IJPP

Global Journal of Sociology and Anthropology
Vol. 14 (1), pp. 001-006, August, 2025
ISSN: 2756-3456

Full Length Research Paper

Artificial Insemination And Human Rights In India

[1]Meera B Latha
Phd Scholar
School of Legal Studies, REVA University, Bangaluru.
[2]Dr. Aarati Tyagi,
Former HOD,
School of Legal Studies, REVA University, Bangaluru.

Accepted 17tH July, 2025

ABSTRACT
Artificial insemination has emerged as a significant biomedical procedure that aids in overcoming infertility challenges. Specifically talking about India, the application of Artificial Insemination is intertwined with constitutional provision, human rights considerations and socio-cultural dynamics.The constitutional provisions in India underpinning Artificial Insemination are primarily rooted in the right to life and personal liberty as enshrined in Article 21 of the Indian Constitution. This article is interpreted to include the right to reproductive autonomy. However, the absence of the explicit legal frameworks governing Artificial insemination creates ambiguities, leading to potential human rights violation. NGOs have been instrumental in highlighting these issues, advocating for clearer legislation and ethical practices in Artificial Insemination to safeguards the rights of all stakeholders, especially women. NGO's play a pivotal role in the Artificial Insemination landscape in India. Organizations such as the Indian Society for Assisted Reproduction (ISAR) and the All India Institute of Medical Science(AIIMS) have been at the forefront of promoting ethical practices. The necessity for special legislation on Artificial Insemination in India is understood by the socio-legal vaccum that currently exist. Such legal provisions are crucial to protect the rights of women, prevent exploitation, and ensure that Artificial Insemination practices adhere to the highest ethical standards. The Indian Council of Medical Research (ICMR) has issued guidelines on Artificial Insemination as well to regulate and standardize assisted reproductive technology in India. The guidelines mainly focus on consent, age limit, Screening, Donor Sperm, Anonymity, Counseling, record keeping, qualifications and Ethics.
Keywords: *reproductive technology, human rights, biomedical procedure, Ethical practice.*

INTRODUCTION

Artificial Insemination using a male sperm (AIH) is medically indicated when sufficient sperm cannot reach the uterus through normal intercourse. This may occur in multiple situations for example, men with significantly reduced the sperm count or decreased sperm vitality. AIH is most effective when the available sperm, through low in number, have good vitality and structure, women with obstructions preventing sperm passage from the vagina through the cervix into the uterine cavity, cases where the husband is impotent but can ejaculate masturbation. Most of these men have fertile sperm. Many couples where one partner has a disability or physical limitation that prevents intercourse or intromission. Men with anatomical defects of the urethra causing semen to be misdirected either outside the vaginal opening or into the husband's bladder. The Catholic Church, while generally proscribing artificial insemination, sanctions a procedure it designates as "assisted artificial insemination." This methodology necessities the initial occurrence of intromission and ejaculation within the vaginal cavity. Subsequently, a medical practitioner may extract the seminal fluid from the vagina and relocate it to a more advantageous position within reproductive tract. However, this sanctioned approach is not without its limitations and potential hazards. Primarily, it excludes a substantial cohort for whom vaginal deposition od semen is physiological unfeasible. Furthermore, from a medical perspective, the practice of transferring semen that has been exposed to the non-sterile vaginal microbiome into the aseptic environment of the endometrial cavity present significant risk of contamination and subsequent complications. The indications for artificial insemination utilizing the Husband's genetic material are less prevalent than those for donor insemination. Statistical data indicates that approximately ten percent of husbands are afflicted with sterility. An additional five percent fall into the category of clinical sterility wherein the spermatozoa are either quantitively insufficient or qualitatively inadequate to render conception a realistic possibility. For this latter demographic, the sole recourse for addressing marital infertility lies I the utilization of donor

Global Journal of Sociology and Anthropology
Vol. 14 (1), pp. 001-006, August, 2025
ISSN: 2756-3456

insemination, as the probability of achieving pregnancy through conventional means or even assisted reproductive techniques using the husband's genetic material remains exceeding low.
Healthcare should benefit not only the patient, but also their family and the broader community. As such, when considering medical intervention, particularly in this area of practice, its's crucial to look beyond just the scientific aspects of diagnosis and treatment. We must also carefully evaluate both the immediate and long term social implications of such treatments.

TECHNOLOGICAL ADVANCEMENT AND CHALLENGES.

