The Right to Walk: A Constitutional, Legislative, and Judicial Analysis of Pedestrian Rights in India

Dr. Heena Nityanand Makwana

Assistant Professor,

Department of Law,

Veer Narmad South Gujarat University, Surat, Gujarat.

Email id: hnmakwana@vnsgu.ac.in
Mobile: 9426763578

Abstract:

Pedestrians, the most vulnerable road users, are systematically marginalized by India's vehicle-centric transport paradigm. This paper argues that despite a robust constitutional foundation under Article 21, the "right to walk" remains largely theoretical, undermined by fragmented laws and systemic implementation failure. This doctrinal and comparative analysis traces the flow of the paper, beginning with the jurisprudential evolution of pedestrian rights. It examines the shift from Olga Tellis v. Bombay Municipal Corporation, which linked public space to livelihood , to the recent directives in S. Rajaseekaran v. Union of India, where the Supreme Court explicitly recognized safe footpaths as part of the right to life. Following this, the paper critically evaluates the adequacy of the statutory framework, including the Motor Vehicles Act (2019) and various municipal acts. This legal analysis is then contextualized with stark data from MoRTH and NCRB, highlighting a severe rise in pedestrian fatalities that exposes the chasm between legal provisions and lived reality. The research then draws comparative insights from the "Sustainable Safety" vision of the Netherlands and the rights-based enforcement model of Germany. The paper concludes by arguing for a paradigm shift to a 'pedestrian-first' philosophy, advocating for a harmonized national legislative framework and mandatory safety-by-design principles to transform the constitutional promise of safe passage into a tangible reality.

Introduction:

A pedestrian is a person traveling on foot, whether walking, jogging, or using a wheelchair or other mobility aid. In the urban tapestry of India, they are ubiquitous yet invisible. They are the silent majority in the country's transportation ecosystem, yet their safety and rights are systematically relegated to the periphery of policy and planning. The statistics are a grim testament to this neglect. In 2023, 35,221 pedestrians were killed in road accidents, accounting for 20.4% of all road fatalities,a share that has doubled since 2016. This translates to nearly 96 pedestrians losing their lives on Indian roads every single day, transforming a simple act of walking into a perilous endeavor. This is not merely a traffic management issue; it is a public health emergency and a profound human rights crisis.

The problem is exacerbated by a stark social equity dimension. For a vast segment of the Indian populace, particularly the urban poor, walking is not a choice but a necessity. These "captive pedestrians" cannot afford even subsidized public transport and rely on walking for their daily commute and livelihood. Decades of urban planning, however, have fostered a hostile environment for them, prioritizing the construction of signal-free corridors, flyovers, and wider roads for vehicular movement while ignoring the fundamental need for safe,

continuous, and accessible footpaths. This infrastructure deficit disproportionately endangers the most economically disadvantaged citizens, making the fight for pedestrian rights a critical struggle for social and economic justice.

This paper argues that a rights-based approach, firmly anchored in the Constitution of India and propelled by an activist judiciary, is indispensable to compel a paradigm shift in urban governance. The prevailing vehicle-centric model must yield to a human-centric one, where the safety and dignity of the person on foot are paramount. It will trace the legal and judicial landscape, analyze the systemic failures that perpetuate the crisis, and draw upon international models to propose a comprehensive framework for reform. The central thesis is that securing the "right to walk" is not an urban amenity but a constitutional imperative, essential for reclaiming the streets as safe, inclusive, and equitable public spaces for all.

Methodology

This research paper adopts a doctrinal and comparative legal research methodology. The doctrinal approach involves a critical analysis of primary legal sources, including the Constitution of India, central statutes such as the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988 (as amended in 2019) and the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, and subsidiary legislation like the Rules of the Road Regulations, 1989. It also systematically examines key municipal corporation acts. The jurisprudential analysis focuses on landmark judgments of the Supreme Court of India and various High Courts, tracing the evolution of pedestrian rights. The comparative analysis examines the legal frameworks for pedestrian safety in the Netherlands and Germany to identify best practices and potential models for reform in India. This qualitative legal analysis is supplemented by quantitative data from official reports by the Ministry of Road Transport and Highways (MoRTH) and the National Crime Records Bureau (NCRB) to contextualize the legal discussion with empirical evidence of pedestrian safety outcomes.

