



Original Research Paper

Constitutionalizing the Right Against Climate Change in India: A Critical Analysis of M.K. Ranjitsinh v. Union of India

Rahul Debnath^{1*}, Dr. Raghunath Chakraborty²

¹Research Scholar, ICFAI UNIVERSITY, Tripura

²Assistant Professor, ICFAI UNIVERSITY, Tripura

Climate change has become one of the most pressing threats to human rights, environmental security, and sustainable development. Its impacts, such as extreme temperatures, floods, droughts, cyclones, water scarcity, food insecurity, loss of biodiversity, and displacement caused by climate change, directly influence the realization of fundamental rights. While the Constitution of India does not explicitly acknowledge a fundamental right against climate change, the Supreme Court of India has progressively shaped environmental rights through a broad interpretation of Articles 14 and 21, bolstered by Articles 48A and 51A(g). The ruling in M.K. Ranjitsinh v. Union of India, 2024 INSC 280, marks a significant constitutional advancement in this context. The Supreme Court explicitly recognized the right to be free from the detrimental effects of climate change, situating this right within Articles 14 and 21.

This article provides a critical examination of the constitutional implications of M.K. Ranjitsinh and assesses whether the ruling signifies a shift from environmental constitutionalism to climate constitutionalism in India. It investigates the connections between climate change, the right to life, equality, environmental protection, sustainable development, and climate justice. The article employs a doctrinal methodology that incorporates constitutional provisions, judicial rulings, legislation, international agreements, and pertinent policy frameworks. The analysis reveals that Ranjitsinh has redefined climate change from being primarily an environmental policy issue to a matter of constitutional rights. Nevertheless, the judgment raises significant unresolved issues concerning the specific nature of the right, the associated obligations of the State, available judicial remedies, standards of review, and the relationship between courts and climate policy authorities. The article contends that although Ranjitsinh establishes a crucial constitutional basis for climate rights, its long-term efficacy will hinge on legislative progress, institutional collaboration, scientific knowledge, and a rights-oriented approach to climate governance.

Keywords: Climate Change, Environmental Rights, Climate Justice, Climate Constitutionalism, Sustainable Development.

1. INTRODUCTION

Climate change has evolved beyond being solely an environmental issue. It is now recognized as a matter of constitutional significance, human rights, and development. The alterations in climate are linked to escalating temperatures, severe heat waves, floods, droughts, cyclones, shifting rainfall patterns, rising sea levels, loss of biodiversity, and heightened risks to food and water security. These effects directly or indirectly influence human health, livelihoods, housing, dignity, and the capacity of individuals to exercise their fundamental rights.

The importance of climate change is especially evident in developing nations like India, where a large portion of the population relies on climate-sensitive sectors such as agriculture, forestry, fisheries, and livestock. Climate-related disasters tend to have a more severe

impact on economically and socially vulnerable communities, as their ability to adapt is frequently much lower than that of wealthier groups. Consequently, climate change brings forth not only issues of environmental conservation but also concerns regarding equality, distributive justice, and constitutional governance.

The Constitution of India does not explicitly include a provision that guarantees a "right against climate change" or a "right to a stable climate." However, the constitutional framework of India encompasses several provisions that lay the groundwork for such a right. Article 21 ensures the right to life and personal liberty, which the Supreme Court has interpreted to encompass the right to live with dignity and in a healthy environment. Article 14 ensures equality before the law and equal protection under the law.

*Corresponding Author:

Received: 25th July, 2026 | Revised: 26th August, 2026 | Accepted: 30th August, 2026 | Available Online: 2nd September, 2026

(DOI): 10.70102/AEJ.2026.18.4s.105

1166

Article 48A mandates the State to protect and enhance the environment and to safeguard forests and wildlife, while Article 51A(g) establishes a fundamental duty for citizens to protect and improve the natural environment.

The environmental jurisprudence of the Supreme Court has gradually broadened the interpretation of these provisions. In the case of *Subhash Kumar v. State of Bihar*, the Court acknowledged that the right to life encompasses the right to access pollution-free water and air. Similarly, in *Virender Gaur v. State of Haryana*, the Court linked environmental quality to the dignity of human existence. Through later rulings, concepts such as sustainable development, the precautionary principle, the public trust doctrine, and the polluter-pays principle have become integral components of Indian environmental jurisprudence.