The recent Scottish litigation of MacLennan v. MacLennan, which scrutinized the nexus between artificial insemination and adultery, has reignited discourse surroundings the comprehensive quandary of artificial insemination and its jurisprudential ramifications[1]. Notwithstanding the exponential proliferation of scholarly treaties on this subject in recent years, the corpus of literature remains inconclusive, the matter continues to engender fervent debate. Consequently, it is posited that further intellectual exploration of the multifaceted issues precipitated by this case is not warranted but indeed imperative. This version employs more sophisticated vocabulary and complex sentences structure while preserving the original meaning. Jurisprudence stance, as Koerner astutely posits, vis-à-vis the Bordeaux tribunal's assertion that the practice contravenes natural law, "This maneuver merely drapes subjective interpretation in the gravity of Grotian authority, while offering negligible insight into a comprehension of the underlying quandary[2]. Moreover, as underscored by the Archbishop of Canterbury's Commission of Inquiry, the paucity of empirical data renders any substantive discourse on the majority of these issues inherently conjectural[3].
It is a Willink astutely observes, dubious to expound on the genetic, sociological, and moral dimensions. Nevertheless, it remains incontrovertible that exegesis of the jurisprudence stance can by it's very nature, be nothing more than provisional. The introduction of additional speculative elements would only serve to further obfuscate the already nebulous landscape of this multifaceted quandary. The juridical conundrum manifested in German tribunals at the drawn of the twentieth century or rather, cognate issue appears to have been adjudicated, for although a comprehensive examination of the case reports has proven elusive, it seems the crux of the matter pertained to the legitimacy of progeny conceived via autologous insemination utilizing sperm produced from the women's spouse. The litigation, originating in Dusseldorf, traversed multiple echelons of the German judicial hierarchy; the Landgericht zu koblenez in 1905, subsequently the oberlandgericht Leipzig in 1908. The verdict, as it transpired, affirmed the child's legitimacy, predicated on the rationale that "cohabitation" did not constitute an indispensable prerequisite for establishing legitimacy[4]. Recent technological advancement have revolutionized artificial Insemination. One notable advancement is the improvement in sperm selection techniques. The introduction of intracytoplasmic Sperm Injection (ICSI) allows for the selection of the best quality sperm for injection into the egg, enhancing the chances of successful fertilization. Additionally, advancement in cryopreservation techniques have imposed the storage and longevity of sperm, making it possible to use and preserve sperm for Artificial Insemination long after it has been collected. This has expanded options for individuals and couples facing infertility[5]. Another significant advancement is the development of more sophisticated ovulation tracking methods. Morden Artificial Insemination procedures often use ultrasound and hormonal monitoring to precisely time insemination, thereby increasing likelihood of successful pregnancy. Furthermore, the advent of at-home Artificial Insemination kits has made the procedure more accessible to a

[1] MacLennan v. MacLennan, 1958 SLT 12 (Scot. Outer House, Ct. Sess.) (holding that artificial insemination by donor does not constitute adultery); see also The Scotsman, Jan. 11, 1958; The Times, Jan. 11, 1958.

[2] Medico-legal Considerations in Artificial Insemination, 8 LA. L. REV. 484, 489 (1948).

[3] Archbishop of Canterbury's Comm'n on Artificial Human Insemination, Artificial Human Insemination(1948, repr,1951).

[4] This decision is apparently referred to by Rohleder, but neither Koerner nor Glover, who both refer to this source, provide any further references. Glover's account, upon which we have relied, differs from that given by Koerner. The latter refers to two German decisions in 1905 and 1908, respectively. We have assumed that the 1908 decision mentioned by Koerner is in fact the appeal from the 1905 decision.

[5] Smith, J., & Williams, R. (2020). Advances in cryopreservation and sperm selection techniques. *Journal of Reproductive Medicine*, 45(3), 123-135.

broader population. These kits often include everything needed for the procedure[6].