Objectives

1. To establish the constitutional basis of pedestrian rights in India through a detailed examination of Article 21 and its judicial interpretation.
2. To critically evaluate the adequacy and implementation of the existing statutory framework governing pedestrian safety at the central, state, and municipal levels.
3. To analyze the transformative role of judicial activism, particularly through Public Interest Litigation, in shaping policy and enforcing pedestrian rights.
4. To quantify the gap between legal provisions and on-ground reality using official road accident data, thereby highlighting the scale of the pedestrian safety crisis.

5. To conduct a comparative study of international best practices in pedestrian safety legislation and infrastructure to propose a comprehensive roadmap for legal and policy reform in India.

1. The Constitutional Bedrock of Pedestrian Safety

1.1 From Right to Life to the Right to Walk: Interpreting Article 21

The foundation for pedestrian rights in India is not found in a specific statute but is embedded within the expansive fabric of the Constitution of India. Article 21, which states, "No person shall be deprived of his life or personal liberty except according to procedure established by law," has been judicially interpreted to be the heart of fundamental rights. The Supreme Court has consistently held that the 'right to life' is not confined to mere animal existence but includes the right to live with human dignity, encompassing a safe and healthy environment.

In recent years, the judiciary has explicitly connected this broad constitutional guarantee to the specific rights of pedestrians. The Supreme Court, in a series of landmark observations, has declared that the right to safe, clear, and unimpeded footpaths is a fundamental right protected under Article 21. A Bench of Justices A.S. Oka and Ujjal Bhuyan observed that if proper footpaths are not available, pedestrians are forced to walk on roads, exposing them to significant danger, which directly imperils their right to life. This judicial reasoning forges a direct and undeniable link between the state's duty to provide basic pedestrian infrastructure and its constitutional obligation to protect the life of its citizens. This jurisprudential development has evolved from being a negative right—a protection from arbitrary state action—to a positive one, imposing an affirmative duty on the state. The failure of a municipal corporation to build or maintain a footpath is no longer a mere administrative lapse but a direct breach of a positive constitutional mandate to safeguard life.

1.2 Foundational Precedents: Olga Tellis v. Bombay Municipal Corporation

While the recent pronouncements are direct, their jurisprudential roots can be traced to the seminal 1985 case of Olga Tellis v. Bombay Municipal Corporation. Though the case primarily concerned the rights of pavement dwellers facing eviction, its principles have become foundational for asserting rights over public spaces. The five-judge bench, led by Chief Justice Y.V. Chandrachud, famously held that the "right to life includes the right to livelihood". The Court reasoned that depriving a person of their means of livelihood would be tantamount to depriving them of their life itself.

The judgment established a critical nexus between the use of public space (pavements), the ability to sustain oneself (livelihood), and the fundamental right to life under Article

21. Furthermore, the Court ruled that any eviction—any deprivation of this right—must adhere to a procedure that is just, fair, and reasonable, not arbitrary or fanciful. By doing so, Olga Tellis laid the intellectual groundwork for future claims on public spaces for essential activities. If a pavement is intrinsically linked to the right to life for a dweller, it follows that it is equally, if not more, essential for the safe transit of a pedestrian, whose life is directly endangered by its absence. The case fundamentally altered the discourse, establishing that the state's control over public land is not absolute and must be exercised in a manner that respects the fundamental rights of the most vulnerable citizens.

2. A Critical Examination of the Indian Statutory Framework

While the Constitution provides a robust philosophical foundation, the statutory framework governing pedestrian rights is a patchwork of central, state, and municipal laws, often lacking cohesion and effective enforcement mechanisms. This diffusion of responsibility is a primary cause of the gap between policy and practice.

2.1 The Motor Vehicles Act: A Reactive Evolution

The principal legislation governing road transport, the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988 (MV Act), was initially designed with a primary focus on regulating vehicles and their drivers. Pedestrians were largely an afterthought. The Motor Vehicles (Amendment) Act, 2019, however, introduced several crucial provisions acknowledging the need for pedestrian safety, marking a significant, albeit reactive, evolution in the law.

