Designing a Comprehensive Legal Framework for Mental Health Support in Indian Higher Education Institutions

Dr. Madhuri V. Sarwade*

Associate Professor, Tilak Maharashtra Vidyapeeth's Lokmanya Tilak Law College, Pune, Maharashtra, India

madhurisarwade@gmail.com

Abstract: In India, mental health issues among students in higher education institutions (hereinafter referred as HEIs) have become a major public health and governance issue. Growing rates of stress, anxiety, despair, and student suicides point to structural weaknesses in institutional support systems. The National Education Policy (hereinafter referred as NEP 2020) and the Mental Healthcare Act of 2017 are two examples of legislation and policy frameworks that recognize mental health but lack institution-specific enforceability in higher education. In addition to identifying implementation gaps and analyzing international best practices from the USA, UK, Australia, and Canada, this article conducts a doctrinal, comparative, and socio-legal examination of current frameworks. Incorporating institutional responsibilities, student rights, regulatory compliance, preventive methods, crisis intervention systems, and accountability structures, it suggests a comprehensive legislative framework specifically designed for Indian HEIs. The study contends that in order to make HEIs accessible, secure, and mentally helpful, a legally binding and organized framework is necessary.

Keywords: Institutional Accountability; Counselling Services; Crisis Intervention; Preventive Mental Health; Digital Mental Health; Socio-Legal Analysis; Comparative Legal Study;

1. INTRODUCTION

"There is no health without mental health", a principle that becomes particularly significant within higher education institutions, where academic excellence is deeply intertwined with psychological wellbeing." ***-- (World Health Organization)***

Globally, mental health is becoming a major concern in higher education systems. Universities are being seen as environments that influence students' psychological, emotional, and social welfare rather than only as hubs for academic study. HEIs in India urgently need structured mental health support systems due to the rising rates of student misery, burnout, and suicides. Reports from the National Crime Records Bureau (NCRB) have repeatedly shown a concerning increase in student suicides nationwide. Academic pressure, financial

hardship, social isolation, and a lack of institutional assistance are frequently associated with these instances. Students' mental health vulnerabilities have been made worse by the competitive nature of higher education, societal expectations, and a lack of coping strategies. Legally speaking, the right to life and personal liberty guaranteed by Article 21 of the Indian Constitution is inextricably linked to mental health. The right to live with dignity, which includes mental health, has been added to this right by judicial interpretations. Nevertheless, despite being recognized by the constitution, these rights are still not adequately translated into institutional procedures that may be enforced.

The recognition of mental healthcare as a legal right has advanced significantly with the passage of the Mental Healthcare Act, 2017. It places a strong emphasis on confidentiality, nondiscrimination, and dignity while guaranteeing access to mental health services. However, the Act does not place any particular requirements on educational institutions and instead focuses on clinical mental health care. Similar to this, the (NEP) 2020 places a strong emphasis on student wellness and holistic development, although it does not contain any legally binding requirements for mental health infrastructure in HEIs.

Guidelines for student counseling and wellbeing have been released by regulatory organizations including the University Grants Commission (hereinafter referred as UGC). However, these rules lack strong enforcement measures and are mainly advisory. Because of this, execution is still inconsistent and frequently symbolic among institutions. On the other hand, a number of affluent nations have used legally binding structures to institutionalize mental health support. Universities in the US, UK, Australia, and Canada are governed by established systems that require compliance audits, crisis intervention, and counseling services. In light of this, the current study aims to provide a thorough legal framework specifically for Indian universities. By putting out a structured, enforceable, and context-specific model, it seeks to close the gap between institutional implementation and legal recognition.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

The nexus of institutional accountability, policy, and legislation is highlighted in scholarly discourse on mental health in higher education. Rajamani (2020) argues that mental health must be viewed as a fundamental entitlement rather than a welfare measure and highlights the necessity of incorporating human rights ideas into mental health administration. Vikram Patel

rightly stated, "Mental health is a fundamental component of human capital and must be integrated into all sectors, including education." (Global Mental Health Expert)

Policy fragmentation is a significant issue, according to Sengupta's (2019) analysis of the Indian environment. International research indicates that institutional responsibility and regulatory supervision are necessary for mental health frameworks to be effective. Research from the World Health Organization (WHO, 2021) shows that student results are better at universities with organized mental health strategies. Comparably, studies conducted in the US emphasize the importance of legal requirements in guaranteeing crisis intervention and counseling services on campuses. There is also a lack of literature that particularly addresses the legislative design of mental health frameworks in Indian HEIs, despite growing study.