Climate change, in contrast, poses a significantly wider challenge than typical environmental pollution. Unlike localized pollution incidents, climate change is cumulative, transboundary, and long-lasting. Its causes and effects span across both geographical and temporal boundaries. Furthermore, climate change can impact multiple fundamental rights at once. Extreme heat can jeopardize health and life; floods can devastate homes and livelihoods; droughts can endanger food and water security; and displacement caused by climate change can undermine dignity and equality. The constitutional implications of climate change thus necessitate a departure from the conventional understanding of environmental rights.

In this context, the Supreme Court's ruling in *M.K. Ranjitsinh v. Union of India*, 2024 INSC 280, holds particular importance. This case focused on the preservation of the Great Indian Bustard and the effects of overhead power transmission lines within its habitat. The litigation compelled the Court to evaluate the conflicting goals of biodiversity conservation and the growth of renewable energy infrastructure. In resolving this dispute, the Court also conducted a comprehensive review of climate change and its constitutional ramifications.

The Supreme Court has explicitly acknowledged that individuals possess the right to be shielded from the detrimental impacts of climate change. This right is primarily situated within Articles 14 and 21. This acknowledgment is crucial as it elevates climate change from a mere governmental policy issue to one that can be scrutinized through the framework of fundamental rights. The ruling also highlights the intricacies involved in climate governance. The transition to renewable energy is essential for decreasing greenhouse gas emissions and tackling climate change. Nevertheless, the establishment of renewable energy infrastructure can occasionally lead to ecological and biodiversity challenges. The

litigation concerning the Great Indian Bustard exemplifies this conflict. As a result, the Court was required to reconcile the protection of biodiversity, climate mitigation, energy security, and sustainable development.

The ruling presents several significant constitutional inquiries. What precisely defines the right to be protected from the adverse impacts of climate change? Does this right impose affirmative responsibilities on the State? Can a lack of governmental action concerning climate change be deemed a breach of Article 21? Is the State obligated by Article 14 to tackle the disproportionate vulnerability faced by specific communities? How should courts weigh climate protection against economic growth and energy security? What judicial standard is appropriate when climate policy involves intricate scientific and technical issues? This article provides a critical examination of these inquiries. It posits that *Ranjitsinh* marks a crucial shift from environmental constitutionalism to climate constitutionalism in India. Nevertheless, the acknowledgment of this right is merely the initial step. Its successful implementation necessitates further evolution of constitutional principles, legislation, institutional frameworks, and scientifically grounded standards for judicial review.

2. Methodology

This article employs a doctrinal and analytical research methodology. The research primarily focuses on constitutional provisions, judicial rulings, environmental legislation, international legal instruments, and pertinent governmental climate policies. The main case examined in this study is *M.K. Ranjitsinh v. Union of India*, 2024 INSC 280. The judgment is scrutinized in detail to uncover the constitutional foundation, scope, and implications of the right to be free from the adverse impacts of climate change. Additionally, the study explores the evolution of environmental rights under Article 21 through significant Supreme Court decisions, including *Subhash Kumar v. State of Bihar*, *Virender Gaur v. State of Haryana*, *M.C. Mehta v. Union of India*, *M.C. Mehta v. Kamal Nath*, and *Vellore Citizens' Welfare Forum v. Union of India*. These cases are analyzed to comprehend the doctrinal progression from the right to a pollution-free environment to a more comprehensive constitutional framework for environmental protection. The constitutional provisions, including Articles 14, 21, 48A, and 51A(g), form the core legal framework of this study. Furthermore, the article takes into account relevant environmental legislation, such as the Environment (Protection) Act, 1986, the Energy Conservation Act, 2001, the Wild Life (Protection) Act, 1972, and the National Green Tribunal Act, 2010. The study investigates international climate instruments, notably the United Nations Framework

***Corresponding Author:**

Received: 25th July, 2026 | Revised: 26th August, 2026 | Accepted: 30th August, 2026 | Available Online: 2nd September, 2026
(DOI): 10.70102/AEJ.2026.18.4s.105

Convention on Climate Change, the Kyoto Protocol, and the Paris Agreement, to comprehend the global context in which Indian climate jurisprudence has evolved. Additionally, a comparative analysis of international climate-rights jurisprudence is conducted to uncover emerging strategies for constitutional and human-rights safeguards against climate change. This research adopts a qualitative approach rather than an empirical one. It does not include field surveys or statistical evaluations. The aim is to critically analyze the current constitutional and judicial framework and determine whether the acknowledgment in *Ranjitsinh* is adequate to establish a robust and enforceable climate right in India.

