments were made to daily wage earners, auto drivers, and street vendors. Provision of free rations under the PM Garib Kalyan Yojana and state programs.

During the COVID-19 crisis in Uttarakhand, we observed a complex administrative and technical response mechanism. It was a multi-dimensional gradient fusing a top-down leadership approach with grassroots level intervention. Despite infrastructure constraints, especially in the remote hill districts, the state has significantly intervened in disease control, economic assistance and social protection. Yet the experience also revealed vulnerabilities in legal preparation, digital infrastructure and fragmented health care systems. The pandemic presents Uttarakhand with a crucial opportunity to update its public health legislation, enhance long-term health infrastructure, and establish crisis governance systems that prioritize equity, resilience, and respect for rights.

1.4. Model Public Health Emergency Laws in Indian States

1. Kerala – The Kerala Public Health Act, 2023 *(replacing the Travancore-Cochin Public Health Act, 1955)*

The Kerala Public Health Act, 2023 (KPHA), which came into effect on December 1, 2023, supersedes the Travancore-Cochin Public Health Act of 1955 and the Madras Public Health Act of 1939, consolidating the public health system in Kerala. This review highlights the main aspects of the KPHA and pinpoints insights that Uttarakhand could implement to improve its crisis management, utilizing statistical evidence and examples from the COVID-19 pandemic.

Key Features of the KPHA, 2023

(i) Unified Framework: The KPHA consolidates and updates the Travancore-Cochin Public Health Act of 1955 and Madras Public Health Act of 1939, creating a unifying body of

law governing the state of Kerala. The consolidation removes contradictions in managing public health across the state's various regions. Consolidates old laws into one act, for uniformity throughout Kerala. [6]

(ii) Three-Tier System: Establishes a structured public health governance system at the state, district, and local levels, designating particular health officials as the public health authorities. The State Public Health Authority is such that it can be represented by the Director of Health Services, who is empowered to form temporary advisory committees in situations of exigency.[7]

(iii) Social Determinants: Emphasizes the significance of improving access to safe water, sanitation, waste disposal, and environmental health, recognizing these components as crucial in avoiding illness and promoting well-being. The law calls for adequate toilet facilities in public places. Prioritizes clean water, sanitation, waste management, and public toilets to avoid disease.[8]

(iv) Disease Control: Provides methods for managing infectious disease (e.g., mosquito control and zoonotic epidemics) as well as non-communicable disease (NCD) management. Promotes healthy lifestyles by creating active areas and facilities for physical activity.[9]

(v) Antimicrobial Resistance (AMR) and One Health: Includes AMR measures and a One Health strategy involving human, animal, and environmental health.

(vi) Emergency Powers: Empowers authorities to declare emergencies, conduct surveillance, and develop annual action plans.

(vii) Gender-Sensitive Language: Uses feminine pronouns (e.g., “udamastha” for owner), a first for India, though non-binary pronouns are not used.

(viii) Migrant Welfare: Includes migrant laborers' health provisions, though accountability is minimal.

(ix) Food Safety and Waste: Regulates food safety, blood banks, and biomedical waste disposal.

(x) Penalties: Penalties up to ₹10,000 for misuse of power, though undefined terms are worrying.

(xi) Public Participation: Formulated by consulting experts and the public.

(xii) Climate and Diseases: Addresses health risks due to climate and emerging diseases.

Statistical Context

Health Indicators: Kerala’s infant mortality rate (IMR): 6/1,000 (2020); life expectancy: 75 years.[10] Uttarakhand’s IMR: 24/1,000; life expectancy: 71 years.[11]

COVID-19 Testing: Kerala: 1.5 lakh daily tests (2021); Uttarakhand: 10,000 (May 2021).

Migrants: Kerala: 25 lakh, 70% healthcare access; Uttarakhand: 1.2 lakh returnees, 60% access.

Lessons for Uttarakhand: Adoption and Adaptation

(i) Integrated Legislation: Enact a unified Uttarakhand Public Health Act to replace the 2020 Epidemic Regulations that target communicable diseases and non-communicable diseases (NCDs) alike.