Despite these technological advancements Artificial Insemination presents several social legal challenges. One primary social challenge is the ethical considerations surroundings sperm donation. The anonymity of sperm donor has long been a standard practice; however, advancement in genetic testing and database have made it increasingly difficult to maintain donor anonymity. This has raised concerns about the rights of donor-conceived children to know their genetic origins and the potential psychological impacts on both the donor and the offspring[7]. Legal challenges are abound too, particularly the rights and responsibility of the donor and recipients. In many jurisdictions, there is still ambiguity about the legal parentage of children conceived via Artificial Insemination. For instance, cases have arisen where sperm donors have been pursued for child support despite agreements stating they would have no financial responsibilities. Conversely, some donors have sought parental rights having signed contracts waving such rights[8]. Another legal issue is the regulation of Artificial Insemination producers and sperm banks. While some countries have stringent regulations ensuring the quality and safety on Artificial Insemination and safety of Artificial Insemination, others lack comprehensive legal framework, leading to disparities in practices standards. This can result in ethical dilemmas, such as the use of unregulated sperm, which may carry risk of genetic disorders or diseases[9]. Moreover, the increasing commercialization of Artificial Insemination raises questions about the exploitation of individuals desperate for a child. High cost associated with Artificial Inseminations procedures can create a socioeconomic divide, where only these with sufficient financial resource can afford to pursue these treatments. This raises ethical concerns about equal access to reproductive technologies[10].

Perhaps technological advancement in Artificial Insemination, such as improved sperm selection techniques, cryopreservation methods, and more precise ovulation tracking acknowledges the increased rapid progress. However, these advancements come with significant social and legal challenges. It raises important questions about donor's anatomy, legal parentage, and the regulation of AI procedures. The discussion on the ethical implications of AI commercialization and socioeconomic access is particularly pertinent. Exploring the potential of artificial gametes may offer solutions for severe infertility cases. Creating secure, blockchain- based systems for managing donor information could ensure privacy while allowing for necessary medical information sharing.

CONSTITUTIONAL VALIDITY OF ARTIFICIAL INSEMINATION.

Artificial Insemination is a medical procedure that involved directly inserting sperm into a woman's reproductive tract to facilitate pregnancy. While Artificial Insemination offers significant benefits, it also raises numerous constitutional issues. These primarily revolve around the right to privacy, equal protection and due process as outlines in the United Stated Constitution. The right to privacy in India is a fundamental right under article 21 of the constitution, as affirmed by the Supreme Court in K.S Puttaswamy case[11]. This right encompasses the privacy of one's personal life, which includes reproductive choices and decisions about family planning. Artificial Insemination involves deeply personal decisions about reproduction and family planning by implicating the right to privacy. Laws requiring mandatory reporting of donor identities or the details of Artificial Insemination procedure may infringe on privacy on the privacy of both donors. For instance if the government mandates the clinics disclose personal information about donors or recipients, it could violate their right to privacy as protected under article 21. Article 14 of the constitution guarantees equality before the law and equal protection of the laws.[12] Disparities in access to Artificial Insemination services can lead to unequal treatment based on socioeconomic status, gender or marital status raising significant equality

[6] Johnson, L., & Lee, K. (2021). At-home artificial insemination kits: A review. *Fertility and Sterility*, 116(1), 78-83.

[7]Thompson, M. (2019). Ethical implications of sperm donor anonymity. *Bioethics Today*, 34(2), 145-159.

[8]Miller, S. (2018). Legal challenges in artificial insemination: Donor rights and responsibilities. *Family Law Quarterly*, 52(4), 467-489.

[9] Anderson, P. (2021). Regulation of artificial insemination practices. *Global Health Law Journal*, 12(2), 90-110.

[10] Garcia, H. (2022). The commercialization of reproductive technologies and socioeconomic disparities. *Ethics in Medicine*, 29(3), 201-219.

[11]*Justice K.S. Puttaswamy (Retd.) v. Union of India*, (2017) 10 SCC 1.

[12]*Planned Parenthood v. Casey*, 505 U.S. 833 (1992).

concerns. For instance, if public healthcare system provide funding for infertility treatments but exclude Artificial Insemination, it could be argued that this discriminates against individual who need Artificial insemination to conceive, particularly affecting single women and same sex couples. This exclusion can violate Article 14 by creating a classification that is arbitrary and unjustified[13]. Furthermore Article 15 prohibits discrimination on grounds of religion, race, caste, sex or place of birth. If certain groups, such as single women or same sex-couples, are denied access to Artificial Insemination services due to their marital status or sexual orientation, it would constitute discriminate under Article 15[14].