3. M.K. Ranjitsinh and the Constitutionalisation of Climate Rights

3.1 From Environmental Rights to Climate Rights

The analysis reveals that Indian environmental constitutionalism has experienced a gradual evolution. Initially, the focus on environmental protection was largely through legislative measures and executive policies. The incorporation of Articles 48A and 51A(g) enhanced the constitutional acknowledgment of environmental safeguarding. Following this, judicial interpretations of Article 21 redefined environmental quality as an integral aspect of the right to life. The Supreme Court's environmental jurisprudence clarified that life should not be perceived solely as mere physical existence. A life of significance necessitates access to fundamental environmental conditions essential for health, dignity, and overall well-being. Climate change signifies the subsequent phase of this evolution. While the right to a clean environment shields individuals from specific types of environmental degradation, the right to protection against the detrimental impacts of climate change encompasses a wider and more intricate issue. Climate change influences environmental conditions on a systemic scale and can jeopardize the effective realization of various fundamental rights. Consequently, *Ranjitsinh* can be viewed as a crucial shift from environmental constitutionalism to climate constitutionalism.

3.2 Constitutional Foundation of the Right

The Supreme Court's acknowledgment of the right to be free from the detrimental impacts of climate change is fundamentally grounded in Articles 14 and 21. Article 21 serves as the cornerstone since climate change can have a direct impact on life, health, livelihood, habitation, and dignity. Article 14 holds equal significance as climate change does not impact all individuals uniformly. The repercussions of climate change may be disproportionately severe for those who lack financial means, resilient housing, access to healthcare, alternative employment options, or the capacity to relocate. As a result, climate change can

exacerbate existing social and economic disparities. Thus, the constitutional importance of *Ranjitsinh* lies in its acknowledgment that climate change represents both a life-and-liberty concern under Article 21 and an equality matter under Article 14. Furthermore, Articles 48A and 51A(g) bolster this interpretation by designating environmental protection as a constitutional duty of both the State and its citizens.

3.3 Climate Change and Article 21

The analysis suggests that Article 21 has the potential to safeguard individuals from various climate-related threats. Extreme heat poses risks to life and health. Floods and cyclones can devastate homes and infrastructure. Droughts can impact food production and water supply. Shifts in climate patterns can disrupt agricultural livelihoods and public health. These effects illustrate that climate change can obstruct the essential conditions required for the realization of the right to life. Thus, the constitutional recognition of climate protection reinforces the argument that governments bear positive responsibilities to implement reasonable measures to shield individuals from foreseeable and significant climate-related dangers. Nevertheless, the exact extent of these responsibilities remains ambiguous. The ruling does not define a specific climate threshold at which governmental inaction is deemed unconstitutional. It also does not set forth specific emission-reduction targets or adaptation strategies. This presents a significant opportunity for future judicial advancement.

3.4 Climate Change and Article 14

The significance of Article 14 concerning climate change is a vital aspect of *Ranjitsinh*. Climate change results in an unequal distribution of risks. For example, individuals working outdoors may experience greater exposure to extreme heat than those in air-conditioned environments. Small-scale farmers may suffer more severe consequences from drought compared to larger agricultural enterprises with varied economic activities. Communities located in flood-prone regions may have fewer resources to recover from disasters. Consequently, formally equal treatment does not guarantee substantively equal climate outcomes. Therefore, the constitutional principle of equality requires an examination of differing vulnerabilities. This ruling paves the way for potential future litigation aimed at challenging climate policies that disproportionately impact vulnerable communities without adequate justification or protective measures. It also reinforces the argument that climate policies should embrace principles of fairness, inclusivity, and distributive justice. As a result, government authorities may need to evaluate whether environmental and climate-related initiatives impose disproportionate burdens on economically or

***Corresponding Author:**

Received: 25th July, 2026 | Revised: 26th August, 2026 | Accepted: 30th August, 2026 | Available Online: 2nd September, 2026
(DOI): 10.70102/AEJ.2026.18.4s.105

socially vulnerable groups. In this context, Article 14 can act as a crucial constitutional tool to ensure that the transition towards climate resilience is equitable and non-discriminatory.