---

[6] https://www.thehindu.com/news/national/kerala/state-government-issues-gazette-notification-on-kerala-public-health-act-2023/article67618700.ece

[7] https://prsindia.org/bills/states/the-kerala-public-health-bill-2021

[8] https://www.thehindu.com/news/national/kerala/state-government-issues-gazette-notification-on-kerala-public-health-act-2023/article67618700.ece

[9] https://prsindia.org/bills/states/the-kerala-public-health-bill-2021

[10] https://arogyakeralam.gov.in/

[11] https://des.uk.gov.in/economic-survey/

(ii) Benefit: Improves governance by cutting out fragmented COVID-19 regulations.
(iii) Three-Tier Framework: KPHA's 3 tier system (state, district, local) with designated public health authorities enhances accountability and rapid response. Uttarakhand's decentralized governance during COVID-19 was effective but lacked formal structure, leading to coordination issues (e.g., inconsistent testing across districts). Establish state, district, and local health authorities to enhance coordination in rural areas, which are home to 70% of the population.
(iv) Evidence: Testing rose from 5,000 to 10,000 upon judicial intervention, which shows such gains could be sustained with structured governance.
(v) Social Determinants: Implement sanitation and waste disposal measures in tourist areas (e.g., Haridwar) to reduce dengue cases (about 5,000 cases in 2020). Example: Kerala's focus on sanitation reduced waterborne disease incidence by almost 20%.
(vi) Emergency Planning: Make it compulsory to prepare yearly action plans for combating monsoon-borne diseases (such as malaria, with an estimated 10% prevalence in rural areas) and tourism-related hazards. Illustration: Kerala's strategies managed to limit Nipah virus cases to less than 10 annually.
(vii) AMR and One Health: Manage antibiotic use in agriculture and track zoonotic threats in wildlife reserves (like Govind Wildlife Sanctuary). Illustration: Kerala's AMR tracking reduced resistant infections by approximately 15%.
(viii) Migrant Welfare: Set up mobile clinics and insure around 300,000 seasonal laborers, closing gaps (30% did not get tested in 2020).
(ix) Criticism: Improve: Lack of accountability against migrants.
(x) Accountability Mechanisms: Define terms of abuse of power and institutionalize an ombudsman position to prevent cases such as that of the Van Gujjar community (some 7,500 affected people).
(xi) Evidence: Almost 50 Public Interest Litigations (PILs) between 2020-21 emphasize the need for better checks.
(xii) Public Participation: Involve communities and non-governmental organizations in the legislative process to reduce resistance (e.g., some 10% failure to comply with travel rules). Illustration: Kerala's public consultations enhanced policy acceptance.
(xiii) Climate and Tourism: Integrate health warnings for the Char Dham Yatra and disaster preparedness (20% districts affected by floods).
(xiv) Evidence: Kerala's climate policies resulted in an estimated 10% reduction in vector-borne diseases.

Metric	Kerala (2020-23)	Uttarakhand (2020-21)
Daily Testing (Peak)	1.5 lakh (2021)	10,000 (May 2021)
Vaccination (Dec 2021)	85% first dose, 60% fully vaccinated	80% first dose, 50% fully vaccinated
Migrant Population	25 lakh, 70% healthcare access	1.2 lakh returnees, 60% access
Health Infrastructure	1,200 PHCs, 90% rural coverage	400 PHCs, 30% rural coverage

Judicial Interventions	20 PILs (2020-21)	50 PILs (2020-21)
Environmental Impact	30% air pollution reduction (2020)	40% air pollution reduction (2020)

Source: [National Health Mission, Kerala], [Economic Survey of Uttarakhand, 2025], [Vaz et al., 2021]

2. Tamil Nadu Public Health Act, 1939 (Amended)

The Tamil Nadu Public Health Act of 1939 (TNPHA) is a historic legislative achievement in India, being one of the first state-level public health laws. It was passed on 7 March 1939 with the goal of enhancing public health in Tamil Nadu through a focus on sanitation, disease prevention and control, and health infrastructure. Over time, it has been amended to address evolving public health concerns, with major revisions proposed in 2008 and put in place in specific instances, such as dengue management in 2023. Though the act remains fundamental, its amendments have worked towards updating regulations to meet contemporary challenges, such as biomedical waste and public health emergencies. This analysis identifies key points of the TNPHA (in its revised form) and identifies lessons that can be adopted by Uttarakhand to make its public health and crisis management system stronger, keeping in mind its experiences with the COVID-19 pandemic.

Key Features of the TNPHA, 1939 (Amended)

(i) Widespread Public Health Coverage: The Act addresses many public health issues, including water supply, sanitation, waste management, infectious disease control, child and maternal health, mosquito control, food safety, and regulation of fairs and festivals. It was the first such law related to public health in India, setting a model for state-level health governance.[12]

(ii) Local Authority Empowerment: Identifies "Executive Authority" as key officials (e.g., Commissioner, Chairman, Executive Officer) working under corresponding legislations like the Tamil Nadu District Municipalities Act, 1920, and the Tamil Nadu Panchayats Act, 1994. Such officials are empowered to implement health regulations at the local level to ensure decentralization of implementation.[13]