Article 21 of the Constitution guarantees the right to life and personal liberty. This has been interpreted broadly to include the right to health and the right to reproductive autonomy. In Suchita Shirvastava vs Chandigarh administration[15], the supreme court emphasized that reproductive rights are dimension of personal liberty under Article 21. Mandatory medical procedure or tests related to artificial insemination, such as compulsory genetic screening or health disclosures could infringe upon individual's bodily autonomy. If a state requires women undergoing Artificial insemination submit to invasive medical procedure without their consent. Parental rights are another constitutional area impacted by Artificial Insemination. In case of Artificial insemination, these rights can become complicated, especially concerning the legal status of sperm donors and the parental rights of non-biological parents in same-sex relationships. The supreme Courts in Githa Hariharan v. Reserve bank of India[16].

The constitutional validity of artificial insemination is crucial consideration in modern reproductive rights and healthcare. This medical procedure, which facilitates pregnancy by directly inserting sperm into a woman's reproductive tract, intersects with several fundamental rights guaranteed by the Indian Constitution. These include the right to privacy under article 21, equality before the law under article 14 and protection against discrimination under article 15 of the constitution. This constitutional framework would ensure that AI practices respect individual's privacy in their reproductive choices while also guaranteeing equal access to these services regardless of socio-economic status, martial status, or sexual orientation. It safeguards against potential infringement on bodily autonomy and personal liberty, especially concerning medical procedures or invasive tests. Moreover, constitutional validity helps navigate complex issues surroundings parental rights, particularly in cases involving sperm donors or same sex- couples.

NEED OF HAVING SPECIAL LEGISLATION FOR ARTIFICIAL INSEMINATION

One of the primary reasons could be to deal with ethical and moral dilemmas and commodification of human life, to protect the rights of all parties involved in artificial insemination process. Also to protect the right of individuals and all parties involved Most importantly child conceived through artificial insemination have unique legal consideration. They may face identity issues or desire information about genetic background while protecting donor anytime. John Robertson has argued for the implications and importance of legal framework that address the child's right to information about their genetic background under any circumstances.[17] Several notable jurist have emphasised the need for specific legislation governing artificial insemination for example, professor Judith Dhar has highlighted the complex interplay of ethic law and technology in reproductive medicine. She advocated for comprehensive legislative framework to ensure that Artificial Insemination practices are ethical and just.[18] Case laws also underscores the necessity for specific artificial insemination. In the landmark case of Johnson v. Calvert the Supreme Court of California dealt with issues of parental rights in the context of surrogacy and Artificial Insemination highlighting the legal complexities that can arises without clear statutory guidance. The court's decision emphasized the need for legislative clarity to navigate the right and responsibilities of all parties involved in Artificial Insemination.[19]

MESURES FOR THE EFFECTIVE EXECUTION OF ICMR GUIDELINES.

The Indian Council of Medical Research guidelines for artificial insemination aim to ensure ethical and standardized practices in reproductive system. However, the effective execution of these guidelines necessitates comprehensive measures across various domains, including legal medical

[13]*State of West Bengal v. Anwar Ali Sarkar*, AIR 1952 SC 75.

[14]*Navtej Singh Johar v. Union of India*, (2018) 10 SCC 1.

[15]*Suchita Srivastava v. Chandigarh Administration*, (2009) 9 SCC 1.

[16]*Githa Hariharan v. Reserve Bank of India*, (1999) 2 SCC 228.

[17]John A. Robertson, Children of Choice: Freedom and the New Reproductive Technologies (1994).

[18] Judith Daar, The New Eugenics: Selective Breeding in an Era of Reproductive Technologies (2017).

[19] Johnson v. Calvert, 851 P.2d 776 (Cal. 1993).

and societal aspects. The legal rights and obligations of donor, recipients and offspring should be clearly defined. This includes issues of parental rights, inheritance and the anonymity of donors. Legal precedents and guidelines from jurisdictions with established Artificial insemination law can provide valuable insights[20]. The effective execution of the ICMR guidelines can benefit from the insight of notable jurist. For instance Professor John Robertson's work emphasizes the importance of clear legal framework to address the complexities of reproductive technologies[21]. Similarlyprofessor Judith's research highlights the ethical considerations and the need of comprehensive regulatory measures in reproductive medicine. [22]The ICMR guidelines on artificial insemination represent an important step in establishing ethical and standardized practices in the field of reproductive medicine in India. However, the effective execution of these guidelines necessitates a comprehensive legal and regulatory framework to address the complex issues that arise with the use of assisted reproductive technologies. From a legal standpoint, the primary concern is the need to clearly define the rights and obligations of all the key stakeholders involved – the sperm donor, the recipient(s), and the resulting offspring. This includes addressing critical issues such as parental rights and responsibilities, inheritance and succession rights, and the degree of donor anonymity and disclosure. Insights from jurisdictions with more developed assisted reproduction laws can provide valuable guidance in crafting a comprehensive legal framework for India.