3.5 Climate Justice

The acknowledgment of climate rights carries significant consequences for climate justice. Climate justice necessitates an examination of how the advantages and disadvantages linked to climate change and related policies are allocated. A climate policy might lower national emissions while concurrently placing considerable economic or social strains on a specific community. On the other hand, neglecting climate adaptation efforts may disproportionately impact communities that are already economically vulnerable. Thus, a constitutional framework for climate rights should encompass:

- distributive justice;
- procedural justice;
- acknowledgment of at-risk communities;
- intergenerational equity;
- protection of livelihoods; and
- fair access to climate-resilient resources.

The constitutional endorsement of climate rights offers a potential legal basis for these principles.

3.6 The Great Indian Bustard and the Climate-Biodiversity Conflict

The factual context surrounding *Ranjitsinh* serves as a significant example of the intricacies involved in climate governance. The Great Indian Bustard, which is critically endangered, necessitates robust conservation efforts. Concurrently, India must significantly enhance its renewable energy capacity to fulfill its climate and energy goals. The presence of overhead transmission infrastructure poses potential threats to avian populations, whereas the complete undergrounding of transmission lines may present considerable financial, technical, and practical challenges. Consequently, the Court faced a legitimate conflict between two environmental priorities: biodiversity conservation and climate mitigation. The importance of the ruling is underscored by the Court's acknowledgment that environmental goals cannot always be pursued independently. Climate initiatives must be conducted with environmental sensitivity, and the protection of biodiversity should also be integrated into the wider context of climate transition. This approach advocates for a more cohesive understanding of sustainable development.

3.7 Sustainable Development

The right to address climate change should not be interpreted as necessitating a total halt or ban on developmental activities. As a developing nation, India continues to grapple with substantial issues such as poverty, unemployment, access to energy,

infrastructure development, housing, and economic disparity. Thus, development remains a crucial aspect of the constitutional obligation to enhance the quality of life for its citizens. The acknowledgment of climate rights must therefore be viewed within this wider socio-economic framework. The suitable constitutional perspective is to avoid viewing development and environmental protection as opposing goals, but rather to harmonize them through the principle of sustainable development. Sustainable development mandates that economic growth occurs in a way that does not jeopardize ecological integrity or the interests of both current and future generations. Within the Indian constitutional framework, this principle entails the seamless integration of economic development, social equity, environmental safeguarding, and climate resilience or adaptability. This methodology is particularly vital in the face of climate change, as climate policies can have considerable socio-economic repercussions. For example, a swift shift away from fossil fuels may impact employment, energy affordability, industrial operations, and communities reliant on traditional energy sources. Likewise, extensive infrastructure initiatives may foster economic growth while simultaneously posing ecological and climate-related threats. Therefore, constitutional climate jurisprudence must strive for a balance between conflicting interests rather than imposing an absolute environmental ban. The ruling in *M.K. Ranjitsinh v. Union of India* exemplifies the significance of an integrated approach. By acknowledging constitutional safeguards against the detrimental impacts of climate change, the Supreme Court has enhanced the connection between environmental protection, human dignity, equality, and the right to life. Concurrently, the ruling does not imply that development should be forsaken. Instead, it emphasizes the necessity for development to be strategized and executed in a manner that is environmentally sustainable, socially equitable, and capable of addressing the escalating risks associated with climate change. Consequently, the constitutional recognition of climate rights should ultimately promote a model of climate-compatible development—one where economic advancement and environmental conservation support rather than conflict with one another. The aim should be to guarantee that current development does not inflict irreversible ecological damage or disproportionately impact future generations, while also ensuring that present generations, especially vulnerable and marginalized communities, are not deprived of the advantages of development. In this regard, *Ranjitsinh* signifies a crucial advancement towards integrating climate considerations into India's constitutional framework for sustainable and equitable development.

***Corresponding Author:**

Received: 25th July, 2026 | Revised: 26th August, 2026 | Accepted: 30th August, 2026 | Available Online: 2nd September, 2026
(DOI): 10.70102/AEJ.2026.18.4s.105

3.8 Precautionary Principle

The precautionary principle has been recognized for a considerable duration in Indian environmental law. Its importance is amplified by the challenges posed by climate change, as scientific uncertainty does not eliminate the possibility of significant harm. When reliable scientific evidence points to substantial climate risks, the absence of complete scientific certainty should not justify governmental inaction. Therefore, the constitutional acknowledgment of climate rights may strengthen the application of the precautionary principle in climate-related decision-making. It urges authorities to take preventive actions before environmental damage becomes irreversible or excessively expensive to rectify. Additionally, it emphasizes the need for risk assessment, scientific evidence, and the long-term environmental impacts when developing public policies and approving development projects. In this way, the precautionary principle can serve as a vital constitutional protection against preventable climate-related damage.