3. EXISTING LEGAL AND POLICY FRAMEWORK IN INDIA

The Mental Healthcare Act of 2017 acknowledges access to mental healthcare as a statutory right and offers a rights-based approach to mental health. It requires the government to provide service accessibility and shields patients from prejudice. However, the function of educational institutions is not expressly covered by the Act. According to one interpretation of Article 21 of the Constitution, mental health is implicitly covered by the right to live with dignity. A constitutional basis for mental health rights has been established by judicial precedents that have emphasized the value of human dignity and quality of life. The (NEP) 2020 places a strong emphasis on interdisciplinary and comprehensive education, emphasizing the value of psychological and emotional health. It does not, however, contain enforceable implementation provisions. Counseling centers and student support networks are recommended by UGC recommendations, but because they are not legally binding, compliance is still uneven.

4. GAPS AND CHALLENGES

4.1 Absence of HEI-Specific Legal Mandates

The lack of law that expressly addresses higher education institutions is one of the most significant holes in the Indian mental health framework. Despite establishing a rights-based approach to mental healthcare, the Mental Healthcare Act, 2017 does not directly impose requirements on universities or colleges and instead concentrates on clinical settings (Government of India, 2017). Similar to this, the (NEP) 2020 places a strong emphasis on the holistic development of students, although it does not contain any legally binding

requirements requiring mental health infrastructure at HEIs ,(Ministry of Education, 2020). As a result, there is no consistent legal necessity for institutions to set up crisis response systems, mental health programs, or counseling centers. This legislative gap impedes the implementation of mental health as a fundamental right in academic settings and causes inconsistent institutional practices.

4.2 Lack of Enforcement Mechanisms

The lack of strong enforcement mechanisms greatly impairs the application of policies and guidelines, even when they do exist. Guidelines for student counseling and wellbeing have been released by regulatory organizations like the UGC; nevertheless, these guidelines are primarily advisory in nature and do not have legal force or consequences for non-compliance (UGC 2020). Indian institutions face few repercussions for failing to provide sufficient mental health care, in contrast to countries like the United States where breaking disability rules can lead to legal penalties. Because of this lack of enforceability, institutions may create nominal systems without guaranteeing their efficacy or accessibility, leading to cosmetic compliance. As a result, there is still a big gap between the creation of policies and their practical application.

4.3 Shortage of Trained Mental Health Professionals

The severe lack of trained mental health specialists in educational institutions is another significant issue. The ability of HEIs to offer sufficient mental health care is directly impacted by India's larger national shortage of psychiatrists, psychologists, and counselors (World Health Organization [WHO], 2021). The quality and range of support services are limited by the fact that many colleges either lack dedicated counseling staff or rely on workers with insufficient training. This problem is made worse by the lack of uniform hiring standards for mental health specialists. Even well-meaning institutional regulations fall short of creating efficient support networks in the absence of qualified professionals, endangering the welfare of students.

Judicial observations, official reports, and empirical studies have all frequently brought attention to India's lack of qualified mental health specialists, which reflects a structural deficiency in the country's mental healthcare infrastructure. In *Sheela Barse v. Union of India* (1986), the Supreme Court highlighted the necessity of appropriate mental health facilities and trained workers, particularly in correctional settings, which is one of the most important

legal acknowledgments of this subject. The Court acknowledged the wider systemic shortcomings in mental healthcare services, notably the shortage of skilled experts, even though the issue mainly concerned the rights of prisoners.