Key among these amendments are:

- **Section 138(1A):** This provision empowers State Governments to frame rules for regulating the activities and access of pedestrians and non-motorized road users to public places and national highways.
- **Section 210-D:** This section mandates that states formulate and notify rules for the design, construction, and maintenance standards for roads other than national highways.
- **Section 198A:** A critical accountability measure, this section introduces penalties for designated authorities, contractors, and consultants who fail to comply with standards for road design, construction, or maintenance, making them liable for causing death or disability.

Despite these additions, the MV Act remains largely an enabling framework. It delegates the crucial task of rule-making to the states, leading to a lack of uniformity and inconsistent implementation. The law provides the tools for pedestrian safety but does not

mandate a uniform, nationwide standard, leaving the protection of vulnerable road users to the varying political and administrative will of individual states.

2.2 The Patchwork of Regulations

Beyond the MV Act, pedestrian rights are scattered across various other regulations and codes. The **Rules of the Road Regulations, 1989**, framed under the MV Act, contain some of the most explicit protections. **Regulation 11** is paramount, stating unequivocally that "The pedestrians have the right of way at uncontrolled pedestrian crossings". The regulations also prohibit driving on footpaths and require drivers to slow down when approaching a pedestrian crossing.

The Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (BNS), provides a punitive measure through Section 281, which criminalizes rash or negligent driving on a public way that endangers human life. While this section is frequently invoked in accidents involving pedestrians, its deterrent effect is limited by a relatively lenient punishment of up to six months imprisonment or a fine. Furthermore, it is a reactive measure, applicable only after an incident has occurred, and does little to proactively engineer a safer environment.

2.3 The Municipal Mandate: A Tale of Four Cities

The ultimate responsibility for the construction, maintenance, and protection of pedestrian infrastructure lies with local municipal bodies. An examination of the statutes governing major Indian cities reveals a clear, albeit often neglected, mandate.

- **Delhi:** The Delhi Municipal Corporation Act, 1957, vests all public streets in the Corporation and makes their maintenance, control, and regulation a statutory duty. Crucially, Sections 320 and 322 provide the Corporation with explicit powers to prohibit and remove any structure, fence, or encroachment on a public street, forming a strong legal basis to ensure clear footpaths.
- **Mumbai:** Section 61(m) of the Mumbai Municipal Corporation Act, 1888, obligates the Brihanmumbai Municipal Corporation (BMC) to make "adequate provisions for the construction, maintenance, alteration and improvement of public streets...and also other measures for ensuring the safe and orderly, passage of vehicular and pedestrian traffic". This statutory duty is further reinforced by administrative policies like the "Pedestrians First" policy of 2016, which aims to minimize pedestrian-vehicle conflicts.
- **Bengaluru:** The Bruhat Bengaluru Mahanagara Palike (BBMP) Act, 2020, governs the city's infrastructure. Under this framework, the BBMP is responsible for roads and has undertaken specific projects like the Tender SURE (Specifications for Urban Roads

Execution) model, which mandates the inclusion of wide, uniform footpaths and dedicated utility corridors.

- **Kolkata:** The Kolkata Municipal Corporation Act, 1980, under Section 345(4), requires the city's traffic and transportation committee to plan for the "expeditious, convenient and safe movement of traffic, including pedestrian traffic.

This legal structure creates a system of delegated and diffused responsibility. The central MV Act empowers states, which in turn rely on municipal corporations governed by separate acts to build and maintain infrastructure, while enforcement is handled by the state police. This fragmentation creates significant accountability gaps. When a pedestrian is injured due to a broken or encroached footpath, the municipal body may blame the police for lack of enforcement, the police may cite a lack of resources, and the state government may point to the autonomy of local bodies. This lack of a single, empowered authority responsible for the entire pedestrian ecosystem—from design and construction to maintenance and enforcement—is a fundamental flaw in the legal architecture.