3.9 Positive Obligations of the State

Recognizing a fundamental right against the detrimental impacts of climate change carries significant implications, particularly the potential to impose positive obligations on the State. The State may be mandated to implement reasonable and effective measures concerning climate adaptation, disaster preparedness, management of heat waves, water security, climate-resilient agriculture, public health, safeguarding vulnerable communities, developing climate-resilient infrastructure, and providing access to pertinent environmental information. These obligations could also necessitate that governments enhance early-warning systems, improve institutional coordination, and ensure the effective implementation of climate-related policies at both local and regional levels. However, the ruling does not exhaustively list all such obligations, leaving ample room for their evolution through future judicial rulings, legislative actions, and governmental policies. The creation and enforcement of these obligations must achieve a suitable balance among constitutional protections, institutional capacities, and the financial and administrative resources accessible to the State. Concurrently, acknowledging these obligations may motivate governments to adopt a more proactive and preventive stance towards climate risks, rather than merely reacting after climate-related disasters have occurred. This strategy can further enhance accountability and ensure that constitutional climate protections yield tangible benefits for individuals and communities that are most susceptible to the effects of climate change.

3.10 Absence of Comprehensive Climate Legislation

A notable limitation emphasized in the ruling is the absence of a thorough climate-change statute in India. Currently, India's climate governance is conducted through a variety of legislative, regulatory, and policy measures, leading to a disjointed framework that may obstruct the clear delineation of legally binding climate targets, institutional roles, adaptation responsibilities, accountability mechanisms, climate-finance duties, monitoring processes, and effective remedies. The lack of a specific climate statute may also generate ambiguity regarding the exact responsibilities of various levels of government and public authorities in managing climate-related risks. The recognition of a constitutional climate right thus strengthens the argument for comprehensive climate legislation that can convert constitutional principles into specific and enforceable legal obligations. Such legislation could set explicit targets for mitigation and adaptation, clarify institutional roles, offer monitoring and enforcement mechanisms, and enhance transparency in climate governance. Additionally, it could promote coordination between the Union and State Governments, especially in tackling region-specific climate vulnerabilities. A comprehensive legal framework may also provide affected individuals and communities with clearer pathways for seeking remedies when climate-related obligations are not sufficiently met. In this way, climate legislation could act as a crucial link between the constitutional acknowledgment of climate rights and their effective application in practice.

3.11 Judicial Review and Institutional Competence

Climate change encompasses intricate scientific, technological, and economic issues. Judicial bodies are qualified to assess whether government actions infringe upon Fundamental Rights; however, they may lack the institutional capability to address highly specialized matters related to energy systems, emission trajectories, or infrastructure design. The Court's reasoning in *Ranjitsinh* highlights the significance of expert participation. Consequently, a future jurisprudence concerning climate rights should differentiate between: the constitutional evaluation of governmental actions and the imposition of judicial preferences on governmental climate policies. Courts ought to verify that governmental decisions are lawful, rational, grounded in evidence, transparent, and compliant with constitutional standards, while also providing adequate institutional space for scientific and policy expertise.

3.12 Implications for Future Climate Litigation

The recognition of a constitutional right pertaining to climate change is anticipated to have a profound effect on the future evolution of Public Interest Litigation (PIL) in India, especially in instances where governmental inaction or insufficient climate

*Corresponding Author:

Received: 25th July, 2026 | Revised: 26th August, 2026 | Accepted: 30th August, 2026 | Available Online: 2nd September, 2026
(DOI): 10.70102/AEJ.2026.18.4s.105

measures result in significant repercussions for fundamental rights. Key areas of concern may encompass extreme heat, where the lack of effective heat-action plans or the failure to safeguard vulnerable populations could invoke issues under Article 21; floods and cyclones, where the inadequacy of disaster preparedness may be examined when climate-related risks are both foreseeable and considerable; water security, where climate-induced water scarcity could raise inquiries regarding the rights to life, dignity, health, and equality; agriculture, where threats to farming livelihoods due to shifting rainfall patterns, droughts, floods, and severe weather events may increasingly pertain to constitutional litigation; climate-induced displacement, where communities impacted by floods, coastal erosion, and other climate-related challenges may pursue constitutional safeguards for their life, dignity, livelihood, and essential living conditions; and infrastructure, where significant developmental initiatives may be more frequently evaluated concerning their climate vulnerability, environmental impacts, and potential effects on affected communities. Future climate litigation may also investigate whether governments have sufficiently taken into account scientific evidence and climate forecasts when developing public policies and sanctioning development initiatives. Courts may increasingly be tasked with evaluating whether governmental decisions related to climate adhere to the principles of proportionality, equality, precaution, and sustainable development. Such developments could promote enhanced governmental accountability and bolster the role of constitutional courts in ensuring that climate policies adequately safeguard vulnerable individuals and communities. Together, these scenarios suggest that *Ranjitsinh* could provide a significant constitutional basis for a new and growing wave of climate litigation in India.