In a similar vein, the Supreme Court emphasized the lack of proper psychiatric care and qualified mental health personnel in prisons in *In Re: Inhuman Conditions* in 1382 Prisons (2016). The Court noted that institutions' capacity to deliver appropriate care is severely hampered by the absence of skilled specialists; this is equally true for educational institutions without comparable support networks. In *Parmanand Katara v. Union of India* (1989), the Supreme Court stressed the state's duty to provide prompt and sufficient medical care, which implicitly includes mental health services. This ruling supports the notion that a breach of the right to life under Article 21 may result from the lack of qualified specialists.

In addition to court rulings, national and international reports offer verifiable proof of the scarcity. India has substantially fewer psychiatrists per 100,000 people than is advised, according to the World Health Organization (WHO, 2021). The research also emphasizes how difficult it is for organizations, especially colleges, to offer sufficient mental health care due to the acute lack of clinical psychologists and psychiatric social workers. According to the National Mental Health Survey of India (2015–16) carried out by NIMHANS, around 80–85% of people with mental health problems do not obtain appropriate treatment, mostly as a result of a shortage of qualified experts (Gururaj et al., 2016). In educational institutions, where counseling services are either nonexistent or staffed by unskilled individuals, this treatment gap is most noticeable.

This disparity is also demonstrated by actual events in higher education institutions. The lack of easily accessible and qualified counseling services has been connected to a number of student suicide cases at prestigious universities and IITs. Committees established in response to such tragedies have often highlighted the dearth of qualified mental health personnel and insufficient student support systems. Furthermore, the UGC's 2020 guideline on student mental health recognizes the lack of experienced counselors and suggests that HEIs hire certified experts. However, many institutions continue to function without sufficient staffing due to the advisory nature of these standards. Together, these judicial observations, empirical reports, and real-world examples show that the lack of qualified mental health professionals is a systemic problem that directly affects the efficacy of mental health support in higher education institutions rather than just a logistical one.

4.4 Social Stigma and Lack of Awareness

Socio-cultural variables have a major impact on mental health outcomes in India, as students are discouraged from seeking treatment even when facilities are available due to stigma. Mental health problems are frequently misinterpreted or disregarded, which results in underreporting and postponed care (Kumar & Gupta, 2020). The issue is made worse by educational institutions' lack of knowledge about mental health rights and support networks. Stigma reduction and awareness are essential for any successful legal framework since this cultural barrier not only impacts students but also lowers institutional prioritization of mental health.

4.5 Urban-Rural Disparities in Institutional Resources

Another major obstacle to the development of mental health support systems is the difference between urban and rural institutions. Urban institutions, especially those located in cities, are more likely to have the infrastructure, resources, and qualified personnel required for mental health services. On the other hand, basic facilities, much alone specialist counseling services, are frequently absent from rural and semi-urban institutions (Patel et al., 2018). Students in rural areas continue to be disproportionately underserved as a result of this imbalance. The idea of equal access to mental healthcare is compromised by the unequal distribution of resources, underscoring the necessity of focused governmental initiatives.

4.6 Weak Accountability Structures

The current framework lacks specific procedures to assess mental health services in HEIs, independent oversight bodies, and adequate accountability mechanisms. Students have few options because grievance redressal procedures are either nonexistent or inefficient. Indian institutions function with little oversight, which lowers institutional commitment and implementation effectiveness in contrast to countries with stringent compliance monitoring. These inadequacies demonstrate how urgently a well-organized legal framework is needed.

4.7 India: Fragmented Legal Basis and Weak Institutional Mandate

The Mental Healthcare Act, 2017, which establishes a rights-based approach emphasizing access, dignity, and nondiscrimination, is the primary source of India's legal framework for mental health (Government of India, 2017). Furthermore, the right to life has been extended to include dignity and well-being by constitutional law under Article 21. The Supreme Court

ruled in *Francis Coralie Mullin v. Administrator, Union Territory of Delhi* (1981) that the right to human dignity is a part of the right to life. Similar to this, the Court tacitly upheld mental health rights in *Common Cause v. Union of India* (2018) by acknowledging autonomy and dignity in healthcare decisions.

