Human Trafficking and Organ Trade: Legal Gaps and Ethical Dilemmas in Transplant Tourism

Aman Sonkar[1]
[1]*Assistant Professor at Motherhood University, Roorkee, Haridwar, Uttarakhand*

***Abstract*—This research paper aims to provide insight into the increasing linkage between human trafficking and the illegal transplantation organ business, specifically through the mechanism of transplant tourism. It examines the legal and ethical issues posed by poor people — usually. From the Global South, organs are sold to provide many desiredtransplant options to individuals in wealthier countries, locally and abroad. In particular, the study performs a doctrinal and comparative analysis of major international instruments such as the Palermo Protocol, WHO Guidelines, and the Declaration of Istanbul, vis-à–vis India's "Transplantation of Human Organs and Tissues Act, 1994" (THOTA). The paper unveils major shortcomings in enforceability, consent verification, victim protection, and cross-border transplants by examining landmark Indian and international case laws. Human rights and bioethical frameworks are used to evaluate ethical dilemmas regarding the commodification of the human body and the spectre of informed consent amid economic coercion and desperation. It further reviews global models— like Iran's regulated market, the opt-out system in Spainand legal deterrents in Israel — to identify best practices. In light of this analysis, the paperrecommends several legal and policy changes to fortify India's transplant governance, international collaboration, and cadaveric donations. In conclusion, it emphasises the importance of a transparent and victim-centred legalresponse to organ trafficking and abetting and a need for a legal approach with a strong ethical basis that considers the dignity and the human rights of all persons, both those receiving and donating transplants.**

***Index Terms*—Bioethics, Ethical Dilemmas, Human Trafficking, International Law, Medical Tourism, Organ Trade, Organ Transplant Regulation, Transplant Tourism, THOTA, Victim Protection.**

I INTRODUCTION

Human trafficking for organ trade is one of the most atrocious types of transnational organised crime, both violating basic human rights and undermining theconcept of bodily autonomy. Despite the increased global focus on conscientious medicalpractice, an enormous underground market exists for the illicit procurement and sale of human organs. It is estimated by the "World Health Organization that between 5–10% of all kidney transplants worldwide are the result of organ trafficking, frequently with vulnerable persons who are coerced, tricked, or forced their organs". This grim truth has a particularly insidious effect on the poor in poorer countries like India, where desperation born of poverty, illiteracy and socialisation, combined with a lack of regulatory oversight, creates the perfect environment for exploitation to flourish. India has had its share of organ traffickingscandals over the last 20 years, and with each passing case, we discover new loopholes in legal and medical regulations. Meanwhile, the rise of "transplant tourism" hasbecome a major international issue. Now, rich patients from the developed world are flocking to places such as India, Pakistan, the Philippines, and Egypt to obtain organs for transplants at a fraction of the price they would pay to do thesame at home.Brokers, compliant doctors, and weak enforcement often facilitate demand-side practice. At best, transplant tourism solves long waiting lists for organs. Still, it usually involves shady practices around organ procurement — funnelling massively exploited and underpaid bodily extractions devoid of proper consent from donors, breaching "International human rights law".[i] This practice has grave ethical and legal implications, further exacerbated as the healthcare system becomes commoditised and requires timely academic attention. This research paper is an attempt to critically analyse the legal loopholes and ethical dilemmas relevant to organ trafficking and transplant tourism, especially withreference to India, to analyse gaps in national

and international legal frameworks which do notsufficiently respond to the complexity of organ trafficking. It further examines the ethical dilemmasendemic to transplant tourism, particularly the conflict between the patients' capacity for individual choice and the systemic nature of exploitation. It also assesses the success of India in this regard by way of legal and policy frameworks, including "The Transplantation of HumanOrgans and Tissues Act, 1994"[ii] To regulate the transplant ecosystem by preventing trafficking. The study takes acomparative approach to learn lessons from jurisdictions with more robust or innovative regulatory models and thus provides a framework for possible legal reforms in India.

The research method used in this article is doctrine, which is an in-depth review of various regulations scrutinised in combination with worldwide conventions and judicial verdicts. A cross-comparative legalanalysis is also performed about how other jurisdictions regulate organ transplantation and trafficking. Here, human rights principles and frameworks of medical bioethics explore ethical dimensionswith a special focus on consent, bodily autonomy, and distributive justice. The new paper is interdisciplinary as it shows how the legal inadequacies interplay with socio-economic inequity and medical ethics and makes a casefor exhaustively unfolding the issue.

