IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA
CIVIL ORIGINAL JURISDICTION

WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) No. 501 OF 2009

HEALTH FOR MILLIONS **PETITIONER(S)**

VERSUS

UNION OF INDIA & ORS. **RESPONDENT(S)**

ORDER

1. Heard Advocate Pranav Sachdeva for the petitioner and Advocate Hemadri Sharma for the respondent(s).

2. The writ petition under Article 32 of the Constitution of India is at the instance of "Health for Millions", a Non-Governmental Organization ('NGO'), alleges to be working for the betterment of health of millions of marginalized people.

3. In the present writ petition, the petitioner lays challenge to a few provisions under the Child and Adolescent Labour (Prohibition and Regulation) Act, 1986 and the prayers read as under:

> ***" a) Declare Proviso to Section 3 of the Act as ultra vires Article 14, 21, 21A, 24 read with Article 39(e), 39(f) and 47 of***

Signature Not Verified
Digitally signed by SNEHA DAS
Date: 2024.11.03 19:01:07 IST
Reason:

the Constitution of India.
b) Direct Respondent No.1 to provide educational facilities as well as two mid day meals to such child workers.
c) To provide any other relief that this Hon'ble court may deem fit in the facts and circumstances of the case."

4. Mr. Pranav Sachdeva, for the petitioner places before us the amendments incorporated to the Child and Adolescent Labour (Prohibition and Regulation) Act, 1986. He further invites our attention to the changed statutory framework and also the obligation fastened on the executive machinery entrusted with the duties and functions under the enactment.

5. Advocate Hemadri Sharma, appearing for the respondent(s) states that with the amendment to the parent Act, the grievance of the petitioner is substantially attended to and in present, the cause of action in the manner set out in the writ petition does not survive.

6. We take note of the writ prayers, the orders passed by this Court and also the amendment to the parent Act. We are of the view that the prayer, as made, in the writ petition does not survive for

further consideration but what remains to be taken note of is giving complete and full effect to the changes introduced by way of amendment Act No. 35 of 2016. Keeping in perspective the above brief narrative, we are persuaded not to examine the prayers as made but we take note of the amendment Act No. 35 of 2016 and note that it shall be the responsibility of the respondent(s) to ensure complete and strict compliance of the mandate of the Child and Adolescent Labour (Prohibition and Regulation) Act, 1986 including the amended provisions.

7. For the said purpose, with a view to preserving the rights of children/ adolescents, we direct the second respondent to constitute a special cell, continue to monitor the implementation of the provisions of the Act and also issue direction to the enforcing agencies through the respective Chief Secretaries of the State, as amended through the Act No.35 of 2016.

8. With the above directions, the writ petition is disposed of.

9. Pending application(s), if any, shall stand disposed of.

……...J.
[S.V.N. BHATTI]

……...J.
[N.V. ANJARIA]

NEW DELHI;
OCTOBER 29, 2026.

ITEM NO.103 COURT NO.14 SECTION PIL-W

S U P R E M E C O U R T O F I N D I A
RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Writ Petition (Civil) No. 501/2009

HEALTH FOR MILLIONS Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

UNION OF INDIA & ORS. Respondent(s)

**(FOR ON IA 1/2009 FOR DIRECTION
FOR ON IA 2/2013 AMENDED APPLICATION FOR DIRECTION
FOR CONDONATION OF DELAY IN FILING ON IA 3/2013)**

Date : 29-10-2026 This matter was called on for hearing today.

CORAM :
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE S.V.N. BHATTI
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE N.V. ANJARIA

For Petitioner(s) Mr. Prashant Bhushan- 515, AOR
Mr. Pranav Sachdeva, Adv.
Mr. Sanyam Jain, Adv.
Ms. Mishra Divya Santosh, Av.
Ms. Khushboo Singhal, Adv.
Mr. P. Rohit Ram, Adv.

For Respondent(s) Ms. Aishwarya Bhati, A.S.G. (N.P.)
Ms. Hemadri Sharma, Adv.
Ms. Anupriya Srivastava, Adv.
Ms. Mitali, Adv.
Mr. Madhav Sinhal, Adv.
Ms. Sansriti Pathak, Adv.
Mr. Chitrangda Rashtaravara, Adv.
Ms. Rajeshwari Shankar, Adv.
Mr. Amrish Kumar, AOR
Dr. Arun Kumar Yadav, Adv.
Mr. B.L.N.Sanjit, Adv.

Mr. K. Rajeev, AOR
Ms. Niveditha R Menon, Adv.
Mr. Aditya Verma, Adv.
Mr. Tarun Kumar, Adv.

UPON hearing the counsel the Court made the following

O R D E R

1. The writ petition stands disposed of in terms of the signed order which is placed on the file.

2. Pending application(s), if any, shall stand disposed of.

(SNEHA DAS)
COURT MASTER (SH)

(AJEET SINGH TARIYAL)
COURT MASTER (NSH)