Despite encouraging advancements, India still lacks institution-specific, legally binding requirements for mental health at HEIs. Many institutions have insufficient or nonexistent counseling services since UGC rules are still advisory. Crisis responses are mostly reactive, and early detection and prevention systems are inadequate. Enforcement is ineffectual because there are no legal repercussions for non-compliance, which undermines the idea that mental health is a legal right in higher education.

4.8 United States: Strong Legal Mandates and Institutional Accountability

Higher education institutions in the United States have a strong and legal system for providing mental health support. Educational institutions are required by federal legislation including the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) and Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act to make reasonable accommodations for students with mental health disorders (U.S. Department of Justice, 1990). Mental health rights have been further reinforced by court rulings. The U.S. Supreme Court upheld the idea of community-based mental healthcare in *Olmstead v. L.C.* (1999), holding that the unnecessary institutionalization of people with mental disorders is discriminatory. University counseling and support services are among the institutional practices that have been impacted by this judgment. Universities in the US are mandated by law to offer counseling services, which are backed by wellness initiatives, crisis response teams, and round-the-clock hotlines. Mental health support is now a legal requirement rather than just a policy goal thanks to robust enforcement mechanisms and federal oversight.

4.9 United Kingdom: Welfare-Based Legal Framework and Structured Oversight

Based on the Equality Act, 2010, which forbids discrimination on the basis of disability, including mental health disorders, the UK has a welfare-oriented approach (UK Government, 2010). Universities have a clear institutional obligation to support students by making "*reasonable adjustments*." Regulatory control is carried out by organizations like the Office for Students (OfS), which keeps an eye on institutional compliance and student welfare.

Additionally, the UK has created governmental frameworks that support a whole-institution approach to mental health, such as the University Mental Health Charter.

The legislative structure guarantees accountability through regulatory institutions, even though court participation in this area is rather limited when compared to the United States. Crisis response systems are organized and proactive, and counseling services are extensively institutionalized. However, because compliance is frequently motivated by regulatory requirements rather than severe legal penalties, enforcement is still moderate. However, the UK example shows how well institutional welfare duties may be integrated with equality law.

4.10 Australia: Integrated National Strategy and Strong Enforcement

Through institutional frameworks and national strategies, Australia has created a comprehensive and integrated approach to mental health in higher education. Universities are required by the Higher Education Standards Framework to guarantee the welfare of their students and offer suitable support services (Tertiary Education Quality and Standards Agency [TEQSA], 2015).
Coherence and coordination are ensured by the integration of mental health into larger national health and education initiatives. Counseling services, mental health programs, and crisis response systems must be established by universities. The regulatory structure guarantees accountability through institutional audits and performance-based evaluation, despite the paucity of case law in this field. When it comes to enforcing standards and keeping an eye on compliance, TEQSA is essential.

Australia is a model for developing nations because of its proactive policy creation, robust enforcement measures, and incorporation of mental health into institutional administration.

4.11 Canada: Decentralized Framework with Strong Institutional Practices

Canada takes a decentralized system, with provincial governments overseeing mental health legislation. Universities continue to have a substantial institutional responsibility for the welfare of their students even in the lack of a standard federal statute that expressly targets HEIs.
Human rights laws, such as provincial human rights codes that forbid discrimination on the basis of mental health disorders, are the source of legal concepts. The Supreme Court of Canada upheld the more general idea of equitable access by highlighting the significance of accessibility in healthcare services in *Eldridge v. British Columbia* (Attorney General)

(1997).

Peer support programs, crisis intervention procedures, and comprehensive counseling systems have been implemented by Canadian universities. Internal policies and provincial oversight uphold institutional responsibility, even though enforcement varies by province.

This model shows that strong institutional commitment and human rights frameworks can provide effective mental health support even in the absence of centralized regulation.