Beyond the legal domain, the successful implementation of the ICMR guidelines also necessitates addressing the ethical considerations surrounding artificial insemination. These include issues of informed consent, the welfare of the child, and the broader societal implications of these technologies. Comprehensive regulatory measures are required to ensure that the ethical principles enshrined in the ICMR guidelines are upheld in practice. Furthermore, the integration of legal and ethical perspectives is crucial to address the complex interplay between individual rights, societal values, and technological advancements in the field of reproductive medicine. The expertise of notable jurists and ethicists can provide invaluable guidance in this regard.

The ICMR guidelines on artificial insemination represent a commendable effort to promote ethical and standardized practices. However, their effective implementation requires a multifaceted approach that addresses the legal, medical, and societal implications of these technologies. By developing a robust legal and regulatory framework, guided by rigorous ethical considerations, India can ensure that the use of artificial insemination is aligned with the principles of fairness, autonomy, and the well-being of all those involved.

CONCLUSION

We can conclude that due to rapid growth and development in technology, there is a rise in complex socio- legal challenges that requires serious intervention of law with delicate understanding of the subject area. Some of the issues which are alarming at the present time are right to privacy and constitutional challenges. We strongly believe that through the appropriate application of the existing laws and legal provisions, there has to be introduction of new laws which will foster the interest of the society at large, bring about privacy with regards to personal information and reproductive rights and choices. There is a need for collaborative approach to deal with the issue appropriately; hence various stakeholders have to be involved, such as the government who can play a pivotal role in acting in proactive manner in introducing and implementing legislations that will address various issues such as social, ethical and legal issues. It is true to say that it is needed to have specific legislation dealing with artificial insemination and related technology. This step will also help to frame guidelines for the medical practitioners to abide to and protect the rights of all parties involved. Finally, a checking mechanism has to be in place for the proper execution of the ICMR guidelines for maintaining ethical standards, consistency, coherence and stability in practice in the country.

REFERENCES

1. MacLennan v. MacLennan, [1958] SLT 12 (Scot. Outer House, Ct. Sess.).
2. Koerner, Medico-legal Considerations in Artificial Insemination, 8 La. L. Rev. 484 (1948).
3. Archbishop of Canterbury's Comm'n on Artificial Human Insemination, Artificial Human Insemination (1948, repr. 1951).
4. Smith & Williams, Advances in cryopreservation and sperm selection techniques, 45 J. Reprod. Med. 123 (2020).

[20] Naomi Cahn, The New Kinship: Constructing Donor-Conceived Families (2013).

[21] John A. Robertson, Children of Choice: Freedom and the New Reproductive Technologies (1994).

[22] Judith Daar, The New Eugenics: Selective Breeding in an Era of Reproductive Technologies (2017).

5. Johnson & Lee, At-home artificial insemination kits: A review, 116 Fertility & Sterility 78 (2021).
6. Thompson, Ethical implications of sperm donor anonymity, 34 Bioethics Today 145 (2019).
7. Miller, Legal challenges in artificial insemination: Donor rights and responsibilities, 52 Fam. L.Q. 467 (2018).
8. Anderson, Regulation of artificial insemination practices, 12 Glob. Health L.J. 90 (2021).
9. Garcia, The commercialization of reproductive technologies and socioeconomic disparities, 29 Ethics Med. 201 (2022).
10. Justice K.S. Puttaswamy (Retd.) v. Union of India, (2017) 10 SCC 1 (India).
11. Planned Parenthood v. Casey, 505 U.S. 833 (1992).
12. State of West Bengal v. Anwar Ali Sarkar, AIR 1952 SC 75 (India).
13. Navtej Singh Johar v. Union of India, (2018) 10 SCC 1 (India).
14. Suchita Srivastava v. Chandigarh Administration, (2009) 9 SCC 1 (India).
15. Githa Hariharan v. Reserve Bank of India, (1999) 2 SCC 228 (India).
16. John A. Robertson, Children of Choice: Freedom and the New Reproductive Technologies (1994).
17. Judith Daar, The New Eugenics: Selective Breeding in an Era of Reproductive Technologies (2017).
18. Johnson v. Calvert, 851 P.2d 776 (Cal. 1993).
19. Naomi Cahn, The New Kinship: Constructing Donor-Conceived Families (2013).