II LEGAL FRAMEWORK GOVERNING ORGAN TRANSPLANTS AND TRAFFICKING

Organtransplants and the trafficking of organs are issues that need to be addressed by a multifaceted legal framework of both nations and international instruments. The global legal norms and mechanisms of cooperation to combat organ trafficking andtransplant tourism are stated. These practices are inherently transnational and affect individuals globally, especially vulnerable ones.

Internationally, the most authoritative legal instrument on trafficking in persons, including trafficking for organ removal, is "The United Nations Protocol to Prevent, Suppress and Punish Trafficking in Persons, Especially Women and Children (Palermo Protocol)". The Protocol elaborates on this definition further, supplementing the United NationsConvention Against Transnational Organized Crime by defining trafficking in persons to mean the recruitment, transportation, transfer, harbouring or receipt of persons by improper means (including coercion, abduction, fraud or deception) for exploitation, expressly stating that exploitation includes, but is not limited to, "the removal of organs at Article 3(a) of the Protocol". It commits State Parties tocriminalising trafficking, protecting victims and facilitating cross-border cooperation to break apart trafficking networks. Nevertheless, its impact is frequently limited dueto the voluntary nature of its implementation and no specific provisions governing transplant-related offences are included in national legal codes.[iii] "The WHO Guiding Principles on Human Cell, Tissue and Organ Transplantation offer ethical and legal guidelines on behalf ofWHO member states as a complement to the Palermo Protocol. They emphasise voluntary and fully informed consent, the non-commercialisation of organ donation, and the equitableaccess to transplantation".[iv] While notlegally binding, these principles constitute the ethical underpinning of national transplant declarations and are widely recognised as a best practice internationally. A second significant tool is the Declaration of "Istanbul on Organ Trafficking and Transplant Tourism (2008)", which is based upon the WHO principles butprovides specific definitions and guidelines to differentiate ethical travel for legitimate transplant from unethical "transplant tourism." It denounces human organ commerce and promotes transparency, traceability, and accountability in organ donationand transplantation.[v] Whilst a soft law instrument, and despite its poorly known character, the Declaration has exerted a massiveinfluence over transplant legislation around the world, including India, portraying transplant tourism as a human rights subject.

Themain response of the law in India to organ transplantation and trafficking is "The Transplantation of Human Organs and Tissues Act, 1994" (herein referred to as THOTA), which was enacted to regulate the removal, storage, and transplantation of human organs for therapeutic purposes and to prevent commercial dealings in human organs.[vi] It bans any sale and purchase of organs. It only permits donations for individuals from their nearest relatives or an altruistic donor, but

onlyunder the strict supervision of Licensing Committees. The Act also establishes authorities by which all transplants should be monitored andregulated and a provision for penal action against violations. The Act was amended in 2011 to include tissues and enhance theregulatory framework. Detailed rules and regulatory mechanisms, such as Authorization Committees at state and hospital levels to evaluate the genuinenessof donor-recipient relationships and genuineness of consent, further reinforce the objectives of THOTA. The Committees are central to preventing market transplants, but their function has been under scrutiny, with accusations of graft, a lack of transparency and due process.

However, organ trafficking lawshave several vital substantiative laws and practical gaps in the context of India. A major problem is the lack of enforcement, particularly in private hospitals with little regulatory oversight and strongprofit motivation. Consent is routinely verified andtherefore superficial, and donors can be coerced or deceived, given their vulnerable economic status. Moreover, the absence of a national registry and interstate coordination impedes the tracking of transplants and allows illegal organ cesspools to relocate across state lines swiftly. Some cases go unreported or underreported due to social stigma, fearof retaliation, or even the collusion of medical professionals. Organs used for illicit transplantations are harvested from victims, often challenginglow-income or hostile environment communities, who receive low or no identification protection and compensation. In addition, Indian laws do not have enough provisions to deal with transplant tourism acrossborders. Although “The Transplantation of Human Organs and Tissues Act, 1995” (THOTA) regulates transplants in India, it does not sufficiently punish citizens who travel outside the country to acquire an organ illegally and does not require such procedures to be reported ormonitored ex-post. Such legal and regulatoryinsufficiencies cry out for reform and collaboration at the international level. The intersectionality across human rights, publichealth ethics, and transnational criminal law speak to the multifaceted nature of the issue and the need for a stronger, more victim-oriented legal response.

III CASE LAW AND NOTABLE INCIDENTS

There have been significant judicial pronouncements in India concerning organ trafficking and transplant tourism, which has helped to develop the libertarian state concept in the present-day legalmilieu. They reveal fundamental systemic defects and highlight urgent ethicaland legal issues of consent, commodification of the human body, and bodily integrity.