4.12 Comparative Insights

1. Several important insights are highlighted by the comparison analysis:
   1. Although India's framework is rights-based, it is not enforceable, especially at HEIs.
2. The US's serves as an example of the significance of strict legal requirements and judicial enforcement.
3. The UK places a strong emphasis on welfare and equality-based duties that are backed by regulatory supervision.
4. Australia incorporates mental health with robust enforcement measures into national schooling plans.
5. Canada serves as an example of how decentralized government and institutional accountability work well together.

Overall, the analysis shows that strong enforcement mechanisms, organized institutional systems, and legally binding requirements are necessary for mental health frameworks to be effective. The absence of these components in the Indian context highlights the necessity of a thorough legislative framework specifically designed for higher education institutions.

5. PROPOSED COMPREHENSIVE LEGAL FRAMEWORK

A thorough legislative framework specifically designed for mental health support in Indian HEIs must be developed in light of current shortcomings and global best practices. Such a framework must include institutional accountability, clearly defined rights, and enforceable legal duties in addition to policy proposals. Institutional responsibilities, student rights, regulatory processes, preventive tactics, crisis intervention systems, and accountability provisions are among the fundamental elements that make up the suggested framework.

5.1 Institutional Obligations

Higher education institutions must be required by a strong legislative framework to set up and sustain mental health support programs. First and foremost, all HEIs, whatever of size or location, have to be required to build specialized counseling centers. These facilities need to be easily available, sufficiently funded, and included into institutional governance frameworks. Second, organizations must make sure that licensed mental health specialists, such as psychologists, counselors, and psychiatric social workers, are appointed in compliance with established guidelines. The efficacy of mental health services is severely compromised by the lack of qualified staff (World Health Organization [WHO], 2021).

The framework should also include regular mental health audits to evaluate the efficacy, accessibility, and quality of institutional support services. To guarantee impartiality and openness, these audits ought to be carried out by independent organizations. By incorporating such responsibilities into a legal framework, mental health support will become a statutory mandate rather than a voluntary service, improving institutional accountability and uniformity (Government of India, 2017).

5.2 Student Rights

The suggested framework must acknowledge students as individuals with rights who are entitled to all-encompassing mental health assistance. The right to mental health services is essential to this, guaranteeing that all students can receive counseling and support without obstacles relating to expense, stigma, or institutional constraints. This is consistent with the Mental Healthcare Act of 2017's rights-based approach.

Furthermore, the secrecy concept needs to be rigorously upheld. Students should be reassured that their counseling records and personal information won't be shared without permission, unless there is an immediate threat. To foster trust and promote help-seeking behavior, this is crucial. The assurance of nondiscrimination is equally crucial, guaranteeing that students with mental health issues won't face institutional, social, or academic prejudice. According to Articles 14 and 21 of the Constitution, these safeguards are in line with the values of equality and dignity (Ministry of Education, 2020).

5.3 Regulatory Mechanisms

Strong regulatory control is necessary for the suggested framework to be implemented effectively. To make sure that universities follow established mental health standards, the UGC and other pertinent agencies should have the authority to carry out compliance checks. Infrastructure, personnel, service delivery, and student results should all be assessed throughout these audits. Additionally, institutional accreditation and rating systems should be connected to mental health compliance. Institutions will be encouraged to consider student welfare as a fundamental aspect of educational excellence by incorporating mental health metrics into accrediting systems. Experience from around the world shows that regulatory linkage greatly increases institutional commitment and compliance (WHO, 2021).

5.4 Preventive Measures

Prevention must be given equal weight with treatment in a comprehensive framework. In order to lessen stigma and encourage help-seeking behavior, HEIs must to be legally required to hold mental health awareness campaigns, workshops, and programs. These programs should be ongoing, inclusive, and aimed at academic staff, administrative personnel, and students.

Additionally, curriculum design and pedagogical approaches should incorporate mental health within the academic curriculum. Students can acquire vital coping skills by taking courses on stress management, emotional intelligence, and wellbeing. In addition to lowering the frequency of mental health crises, preventive measures promote a welcoming and inclusive campus community (Eisenberg et al., 2013).