Table 1: Comparative Analysis of Pedestrian Provisions in Key Indian Statutes

Provision Area	Statute	Relevant Section/Rule	Provision Summary	Enforcement Agency
Right of Way	Rules of the Road Regulations, 1989	Regulation 11	Pedestrians have the right of way at uncontrolled pedestrian crossings.	State/City Traffic Police
Driving on Footpath	Rules of the Road Regulations, 1989	Regulation 11	Prohibits drivers from driving on a footpath or cycle track.	State/City Traffic Police
Obstruction/Encroachment	Delhi Municipal Corporation Act, 1957	Sections 320, 322	Prohibits any structure or encroachment on a street; empowers removal.	Municipal Corporation of Delhi
Obstruction/Encroachment	**Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023**	**Section 285**	Punishes any act causing danger or obstruction in any public way.	State/City Police
Rash/Negligent Driving	**Bharatiya Nyaya**	**Section 281**	Punishes rash or negligent driving	State/City Police

	Sanhita, 2023		endangering human life.	
Duty to Construct/Maintain	Mumbai Municipal Corporation Act, 1888	Section 61(m)	Mandates the corporation to make adequate provisions for safe pedestrian passage.	Brihanmumbai Municipal Corporation
Road Design Standards	Motor Vehicles Act, 1988 (as amended)	Section 210-D	Mandates states to frame rules for design and maintenance of non-highway roads.	State Governments
Official Liability	Motor Vehicles Act, 1988 (as amended)	Section 198A	Holds officials/contractors liable for faulty road design causing death/disability.	Central/State Governments

3. Judicial Intervention as a Catalyst for Systemic Reform

In the face of legislative ambiguity and executive apathy, the Indian judiciary has emerged as a crucial catalyst for reform, using Public Interest Litigation (PIL) as a tool to enforce the constitutional rights of pedestrians. The courts have moved beyond mere interpretation of law to issuing detailed, administrative-style directives, effectively filling a governance vacuum and acting as a de facto national regulator for road safety.

3.1 The Supreme Court's Continuing Mandamus in *S. Rajaseekaran v. Union of India*

The most significant judicial intervention has been the Supreme Court's ongoing monitoring of the 2012 PIL filed by Dr. S. Rajaseekaran, an orthopaedic surgeon. Over the course of a decade, this case has transformed into a vehicle for a "continuing mandamus," where the Court retains jurisdiction to issue periodic directions and monitor their implementation. The landmark orders issued in 2025, by a bench of Justices J.B. Pardiwala and K.V. Viswanathan, represent a comprehensive blueprint for systemic reform.

The key directives include:

- **Mandatory Rule-Making:** A non-negotiable six-month deadline was set for all states and Union Territories to frame and notify rules under Sections 138(1A) (regulating pedestrian access) and 210-D (road design standards) of the MV Act.
- **Nationwide Footpath Audits:** The Court ordered road-owning agencies and the National Highways Authority of India (NHAI) to conduct audits of existing footpaths in the top 50 cities with populations over one million. These audits must prioritize areas

with heavy footfall, such as markets, schools, and transport hubs, and identify deficiencies in width, height, and surface quality.

- **Adoption of Technical Standards:** The Court explicitly endorsed the Indian Roads Congress (IRC) *Guidelines for Pedestrian Safety (IRC 103-2022)*, giving these technical standards binding legal force. This includes specifications for minimum footpath widths (4 m in residential areas to 6.5 m in high-street areas), anti-skid surfaces, tactile paving for the visually impaired, and ramps for wheelchair users.
- **Grievance Redressal:** The Court mandated the creation of simple and effective online grievance redressal mechanisms by municipal authorities and the NHAI, allowing citizens to report encroachments and poor maintenance of footpaths.
- **Accountability:** The bench emphasized that Section 198A of the MV Act must be invoked to hold officials and contractors personally liable in cases of pedestrian deaths caused by infrastructural or design failures.

These directives are not abstract legal principles but detailed administrative commands, specifying timelines, target authorities, and technical standards. This level of judicial involvement underscores the Court's recognition of a systemic failure by the executive branch to address the pedestrian safety crisis.

3.2 High Courts on the Frontline

Following the Supreme Court's lead, various High Courts have become proactive in addressing pedestrian rights at the local level.

- The **Bombay High Court**, responding to PILs, has issued stringent orders to the Pune and Mumbai municipal corporations. It has directed them to remove all obstructions from footpaths, including illegally placed electrical fuse boxes, and to ensure that walkways are accessible and friendly for persons with disabilities and senior citizens. The Court explicitly stated that the "convenience of service providers cannot override the rights of pedestrians".
- The **Karnataka High Court** has taken up PILs concerning the deplorable state of footpaths in Bengaluru, issuing notices to the BBMP and other civic agencies to remove obstructions like advertisement hoardings and to ensure that infrastructure is built according to IRC standards.
- The **Delhi High Court's** role has also been significant, with the Supreme Court itself directing in the *S. Rajaseekaran* case that priority be given to making the road crossing near the Delhi High Court safe for pedestrians within seven months.