The most well-known Indian case is the 2008Gurgaon kidney racket uncovered in the case of “State of Maharashtra v. Dr. Amit Kumar, 2008." [vii] The alleged mastermind, Dr Amit Kumar, ran an illegal kidney transplant scam on a massive scale, primarily involving the poor who were enticed orforced into giving up their organs. The racket, which had its tentacles spread across various states, stalled even outside India, exposing fundamental lapses in enforcing the “Transplantation of Human Organs and Tissues Act, 1994” (THOTA). The case revealed procedural failures regarding verifying donor consent, lack of efficiency of the Authorization Committees, and poorcooperation among relevant government agencies. The judgement strongly urged strengthening the regulatory mechanisms under THOTA to protect againstcommercialisation under the garb of non-directed altruistic donation. Although not directly on the subject of organ trade, The Supreme Court in 1983 in “Laxmi Kant Pandey v. Union of India, (1984)”[viii] Some fundamental principles on why protecting vulnerable individuals at risk of exploitation is important in the name ofhumanitarianism were articulated. Inthe case involving inter-country adoption practices, the court reiterated the need for "effective measures and procedures" and that it is “a positive obligation on the part of the state to prevent the commodification of individuals”. These principles find ample resonance in cases of organ trafficking —particularly about "consensual" organ donations made under socio-economic duress.

There have also been some High Court judgments where THOTA has been interpreted with a degreeof nuance. The Madras High Court, in thecase of “A. Navin Kumar v. Authorisation Committee, 2016”, at the outset, has emphasised that there must be a genuine emotional attachment between the unrelated donor and the unrelated recipient before granting

authorisation. The court examinedwhether financial inducement camouflaged behind altruism must be viewed as an attempt to circumvent THOTA, allowing the court to impose a stricter application of its provisions to eliminate commercial dealings.[ix] Delhi High Court in "Manik Tanejav. Govt. NCT Delhi" held that valid consent is anoutcome of the role played by Authorization Committees while deciding cases of donations, and the mere filing of an affidavit does not suffice to establish consent. Thesecases have been fundamental to establishing procedural safeguards that need to be in place to address hidden organ sales.[x]

At the global level, the United States scored its first federal organ trafficking conviction in 2011, with the case against "United States v. Rosenbaum", Rosenbaum was convicted of brokering the sale of kidneys from poor Israeli donors to Americans willing to pay up to$160,000 per transplant.[xi] Thiscase illustrates that organ trafficking is a global phenomenon and not limited to developing countries, and it shows we do need to criminalise intermediaries for profiting from commodifying human organs. It also highlighted the role of global inequalities in transplant tourism andorgan markets.

Outside the courtroom, reports and policystudies have suggested hospitals in several nations, such as Pakistan, the Philippines and Egypt, have been implicated in assisting transplant tourism. In Pakistan, for example, despite a lawoutlawing human organ exportation, foreign patients can still obtain body parts via illegal markets operated by brokers and shady surgeons. The widespread allegations of commercial transplant operations, for which Lahore hospitals were being used to suchan extent that the case not only jolted the nation but also serious concerns about the implementation of "Pakistan's Transplantation of Human Organs and Tissues Act of 2010".[xii] A pipeline of organ theft: how refugees and migrants are being targeted in Egypt, United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime, November 232017[xiii] These events highlight theurgency of international cooperation and enforcement beyond national borders. These are principally cases ofvalid consent, bodily integrity, and prohibitions against human body commodities. Fororgan donation, valid consent is not merely the absence of illegality but also the lack of coercion or inducement, neither of which is satisfied in a black-market exchange. The right to bodily integrity prevents bodily harm (especially non-consensual), and the doctrine of inalienability prevents commodification (the belief that humanorgans should not be traded as merchandise). In their combination, these doctrinesprovide a normative basis for assessing the legality and morality of organ transplants and constitute the bedrock of the human rights-oriented regulation of organ donation practices.

IV ETHICAL DILEMMAS IN TRANSPLANT TOURISM

The ethical issues surrounding transplant tourism are immense, challenging human rights, medical ethics, and global justice. Although this practice is frequently defended in the nameof personal freedom and the necessity of saving lives, it often hides the fact that systemic coercion, exploitation, and commercialisation of vulnerable groups take place. The difficult choices are even more difficult across borders, where law enforcement works unevenly, and the economicdisparities between those who accept organ donations and those who give them loom large.