5.5 Crisis Intervention Systems

To handle acute mental health issues, the framework must have strong and legally required crisis intervention systems. Institutions should set up measures for preventing suicide, such as integrated support services, trained reaction teams, and early identification procedures. These systems ought to be proactive, emphasizing prompt intervention and early identification. Institutions must also set up 24/7 emergency helplines in order to serve students in need right away. These systems guarantee that assistance is always accessible, especially in times of need. Structured crisis intervention systems dramatically lower the likelihood of serious consequences, such as suicide, according to international models (WHO, 2021).

5.6 Accountability Mechanisms

The creation of robust accountability systems to guarantee compliance is a crucial component of the suggested architecture. Penalties for non-compliance, such as financial penalties, a decrease in accreditation scores, or regulatory action, should be imposed on institutions that don't adhere to established criteria. To ensure real implementation and go beyond symbolic conformity, such steps are required. Additionally, the framework must include efficient grievance redressal mechanisms that allow students to report and seek remedies for inadequacies in mental health care. In order to guarantee that student complaints are swiftly and equitably addressed, these methods should be transparent, accessible, and independent. Accountability clauses will bolster institutional accountability and make mental health support systems more legally enforceable.

6. CASE LAW PERSPECTIVE

The Indian judiciary has added dignity and well-being to Article 21. Jurisprudence supports the inclusion of mental health as a component of life and liberty, even though it does not specifically address student mental health.

7. RECOMMENDATIONS

The urgent need for a comprehensive and enforceable legal framework controlling mental health support in Indian HEIs is highlighted by the analysis of current gaps and comparative frameworks. The following suggestions are meant to improve institutional capability and solve structural flaws..

7.1 Enactment of HEI-Specific Mental Health Regulation

Adopting a particular legislative framework that applies to higher education institutions is one of the main recommendations. The Mental Healthcare Act of 2017 does not directly impose requirements on colleges, but it does offer a basic rights-based foundation. A specific regulatory tool is therefore necessary, either through statutory enactment or legally binding regulations by organizations like the UGC. A framework like this should clearly identify institutional obligations, establish minimum criteria for mental health services, and require the creation of counseling centers. A legal mandate that incorporates mental health would provide consistency, accountability, and enforceability among institutions (Government of India, 2017; Ministry of Education, 2020).

7.2 Mandatory Mental Health Audits

All HEIs should be required to conduct periodic mental health audits in order to guarantee successful implementation. These audits should assess the quality, accessibility, and availability of mental health services, such as crisis response plans, counseling centers, and awareness campaigns. To ensure objectivity and openness, these audits should be carried out by independent organizations or regulatory bodies. Compliance can be further encouraged by tying audit results to accreditation and rating systems. Regular monitoring greatly enhances institutional performance in student wellness programs, according on evidence from international practices (World Health Organization [WHO], 2021).

7.3 Adequate Budget Allocation for Mental Health Services

Establishing and maintaining mental health infrastructure is significantly hampered by financial limitations. As a result, HEIs must set aside a specific budget for mental health services, which includes employing trained specialists, building facilities, and planning awareness campaigns. Additionally, mental health programs in school should be given priority when it comes to government grants and funding. Investing in mental health is essential to both student retention and educational quality, not just a welfare measure (Patel et al., 2018). Even well-designed programs are unlikely to be executed successfully without sufficient financial support.

7.4 Training and Capacity Building of Faculty and Staff

When it comes to spotting and treating early indicators of mental distress in pupils, faculty and administrative personnel are essential. As a result, frequent training sessions should be held to give them knowledge of mental health concerns, referral procedures, and basic psychological first aid abilities. Faculty will be able to serve as first responders and close the gap between students and professional mental health services thanks to this training. International research has demonstrated that the efficacy of institutional mental health frameworks is greatly increased by faculty engagement (Eisenberg et al., 2013).