(iii) Notifiable Diseases and Surveillance: Section 62 delineates conditions like dengue as notifiable and makes it mandatory for healthcare providers to report them immediately to local health authorities. Section 64 provides penal action for non-compliance, thus fortifying the surveillance system. In 2023, the Directorate of Public Health (DPH) used the rules to control an outbreak of cases of dengue by making reports obligatory through the ISDP-IHIP.[14]

(iv) Mosquito Management Strategies: Sections 83–88 describe specific rules for mosquito control, which provide penalties for non-compliance. In 2023, these were strictly

[12] Kailasasundaram. (n.d.). Public Health Act. Scribd, https://www.scribd.com/presentation/131199516/Public-Health-Act

[13] Government of Tamil Nadu, India. (1939). Tamil Nadu Public Health Act, 1939. Retrieved from https://vlex.in/vid/tamil-nadu-public-health-545552314

[14] TNPSC Current Affairs | Tamilnadu Public Health act, 1939. (n.d.). Kamaraj IAS Academy in Chennai. https://www.kamarajiasacademy.com/tnpsc-current-affairs/Tamilnadu-Public-Health-act%2C-1939

enforced to address dengue outbreaks, with instructions to increase surveillance and mosquito control efforts in urban areas like Chennai.[15]

(v) Environmental Health: Section 32 allows for legal action in respect of health hazards, e.g., dirty buildings. 2008 proposed amendments defined plastic waste as "offensive matter" to address environmental health issues, with higher penalties in accordance with prevailing economic standards. Biomedical waste and toxic chemicals disposal were also addressed, responding to emerging challenges.[16]

(vi) Public Health Infrastructure: The act strengthens Tamil Nadu's distinctive public health staff at the district level, which is a unique feature in India. It facilitated the introduction of village health nurses (VHNs) under the Multipurpose Workers Scheme in the 1980s, enhancing rural healthcare access. Tamil Nadu's density of health workers had risen to 32 per 10,000 people by 2018, compared to India's 23, but it is still below the WHO's recommended 44.5.[17]

(vii) Penalties and Enforcement: Subsections 41-44 and 134-135 authorize the giving of notices and fines for violations, such as the running of businesses that are health risks to the public. In 2010, for example, local government representatives issued notices under these subsections to address health hazards from commercial activities. Fines were updated in 2008 to suit the prevailing economic climate.[18]

Lessons for Uttarakhand: Adoption and Adaptation

Uttarakhand, with its mountainous terrain, tourism-dependent economy, and public health challenges (e.g., around 30% coverage for rural health and around 1.2 lakh migrant returnees in the COVID-19 pandemic), can draw valuable lessons from the TNPHA to improve its public health infrastructure, particularly in amending its Uttarakhand Epidemic Disease COVID-19 Regulations, 2020. The following are crucial lessons and recommendations.

1. Comprehensive Public Health Legislation: TNPHA provides a comprehensive strategy (water, sanitation, disease control, maternal health) that builds a solid platform for public health, compared to Uttarakhand's narrower standards in 2020, which focus primarily on epidemics. Pass an Uttarakhand Public Health Act that would cover sanitation, maternal health, and disease control, focusing on dengue (around 5,000 reported in 2020). Benefit: Reduces the fragmentation seen in the 2020 regulations. Example: The sanitation measures in Tamil Nadu led to a reduction of about 15% in waterborne diseases in rural areas from 2015 to 2020, serving as a model for Uttarakhand's roughly 70% rural population.

2. Public Health Team: Create a district-level team and educate village health workers to serve approximately 400 primary health centres, enhancing rural access by 30%. Evidence: The cadre in Tamil Nadu facilitates 80% coverage.

---

[15] The Hindu. (2023, September 22). Tamil Nadu Public Health Act invoked for dengue control. https://www.thehindu.com/news/cities/chennai/tamil-nadu-public-health-act-invoked-for-dengue-control/article67335263.ece

[16] Kannan, R. (2008, April 18). Complete overhaul of Public Health Act proposed. The Hindu. https://www.thehindu.com/todays-paper/tp-national/tp-tamilnadu/Complete-overhaul-of-Public-Health-Act-proposed/article15205947.ece

[17] Parthasarathi R, Sinha SP. Towards a Better Health Care Delivery System: The Tamil Nadu model. Indian J Community Med. 2016 Oct-Dec;41(4):302-304. doi: 10.4103/0970-0218.193344. PMID: 27890982; PMCID: PMC5112973.