One of transplant tourism's greatest ethical dilemmas is voluntary versus coerced informedconsent. Organ donationshould be a non-transactional and selfless act. Often, the economically lessfortunate are manipulated—directly or indirectly—to "agree" to donate their organs for a financial prize. But consent likethat — made under economic duress? — is fundamentally defective. As WHO studiesand many ethical analyses have shown, an informed decision in dire financial need is not voluntary.[xiv] This gendered natureof trafficking for organ donation further complicates the situation. In numerous nations, ladies — particularly from minimised atmospheres– are excessively utilised as gifts or go-between. Cultural and gendered powerdynamics mean that it can be almost impossible for women to say no, especially in cases of familial or community pressure.[xv]

This raises the ethicalquestions of autonomy versus exploitation. Those favouring organ markets typically appealto libertarian principles, suggesting that individuals should be able to choose what to do with their bodies, including selling an organ. But this perspective runs counter to a more hallmark communitarian or human rights approach, which argues that choices in a context of structural

exploitation—poverty, lackof education, and lack of health care—are not free. Or philosopher Martha Nussbaum decries what the capabilities approach sees as emptyformal autonomy when the social conditions of true freedom are absent.[xvi] Thus, the semblance of free voluntary choice may arise from systematic disenfranchisement.

The Global North-South imbalance is also worsened by transplant tourism, in which the organ donation trend is one way—from the lesswealthy South to the rich North. This phenomenon highlights embedding inequalities around globalhealth systems and organ transplantation access. Research by the "Global Observatory on Donation and Transplantation (GODT)" has found that around the world, recipients in high-income countries often travel to low- and middle-income countries in what appear to be organ procurements without consideration for the circumstances in which donors are living or the legality of the operations themselves.[xvii] These practices contribute to deepening neocolonial dynamics, greenwashing the bodies of the impoverished for thewealth of the elite, and have profound implications for questions of distributive justice and global ethics.

The commodification of thehuman body is one of the most philosophically and ethically controversial debates, which starts around transplant tourism. Should people ever be ableto sell their organs? Some bioethicists have proposed a regulated market for organ sales, claimingit would curtail illegal trafficking and enhance supply.[xviii] However, numerousethicists see such a move as fraught with slippery slope danger. When the human body becomes a proper object of commercial trade, then nothing about it will ever be sacred because the human person will always be the victim of its commodification. Thiscommodification now has, under the guise of humanitarianism and dictatorships of culture and ideologies, powerful profit incentives. "The Council of Europe Convention against Trafficking in Human Organs" (2015) explicitly prohibits organ sales of any kind and promotes a completely altruistic organ donation structure.[xix] The use of medical tourism agencies is another more neglected ethicalconsideration expressed in transplant tourism, as they frequently function as brokers. These organisations package life-saving surgical intervention as a travel experience the way one might for an amusement park pass, with legally non-transparent functional immunity to the ethical and legal violations embedded in theprocess. Promotional materials from many such agencies paper over the sources of organs, downplay the risks to donors' andactively invite clients to evade national waiting lists and regulatory oversight.[xx] Their role prompts us to reflect on firms' accountability and facilitators' moral obligations in globalhealth marketplaces.

In short, transplant tourism is a quintessentially ethically problematic practice, not only because of its life-and-death nature butalso because it lies at the nexus of massive inequality, compromised consent, and commodified healthcare. Strong ethics rooted in human rights, social justice, and global solidarity that centre the dignity and agency of all human beings (andnot just recipients) are needed to address these dilemmas.

V COMPARATIVE LEGAL ANALYSIS: BEST PRACTICES FROM OTHER JURISDICTIONS

Navigating the ethical and legal questions posedby transplant tourism and organ trafficking should include an exploration of international best practices and a comparative legal approach. In response to the increasing threat of a black market for organ sales, many jurisdictions have taken varied approaches, ranging from banning all commercial organ sales to regulating them. An analysis of these legal frameworks' sheds light on India as it develops its own organ transplantsystem.