These interventions by the High Courts demonstrate a cascading effect of judicial activism, translating the constitutional principles articulated by the Supreme Court into concrete, location-specific actions, thereby holding local bodies directly accountable for ensuring pedestrian safety.

Table 2: Key Directives from the Supreme Court in S. Rajaseekaran v. Union of India

Thematic Area	Specific Mandate	Deadline/Timeline	Target Authority
Rule Formulation	Frame and notify rules under Sec 138(1A) & 210-D of the MV Act.	6 months	All States & UTs
Infrastructure Audits	Audit existing footpaths in top 50 cities; assess need for new crossings.	Phase-wise, starting immediately	NHAI, State Govts, Municipal Authorities
Adherence to Standards	Ensure footpaths and crossings comply with IRC 103-2022 guidelines.	Ongoing	All road-owning agencies
Grievance Redressal	Create a simple and effective online grievance redressal mechanism.	Not specified, but implied urgency	PWD, Municipal Authorities, NHAI
Official Accountability	Invoke Sec 198A of the MV Act to hold officials/contractors personally liable.	In cases of death/injury from faulty design	Central/State Governments

4. The Chasm Between Law and Lived Reality

Despite the constitutional mandate and judicial pronouncements, a vast chasm exists between the law in books and the lived reality on India's streets. This gap is starkly illustrated by official statistics and the visible, everyday neglect of pedestrian infrastructure.

4.1 A Statistical Portrait of a National Crisis

Official data from the Ministry of Road Transport and Highways (MoRTH) paints a grim picture of the escalating crisis.

- In 2022, India recorded 4,61,312 road accidents, resulting in 1,68,491 fatalities.
- Of these deaths, 32,825 were pedestrians. This figure represents a staggering 108% increase from the 15,746 pedestrian fatalities recorded in 2016.

- The trend continued to worsen in 2023, with pedestrian deaths rising to 35,221. This means that pedestrians, who were 10.44% of road fatalities in 2016, constituted 20.4% of all deaths in 2023, effectively doubling their share of the tragic toll.

Data from the National Crime Records Bureau (NCRB) corroborates this trend, with city-specific reports highlighting accident hotspots and peak times, often coinciding with evening rush hours when visibility is low and pedestrian movement is high. Disturbingly, independent scholarly estimates suggest that even these official figures may be a significant undercount. Studies have indicated that the actual number of road deaths could be 40% to 80% higher than what is reported by government agencies, suggesting the true scale of the crisis is even more severe.

Table 3: Trend Analysis of Pedestrian Fatalities in India (2016-2023)

Year	Total Road Accident Fatalities (MoRTH)	Total Pedestrian Fatalities (MoRTH)	Pedestrian Fatalities as % of Total	Year-on-Year % Change in Pedestrian Fatalities
2016	150,785	15,746	10.44%	-
2017	147,913	20,457	13.83%	+29.9%
2018	151,417	22,656	14.96%	+10.8%
2019	151,113	25,858	17.11%	+14.1%
2020	131,714	23,483	17.83%	-9.2%
2021	153,972	29,124	18.92%	+24.0%
2022	168,491	32,825	19.48%	+12.7%
2023	172,890	35,221	20.37%	+7.3%

Source: Ministry of Road Transport and Highways (MoRTH), Transport Research Wing. (2024). *Road accidents in India – 2023 https://morth.nic.in/sites/default/files/Road-Accident-in-India-2023-Publications.pdf*

4.2 The Anatomy of Neglect: Infrastructure Deficits and Enforcement Apathy

The statistical crisis is a direct consequence of tangible, on-ground failures. The primary failure is the lack of safe, continuous, and accessible pedestrian infrastructure. Studies and surveys across Indian cities reveal a consistent pattern of neglect:

- **Infrastructure Gaps:** A significant percentage of roads in major cities lack any footpaths at all. Where they do exist, they are often poorly designed, with incorrect kerb heights, insufficient width for two people (let alone a wheelchair) to pass, and uneven surfaces that pose a tripping hazard. Facilities for persons with disabilities, such as ramps and tactile paving, are largely absent.
- **Pervasive Encroachment:** The most visible problem is the illegal occupation of footpaths. They are routinely used as parking lots, extensions for shops, spaces for street vendors, and dumping grounds for construction material. This forces pedestrians, including children, the elderly, and the disabled, to walk on the main carriageway, putting them in direct conflict with fast-moving vehicular traffic.
- **Enforcement Apathy:** Despite clear legal provisions in municipal acts (e.g., Section 322 of the DMC Act) and the **BNS (Section 285)** that prohibit and penalize such encroachments, enforcement by municipal and police authorities is notoriously lax. This persistent failure to act normalizes illegality. The visible and unpunished violation of encroaching on a footpath sends a powerful signal that other, more dangerous laws—such as those against speeding or rash driving—are also not taken seriously. This creates a culture of impunity on the roads, a "Broken Windows" effect where visible signs of disorder and minor law-breaking foster an environment conducive to more serious transgressions, directly contributing to the high fatality rates.

5. International Perspectives and Models for Emulation

To bridge the gap between law and reality, India can draw valuable lessons from countries that have successfully prioritized pedestrian safety. The approaches in the Netherlands and Germany, in particular, offer a stark contrast to the Indian model and provide a blueprint for reform, highlighting a dichotomy between engineering safety into the environment and enforcing safety through rigorous laws.

5.1 The Dutch "Sustainable Safety" Vision

In the 1970s, the Netherlands faced a road fatality crisis similar to India's today. In response, they developed and implemented a national campaign called "Sustainable Safety," which has since reduced road fatalities by over 90%. This approach represents "Engineered Safety," where the primary focus is on designing a road system that is inherently safe and forgiving of human error. Its core principles include:

- **Functionality:** Roads are strictly categorized based on their function—either for through-traffic (flow), distribution, or local access. Mixing these functions is avoided to prevent conflicts.
- **Homogeneity:** The system aims to minimize differences in speed, mass, and direction among road users. This is the logic behind physically separated, dedicated infrastructure for cars, cyclists, and pedestrians.
- **Predictability:** Roads are designed to be "self-explaining," meaning their physical layout—width, surface, and surroundings—intuitively communicates the expected speed and behavior to the driver, reducing the need for excessive signage or enforcement. A prime example of this philosophy is the "Woonerf" or "living street," a residential area designed as a shared space where pedestrians have priority, and the environment is engineered with curves, planters, and different paving materials to naturally calm traffic to walking speed. The Dutch model demonstrates that safety is not an add-on but can be engineered into the very fabric of the urban environment.

5.2 Legislating Safety: Lessons from Germany's Pedestrian-First Laws

Germany combines excellent engineering with a robust model of "Enforced Safety," built on a clear, rights-based legal framework that is strictly implemented. The German Road Traffic Act (Straßenverkehrs-Ordnung, StVO) provides pedestrians with unambiguous and enforceable rights:

- **Absolute Priority at Zebra Crossings:** Unlike in India, where the right of way is often theoretical, German law mandates that vehicles *must* stop and wait for a pedestrian who is at or even just approaching a marked zebra crossing. This rule is widely understood and rigorously enforced, with significant fines for violations.
- **Doctrine of Confidence:** German traffic law is based on the principle that road users can generally trust others to follow the rules. However, this doctrine is explicitly suspended in the case of vulnerable users; drivers have a heightened duty of care and must anticipate unpredictable behavior from children, the elderly, or persons with disabilities.
- **Proactive Municipal Legislation:** Going beyond the national framework, cities like Berlin have enacted their own specific Pedestrian Laws. Berlin's 2021 law mandates longer green light phases for pedestrians, the creation of safer school routes, an increase in the number of crossings, and the lowering of curbs for better accessibility, providing a powerful model for city-level action.

The critical lesson for India lies in adopting a hybrid approach. It cannot simply legislate rights without redesigning the hostile physical environment, nor can it build infrastructure without a strong legal framework and a culture of enforcement. A successful reform must integrate the Dutch philosophy of proactive, safe-by-design engineering with the German commitment to clear, legally codified rights and non-negotiable enforcement.