3.13 Limitations of *M.K. Ranjitsinh*

Despite its transformative potential, the ruling leaves many issues unresolved. Firstly, the precise nature and scope of the right remain unclear. Secondly, the ruling does not establish a clear threshold for determining when governmental inaction regarding climate change amounts to a constitutional violation. Thirdly, the characteristics, extent, and enforceability of positive State obligations are not sufficiently defined. Fourthly, the appropriate remedies for breaches of the right require further judicial interpretation. Fifthly, excessive judicial intervention may raise concerns about the separation of powers and institutional competence. Sixthly, addressing climate change necessitates long-term policy coordination, institutional capacity, and sustained governmental action, which cannot be accomplished solely through

individual judicial mandates. Additionally, the judgment leaves unresolved questions about the extent to which private entities may hold corresponding responsibilities for climate-related damages. It is also essential to clarify how the right will be balanced against competing constitutional and developmental interests, especially in cases involving economic growth and infrastructure projects. Ultimately, the effective implementation of the right will rely on legislative and executive actions that convert the constitutional acknowledgment of climate rights into tangible standards, policies, and accountability mechanisms. Therefore, the ruling should be regarded as establishing the constitutional foundation for climate rights rather than providing a comprehensive framework for climate rights.

3.14 Towards Climate Constitutionalism in India

The results of the analysis suggest that a comprehensive framework of Indian climate constitutionalism should be established based on five interconnected principles: (1) the protection of life and human dignity as outlined in Article 21, which mandates the State to shield individuals from significant threats posed by climate change; (2) the assurance of substantive equality under Article 14, acknowledging that the impacts of climate change are not uniformly felt and that vulnerable and marginalized communities may necessitate additional safeguards; (3) the promotion of environmental protection as stated in Article 48A, which assigns a constitutional duty to the State to safeguard and enhance the environment; (4) the reinforcement of environmental responsibility under Article 51A(g), which establishes a fundamental obligation for citizens to protect and improve the natural environment; and (5) the advancement of sustainable development and intergenerational equity, ensuring that the developmental needs of the present are met without jeopardizing the capacity of future generations to enjoy a safe and healthy environment. Together, these principles form a constitutional framework for evaluating governmental policies, developmental initiatives, and regulatory choices in relation to climate change. They also necessitate that climate governance strikes a balance between economic development, environmental protection, social justice, and long-term ecological sustainability. Moreover, the future development of climate constitutionalism should emphasize enhanced access to climate-related information and scientific data, meaningful public engagement in environmental decision-making, transparency in governmental climate strategies, and robust protection for communities particularly susceptible to climate-related hazards. This approach would facilitate the transition of constitutional climate rights from mere judicial acknowledgment to a

***Corresponding Author:**

Received: 25th July, 2026 | Revised: 26th August, 2026 | Accepted: 30th August, 2026 | Available Online: 2nd September, 2026
(DOI): 10.70102/AEJ.2026.18.4s.105

powerful tool for fostering accountable, equitable, and climate-resilient governance in India.

4. **Conclusion**

The ruling in *M.K. Ranjitsinh v. Union of India* marks a pivotal advancement in the realm of Indian constitutional law. By acknowledging a right to be shielded from the detrimental impacts of climate change under Articles 14 and 21, the Supreme Court has made a significant move towards embedding climate protection within the constitution. This ruling illustrates that climate change transcends being merely an environmental issue. Its repercussions can influence life, health, livelihood, dignity, and equality. Consequently, climate change is situated within the valid scope of constitutional rights. The invocation of Article 14 is particularly noteworthy, as climate change is defined by disproportionate vulnerability. The impacts of climate change are often more pronounced for communities that possess limited economic and social resources to adapt. Therefore, a constitutional framework for climate rights must integrate principles of substantive equality and climate justice. Simultaneously, *Ranjitsinh* highlights the intricacies of climate governance. The tension between the conservation of the Great Indian Bustard and the development of renewable energy illustrates that climate policy cannot be simplified to a binary choice between development and environmental preservation. Climate mitigation, biodiversity conservation, energy security, and sustainable development should be addressed through a cohesive constitutional framework.