[18] Casemine. (n.d.). tamil nadu public health act, 1939 | Indian Case Law | Law. Retrieved July 8, 2025, from https://www.casemine.com/search/in/tamil%2Bnadu%2Bpublic%2Bhealth%2Bact%2C%2B1939

3. Health Monitoring: Adopt compulsory digital reporting for diseases like malaria, which prevails at about 10% in rural regions, with a penalty for non-adherence, as done in Tamil Nadu. For example, Tamil Nadu was able to reduce the dengue death rate to 2% in 2023.
4. Environmental Health: Control biomedical waste and plastics to protect tourist regions (40% pollution reduction in 2020). Example: Tamil Nadu reduced urban health hazards by around 10%.[19]
5. Maternal and Child Health: Improve primary health care coverage and midwife training to reduce the infant mortality rate (IMR) to 24 per 1,000 and the maternal mortality rate (MMR) to 89 per 100,000.[20]
6. Data: Tamil Nadu IMR is 15 per 1,000. Flexible Notifications Enable region-specific programs for hilly regions and tourism periods (e.g., Char Dham Yatra). Tamil Nadu notifications resulted in an 80% compliance rate for dengue.
7. Community Engagement: Tribal communities (comprising approximately 40% of the population) should be engaged to reduce resistance (approximately 10% non-compliance registered in 2020). Tamil Nadu's vulnerable populations fared better than others (NFHS-4).
8. Accountability Mechanisms: Impose fines and designate an ombudsman to ease the court's burden (around 50 public interest litigations during 2020-21). Example: Tamil Nadu's fines led to almost 90% compliance in reporting.

Metric	Tamil Nadu (2015-23)	Uttarakhand (2015-21)
Health Worker Density	32 per 10,000 (2018)	33 per 10,000 (2018)
IMR (2015-16)	15 per 1,000	24 per 1,000
MMR (2015-16)	54 per 100,000	89 per 100,000
Daily Testing (Peak 2021)	2 lakhs	10,000
Rural Health Coverage	80% (1,200 PHCs)	30% (400 PHCs)
Judicial Interventions	20 PILs (2020-21)	50 PILs (2020-21)

Source: [NFHS-4, 2015-16], [Economic Survey of Uttarakhand, 2025], [Vaz et al., 2021]

1.5. Findings

The comparative legal review of public health emergency laws in Uttarakhand, Kerala, and Tamil Nadu reveals significant disparities in legislative design, implementation, and effectiveness, evaluated through Lawrence O. Gostin's principles of Duty, Power, and Restraint. The findings are summarized below:

1. Duty: Obligation of the State to Safeguard Population Health

Uttarakhand: The state's reliance on the DMA, 2005 and the EDA, 1897, reveals limited commitment to anticipatory planning. The geography of mountains and resource constraints frustrated equitable access to health care during COVID-19, with only 30% of rural health

[19] Complete overhaul of Public Health Act proposed. (2016, October 8). The Hindu. https://www.thehindu.com/todays-paper/tp-national/tp-tamilnadu/Complete-overhaul-of-Public-Health-Act-proposed/article15205947.ece
[20] Research, D. (2025, January 17). Political Economy of Health: Tamil Nadu. Dvara Research. https://dvararesearch.com/political-economy-of-health-tamil-nadu/

centers equipped to deal with emergencies. The State Disaster Management Authority (SDMA) coordinates response but has no clear mandates for infectious disease preparedness.
Kerala: KPHA, 2021, and Kerala Epidemic Diseases Ordinance, 2020, reflect a firm adherence to Duty in the form of decentralized administration. Panchayats (local self-governments) facilitated local community-based preparedness and equitable resource allocation, which was seen in the rapid containment of the Nipah virus outbreak in 2018.

Tamil Nadu: TPHA, 1939, and COVID-19 amendment targets resource utilization through committed funding and robust surveillance systems. The centralized state policy allowed for effective vaccine rollout, reaching 85% of the population by 2022.

Comparative Insight: Kerala and Tamil Nadu's targeted legislations and infrastructure investments outshine Uttarakhand's sweeping, second-best approaches, highlighting the need for state-specific preparedness plans and rural healthcare improvements.

2. Power: Power to Counter Health Hazards
Uttarakhand: The DMA and EDA grant sweeping powers for the declaration of disasters and the imposition of movement bans, but no comprehensive provisions for infectious diseases. In COVID-19, sluggish testing and quarantine implementation were attributed to unclear legal guidelines, with rural testing rates being sluggish at 500 per million in 2020.
Kerala: Kerala's system empowers the local governments with express jurisdiction over quarantine, contact tracing, and vaccination activities. The state's rapid response during COVID-19, which yielded a 0.5% case fatality rate against the national average of 1.4%, demonstrates a good exercise of Power.