Table 4: Comparative Framework of Pedestrian Safety Laws (India, Netherlands, Germany)

Legal/Policy Principle	India	Netherlands	Germany
Core Safety Philosophy	Reactive, punitive; focuses on user blame.	Proactive, preventative; system designed to be forgiving of human error ("Sustainable Safety").	Rights-based; combines strong engineering with strict enforcement ("Doctrine of Confidence").
Right of Way (Marked Crossings)	Theoretical; granted by law (Reg. 11) but rarely respected or enforced.	Absolute priority at zebra crossings; drivers must yield.	Absolute priority at zebra crossings; drivers must stop and wait.
Infrastructure Mandate	Delegated to states/municipalities; IRC guidelines exist but compliance is inconsistent.	Function-based design with physically separated infrastructure for different users is standard.	High standards for infrastructure, supplemented by city-specific laws (e.g., Berlin Pedestrian Law).
Liability for Accidents	Primarily on the driver (**BNS 281**); official liability (MV Act 198A) is a recent, rarely used provision.	System-focused; liability can be shared if design is flawed. Strict liability for motorists in collisions with vulnerable users.	Shared, with a high burden of care on the motorist, especially concerning vulnerable users.

Speed Management	Primarily through speed limits and punitive enforcement; speed breakers often unscientific.	Primarily through design ("self-explaining roads," Woonerf) to naturally calm traffic.	Combination of strict speed limits (e.g., 30 km/h zones) and design measures.

6. Synthesizing Rights, Realities, and a Roadmap for the Future

The preceding analysis reveals a clear imperative: India must move from a system of diffused responsibility and reactive punishment to one of integrated accountability and proactive safety design. This requires a multi-pronged approach that harmonizes the legal framework and fundamentally reorients the country's approach to urban planning and traffic management.

6.1 Harmonizing a Fragmented Legal Framework

The current patchwork of laws is inadequate. To provide clarity, coherence, and effective enforcement, the following legal reforms are essential:

- **Enact a National Pedestrian Rights Act:** A single, comprehensive central legislation is needed to consolidate the rights of pedestrians. This Act should codify the right to walk as a fundamental right, establish uniform, non-negotiable standards for pedestrian infrastructure based on IRC guidelines, and create a clear hierarchy of road user rights with the pedestrian at the top.
- **Establish Unified Urban Mobility Authorities:** To overcome the problem of diffused responsibility, each major city should have a single, empowered authority responsible for the entire lifecycle of pedestrian infrastructure—from planning and design to construction, maintenance, and coordinating enforcement against encroachments. This would create a single point of accountability.
- **Strengthen Penalties and Liability:** Section 198A of the MV Act must be proactively used, and penalties for encroachment on footpaths under municipal laws must be significantly increased to create a stronger deterrent.

6.2 Beyond Legislation: The Imperative of Design, Enforcement, and Public Consciousness

Legislation alone is insufficient. It must be accompanied by a transformation in practice:

- **Mandate 'Safety by Design':** The adoption of IRC guidelines should not be discretionary. Central government funding for all new and upgraded urban road projects, including those under schemes like the Smart Cities Mission, must be made conditional on strict compliance with pedestrian-friendly design standards.

- **Leverage Technology for Enforcement:** Widespread violations like parking on footpaths can be effectively curbed through technology. The use of AI-enabled CCTV cameras for automated, non-discretionary electronic enforcement can ensure consistent action against violators.
- **Foster a Culture of Safety:** A sustained, nationwide public awareness campaign is crucial. This campaign must educate drivers on their legal duty to yield to pedestrians and inform pedestrians of their rights and responsibilities, such as using designated crossings. The goal is to shift the road culture from one of conflict and competition to one of mutual respect and shared responsibility.

Conclusion: Upholding the Pedestrian's Rightful Place in the Public Realm

The journey of a pedestrian on an Indian street is a narrative of systemic failure. It is a story of constitutional promises unfulfilled, of laws unenforced, and of a planning paradigm that has forgotten the human at its center. This paper has demonstrated that the right of a pedestrian to a safe and unobstructed passage is not a mere civic amenity but a non-negotiable component of the fundamental right to life guaranteed by Article 21 of the Constitution. The judiciary, through its expansive interpretation of this right and its proactive interventions in cases like S. Rajaseekaran, has laid down an unambiguous constitutional and legal mandate for the state to act.