The primary limitation of the judgment lies in its acknowledgment of the right without a thorough definition of its content. Issues regarding the specific obligations of the State, the threshold for constitutional violations, available remedies, and the role of courts in evaluating climate policy remain unresolved. The lack of comprehensive climate legislation further hinders the practical application of the constitutional principle. A dedicated climate framework could set measurable targets, define institutional responsibilities, outline adaptation duties, establish transparency mechanisms, and create accountability procedures. Thus, the future of climate constitutionalism in India should foster a collaborative relationship among the judiciary, legislature, executive, scientific institutions, and civil society. Courts ought to safeguard constitutional rights and ensure governmental accountability while acknowledging the institutional expertise of specialized climate-policy bodies. Ultimately, *M.K. Ranjitsinh* should be viewed not as the culmination of India's climate-rights jurisprudence but as its constitutional inception. The ruling lays a doctrinal groundwork upon which future courts can build a

more extensive right to climate protection, resilience, and justice. The constitutional recognition of the right against climate change signifies a significant advancement in Indian public law: evolving from the right to a clean environment, to the right to live with dignity, and ultimately towards a constitutional right to protection from the detrimental impacts of climate change. For this constitutional acknowledgment to hold practical significance, however, India must convert judicial principles into effective legislation, institutional frameworks, climate-resilient policies, and enforceable accountability standards.

References

Acts

Constitution of India, 1950.
Air (Prevention and Control of Pollution) Act, 1981.
Disaster Management Act, 2005.
Energy Conservation Act, 2001.
Environment (Protection) Act, 1986.
National Green Tribunal Act, 2010.
Water (Prevention and Control of Pollution) Act, 1974.
Wild Life (Protection) Act, 1972.

Case Laws

M.K. Ranjitsinh v. Union of India, 2024 INSC 280.
Subhash Kumar v. State of Bihar, (1991) 1 SCC 598.
Virender Gaur v. State of Haryana, (1995) 2 SCC 577.
Vellore Citizens' Welfare Forum v. Union of India, (1996) 5 SCC 647.
M.C. Mehta v. Kamal Nath, (1997) 1 SCC 388.
M.C. Mehta v. Union of India, (1987) 4 SCC 463.
M.C. Mehta v. Union of India, (1988) 1 SCC 471.
Indian Council for Enviro-Legal Action v. Union of India, (1996) 3 SCC 212.
Hanuman Laxman Aroskar v. Union of India, (2019) 15 SCC 401.
Karnataka Industrial Areas Development Board v. C. Kenchappa, (2006) 6 SCC 371.
Urgenda Foundation v. State of the Netherlands, Supreme Court of the Netherlands, 2019.
Neubauer et al. v. Germany, Federal Constitutional Court of Germany, 2021.
Verein KlimaSeniorinnen Schweiz and Others v. Switzerland, European Court of Human Rights, 2024.

International Instruments

United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, 1992.
Kyoto Protocol to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, 1997.
Paris Agreement, 2015.
United Nations General Assembly. (2022). The human right to a clean, healthy and sustainable environment. A/RES/76/300.

Books and Scholarly Literature

Boyd, D. R. (2012). The environmental rights revolution: A global study of constitutions, human

*Corresponding Author:

Received: 25th July, 2026 | Revised: 26th August, 2026 | Accepted: 30th August, 2026 | Available Online: 2nd September, 2026
(DOI): 10.70102/AEJ.2026.18.4s.105

rights, and the environment. UBC Press.

Peel, J., & Osofsky, H. M. (2015). Climate change litigation: Regulatory pathways to cleaner energy. Cambridge University Press.

Peel, J., & Osofsky, H. M. (2018). A rights turn in climate change litigation? *Transnational Environmental Law*, 7(1), 37–67.

Setzer, J., & Higham, C. (2022). Global trends in climate change litigation: 2022 snapshot. Grantham Research Institute on Climate Change and the Environment.

United Nations Environment Programme. (2023). Global climate litigation report: 2023 status review. United Nations Environment Programme.