7.5 Integration of Digital Mental Health Platforms

Technology has the potential to significantly increase access to mental health services in the current digital era. Digital mental health platforms, such as online counseling, tele-therapy, mobile applications, and round-the-clock help lines, should be incorporated into HEIs. When

it comes to resolving accessibility concerns in rural and resource-constrained institutions, these platforms are very helpful. Additionally, digital solutions offer anonymity, which helps lessen the stigma attached to seeking mental health assistance. Further evidence of the efficacy of digital mental health interventions in reaching a larger student population comes from the COVID-19 pandemic (WHO, 2021).

7.6 Strengthening Awareness and Destigmatization Initiatives

For any mental health system to be successful, socio-cultural stigma must be addressed. Through workshops, seminars, peer support programs, and curricular integration, institutions must actively raise awareness. Such programs ought to be required by law as part of institutional obligations. Raising awareness promotes an inclusive and encouraging campus community in addition to encouraging help-seeking behavior. According to studies, awareness efforts greatly lessen stigma and enhance students' mental health results (Kumar & Gupta, 2020).

References

1. Government of India. (2017). *Mental Healthcare Act, 2017*.

2. Kumar, A., & Gupta, S. (2020). Mental health awareness and stigma in India: A review of societal attitudes. *Indian Journal of Psychiatry, 62*(3), 215–220.

3. Ministry of Education. (2020). *National Education Policy 2020*.

4. Patel, V., Saxena, S., Lund, C., Thornicroft, G., Baingana, F., Bolton, P., Unützer, J. (2018). The Lancet Commission on global mental health and sustainable development. *The Lancet, 392*(10157), 1553–1598. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(18)31612-X

5. University Grants Commission. (2020). *Guidelines on student counselling systems*.

6. World Health Organization. (2021). *Mental health atlas 2020*.

7. Gururaj, G., Varghese, M., Benegal, V., Rao, G. N., Pathak, K., Singh, L. K., … NMHS Collaborators Group. (2016). *National Mental Health Survey of India, 2015–16*. NIMHANS.

8. In Re: Inhuman Conditions in 1382 Prisons, (2016) 3 SCC 700.

9. Parmanand Katara v. Union of India, AIR 1989 SC 2039.

10. Sheela Barse v. Union of India, AIR 1986 SC 1773.

11. University Grants Commission. (2020). *Advisory for universities and colleges on mental health*.

12. World Health Organization. (2021). *Mental health atlas 2020*.

13. Common Cause v. Union of India, (2018) 5 SCC 1.

14. Eldridge v. British Columbia (Attorney General), [1997] 3 SCR 624 (Canada).

15. Francis Coralie Mullin v. Administrator, Union Territory of Delhi, AIR 1981 SC 746.

16. Government of India. (2017). *Mental Healthcare Act, 2017*.

17. Olmstead v. L.C., 527 U.S. 581 (1999).

18. Tertiary Education Quality and Standards Agency. (2015). *Higher Education Standards Framework*.

19. UK Government. (2010). *Equality Act 2010*.

20. U.S. Department of Justice. (1990). *Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990*.

21. Eisenberg, D., Hunt, J., & Speer, N. (2013). Mental health in American colleges and universities: Variation across student subgroups and across campuses. *The Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease, 201*(1), 60–67.

22. Government of India. (2017). *Mental Healthcare Act, 2017*.

23. Ministry of Education. (2020). *National Education Policy 2020*.

24. World Health Organization. (2021). *Mental health atlas 2020*.

25. Eisenberg, D., Hunt, J., & Speer, N. (2013). Mental health in American colleges and universities: Variation across student subgroups and across campuses. *The Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease, 201*(1), 60–67.

26. Government of India. (2017). *Mental Healthcare Act, 2017*.

27. Kumar, A., & Gupta, S. (2020). Mental health awareness and stigma in India: A review. *Indian Journal of Psychiatry, 62*(3), 215–220.

28. Ministry of Education. (2020). *National Education Policy 2020*.

29. Patel, V., Saxena, S., Lund, C., Thornicroft, G., Baingana, F., Bolton, P., … Unützer, J. (2018). The Lancet Commission on global mental health and sustainable development. *The Lancet, 392*(10157), 1553–1598. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(18)31612-X

30. World Health Organization. (2021). *Mental health atlas 2020*.