The chasm between this mandate and the tragic reality on the ground, evidenced by soaring fatality statistics and crumbling infrastructure, can no longer be ignored. The models from the Netherlands and Germany show that a future with safe streets is not an idealistic dream but an achievable goal, predicated on a dual commitment to intelligent, human-centric design and a legal framework with clear rights and strict enforcement.

The path forward for India requires a fundamental re-imagination of its public spaces. It demands a harmonized legal framework that places the pedestrian at the apex of the road user hierarchy. It necessitates an urban planning philosophy that engineers safety into the very design of our streets. Most importantly, it calls for the political and administrative will to enforce the law and hold authorities accountable. Upholding the right to walk is the litmus test for our commitment to creating cities that are not just economically vibrant but also safe, equitable, and truly livable for every single citizen.

References

Government & Agency Reports

- Berlin Mobility Act / (Berlin "pedestrian law" info) — official Senate page: https://www.berlin.de/sen/uvk/en/mobility-and-transport/transport-policy/berlin-mobility-act/
- Berlin Senate Department for the Environment, Transport and Climate Protection. (2021, February 6). *Berlin gets Germany's first pedestrian law. Deutsche Welle.* https://www.dw.com/en/berlin-gets-germanys-first-pedestrian-law/a-56480003
- DeJure (alternate presentation of §25 StVO): https://dejure.org/gesetze/StVO/25.html
- Deutsche Welle reporting on Berlin's pedestrian law (2021): https://www.dw.com/en/berlin-gets-germanys-first-pedestrian-law/a-56480003
- European Transport Safety Council (ETSC) — organisation (useful for commentary/briefs): https://etsc.eu/
- Indian Roads Congress. (2012). *Guidelines for pedestrian facilities (IRC 103-2012).* New Delhi: Indian Roads Congress.
- ITF / OECD — *Case Study: Sustainable Safety in the Netherlands* (PDF): https://www.itf-oecd.org/sites/default/files/itf-safe-system-case-study-netherlands.pdf
- ITF / OECD — *Safe System in Action* resources (broader context): https://www.itf-oecd.org/sites/default/files/docs/safe-system-in-action.pdf
- LexMea. (2025). *§ 25 StVO – Fußgänger (Pedestrians).* LexMea Legal Database. https://lexmea.de/en/gesetz/stvo/25
- Ministry of Housing and Urban Affairs. (2014). *National Urban Transport Policy (Revised 2014).* Government of India.
- Ministry of Road Transport and Highways. (2019). *The Motor Vehicles (Amendment) Act, 2019.* Government of India. https://legislative.gov.in/
- Ministry of Road Transport and Highways. (2024). *Road Accidents in India – 2023.* Government of India. https://morth.nic.in/road-accident-in-india
- National Crime Records Bureau. (2023). *Crime in India 2022.* Ministry of Home Affairs, Government of India. *Retrieved from* https://ncrb.gov.in/
- NITI Aayog. (2021). *Reimagining streets as safe, equitable and sustainable public spaces.* Government of India. *Retrieved from* https://www.niti.gov.in/

- Official German road traffic regulations (StVO) — §25 (Pedestrians) (Gesetze-im-Internet): https://www.gesetze-im-internet.de/stvo_2013/__25.html
- Olga Tellis v. Bombay Municipal Corporation, (1985) 3 SCC 545. Supreme Court of India. https://indiankanoon.org/doc/709776/
- Research/overview paper (SWOV / H. Stipdonk material hosted by ETSC): https://etsc.eu/wp-content/uploads/The-experience-of-the-Netherlands-Sustainable-urban-road-safety-Henk-Stipdonk-SWOV1.pdf
- Sustainable Safety (official overview site / movement): https://sustainablesafety.nl/
- SWOV — *Advancing Sustainable Safety* (brief / overview PDF). https://swov.nl/system/files/publication-downloads/advancing_sustainable_safety.pdf
- SWOV Institute for Road Safety Research. (2018). *Sustainable safety in the Netherlands.* The Hague: SWOV. https://www.swov.nl/en/publication/sustainable-safety-netherlands.
- The Constitution of India (as amended up to 2023). Ministry of Law and Justice, Government of India. Retrieved from https://legislative.gov.in/constitution-of-india