Tamil Nadu: Tamil Nadu's laws allow for strict enforcement, such as non-compliance fines of up to ₹50,000. Centralized contact tracing and surveillance efforts helped decrease transmission levels in the second wave.

Comparative Insight: Decentralized Power of Kerala and the Tamil Nadu enforcement policies allow for speedy, tailored responses, unlike the centralized, less effective methods of Uttarakhand, which are prone to inefficiencies.

3. Restraint: Balancing Rights and Accountability
Uttarakhand: The system in Uttarakhand does not have clear accountability measures in place, leading to alleged abuses amid COVID-19 lockdowns, including disproportionate force during rural enforcement. There is limited transparency, with little public access to health information.
Kerala: Kerala's open reporting and community participation foster trust and are consistent with Restraint. Public dashboards and neighbourhood chats provided compliance with minimal violation of rights.
Tamil Nadu: Legal safeguards in Tamil Nadu, such as judicial oversight, strike a balance between Power and Restraint, though privacy concerns were triggered by widespread contact tracing.

Comparative Insight: Kerala and Tamil Nadu's emphasis on accountability and transparency contrasts with Uttarakhand's ineffective Restraint mechanisms, indicating the necessity for judicial intervention and public participation.

4. Contextual Factors: The mountainous landscape, scarce healthcare facilities, and seasonal migration in Uttarakhand make implementation challenges more complex, in contrast to Kerala's densely populated accessible areas and urban health systems in Tamil Nadu. These pose the need for tailored legal structures for Uttarakhand.

1.6. Conclusion

This comparative legal analysis highlights that Uttarakhand's public health emergency infrastructure, which is dependent upon outmoded laws such as the EDA and sweeping DMA, is poorly equipped to address modern-day health crises, particularly in view of its challenging geography and resource-constrained context. In contrast, Kerala's decentralized community-focused system and Tamil Nadu's aggressive surveillance and enforcement systems are best practices, successfully applying Gostin's Duty, Power, and Restraint principles. Kerala's success in facilitating equitable access and Tamil Nadu's efficient resource mobilization highlight the need for state-specific legislation that meets local demands.

The report reveals glaring gaps in Uttarakhand's system, such as unpreparedness, uncertain legal requirements, and inadequate accountability, all of which undermined its COVID-19 response. To address these shortcomings, Uttarakhand must enact a contemporary public health emergency law, drawing inspiration from Kerala's community participation and Tamil Nadu's surveillance strengths. The proposed Uttarakhand Public Health Emergency Act (UPHEA) must include:

(i)A State Public Health Emergency Council for collective action.
(ii)District level preparedness plans that consider the hilly topography.
(iii)Real-time surveillance that is integrated through the Integrated Disease Surveillance Programme.
(iv)Training of the community in local languages (like Garhwali and Kumaoni).
(v)Clear mandates for quarantine and vaccination, accompanied by judicial supervision and measures to ensure transparency.
(vi)Policymakers must prioritize piloting the UPHEA in high-risk areas, supported by capacity development and targeted funds. Integrating lessons from Kerala and Tamil Nadu, Uttarakhand can enhance its preparedness against future public health crises, ensuring ethical, effective, and equitable response that adheres to Gostin's principles.

References:

1. Directorate of Economics and Statistics, Government of Uttarakhand. (2025). Economic survey of Uttarakhand 2024-25. Dehradun, India: Government of Uttarakhand.
2. Kandpal, P. C. (2024). Responding to Covid-19 pandemic: Policy and governance perspective to reverse migration in Uttarakhand. Journal of Social and Economic Development. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40847-024-00345-2
3. Government of Uttarakhand. (2021, June 6). Uttarakhand COVID-19 health bulletin. Dehradun, India: Department of Medical Health and Family Welfare, Government of Uttarakhand. https://health.uk.gov.in
4. Kandpal, P. C. (2020–2021). Covid-19 'crisis' and the challenges and 'opportunities' of 'reverse migration' [Unpublished report]. Indian Council of Social Science Research (ICSSR).

5. Kumar, R., Bhardwaj, A., Kumar, A., & Singh, P. K. (2021). COVID-19 pandemic in Uttarakhand, India: Environmental recovery or degradation? Journal of Environmental Management, 299, 113518. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvman.2021.113518
6. Awasthi, I., & Mehta, B. S. (2020). Forced out-migration from hill regions and return migration during the pandemic: Evidence from Uttarakhand. Indian Journal of Labour Economics, 63(4), 1123–1124. https://doi.org/10.1007/s41027-020-00277-6
7. Department of Science and Technology, Government of India. (2020, July 1). COVID-19 related initiatives. New Delhi, India: Department of Science and Technology.