Iran is the only country worldwide that has thoroughly deregulated its organ market. The market. The kidneys from living unrelated donors are legal in Iran and regulated by the state. Donoris paid by the government, government; governmental organisations play an important role in matching donors with recipients, with some overseeing the process.[xxi] This helped clear up the kidney transplant waiting list from thatcountry.[xxii] Supporters claim that the model is realistic and eliminates the exploitation of the black market by ensuring that donations are consensual,medically supervised, and financially rewarding for the donor.[xxiii] However, critics say thatinequities and a consistent shortage of funding from donors plague the Iranian model. Theexistence of a market for kidneys would amount, as most donors are poor, to a legalised nefarious exploitation

of people with low incomes.[xxiv] They also raised concerns about the system's lack of transparencyand oversight following reports from a recent trip of informal payment and little after-surgery care.[xxv] Iran's example provides insights into how regulated bail could limit illicit commerce. Still, it also suffers ethical compromises that make it possible to replicate it in India without enormous safeguards. Spainand Israel, in comparison, offer strong ethical frameworks for organ availability expansion. With presumed consent (opt-out system), a centralised coordination system, and well-established public education campaigns, Spain ranks highest globally in the organisation.[xxvi] Presumed consent means that a person is presumed willing to donate their organs after they dieunless they specifically opt out of this status. The need for this was justified by this legal presumption associated with an ONT (national transplant organisation) that was highly efficientin making medical transparency a reality and in winning public confidence.[xxvii]

In the early 2000s, Israel was challenged by a tremendous rise in transplant tourism and organ trafficking; as a response, in 2008 Israel adopted the Organ Transplant Act, criminalising organ trafficking and compensating for illegal transplants abroad.[xxviii] Furthermore, Israelhas instituted a point system that prioritises those who are willing to donate organs or whose families have previously donated their organs.[xxix] The implementation of these legal reforms has resulted in an increase in domestic organ donation rates and a concomitant decrease in transplant tourism.[xxx] These models show how strong legal penalties coupled with moral incentives to donate could decrease the demandfor black-market organs without a legal market for organs. Meanwhile, the Philippines and Pakistan provide cautionary lessons about weak governance and thedangers of poorly regulated transplant systems. Before the 2008 prohibition on selling organs to foreigners, kidney vendors adduced the financial precariousness that drove many—primarily male, impoverished members of society—to make a salefor as low as USD 1,000 in the Philippines.[xxxi] The weak legal punishmentand the influx of foreign patients made it rife for abuse. This crackdown limitedtransplant tourism, but enforcement has remained inconsistent and illegal practices continue in rural regions.[xxxii] Likewise, dueto weaker regulations and poverty, Pakistan became a hotspot for kidney tourism. Before the Transplantation of Human Organs and Tissues Ordinance, 2007, it was said that 85% of transplants had foreign recipients and poor Pakistani donors.[xxxiii] Although the 2010 Act banned the selling of organs and fostered a donation system based on altruism, enforcement is flawed, and black markets continue tothrive unhindered.[xxxiv] Focusing particularly on the examples of C, E, and G, all three examples highlight that the trade in organs cannot thrive in vulnerable communities without effective law enforcement and socio-economic intervention.

India will have both the lessons and theearnings to draw from the experiences of these comparators. Thus, the successful elimination of waitinglists in Iran points to the necessity of further consideration of alternative (non-commodification) approaches to the organ shortage. India needs to strengthen its systems ondeceased donation with an opt-out model, as seen in Spain, or something comparable, but only after, perhaps, taking into account the inherent cultural sensitivities here to some extent. Legal deterrence with a dash of incentive—such as favouringregistered donors first—appears to work in Israel.However, the Philippines and Pakistan's shortcomings highlight that any legal regime will only be as good and effective as its enforcement mechanisms and providing socio-economic support to donors. Therefore, the above scenarios indicatethat India needs not just a well-drafted humane law like THOTA but, more importantly, effective inter-agency coordination, transparency in prosecutions and appropriate support mechanisms for victims in greater numbers than contemplated. Thus, India needs to derive lessons from comparative best practices in transplant regulation to obtain its strength while being vigilant against its weaknesses and achieving a balanced transplantation framework. We must strive toward a just, equitable, ethical, and transparent system of donation that canalso maintain bodily integrity and the dignity of the donors and the recipient.

VI POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS AND LEGAL REFORMS

While organ trafficking and transplant tourism will continue to pose challenges for the Indian healthcare system, the existing legal and policy framework must

be further strengthened to protect the vulnerable groups of society, which are both fundamental tasks underlyingthe effective and ethical regulation of organ transplantation. “The Transplantation of Human Organs and Tissues Act, 1994” (THOTA) is minimal. It needs massive amendments to deal with the current predicament of organ trade, global aspects, and the tactful role of the trafficker.

First, THOTA needs reform to include unambiguous definitionsand victim-driven provisions. The presentlanguage of the Act is commercial in nature, ignoring the plight of donors who may be victims of coercion or deceit. An amendment toinclude a wider definition of "trafficking for organ removal," similar to that in the Palermo Protocol, could ensure that domestic law meets the minimum standards set out in international instruments.[xxxv] THOTA should also include dedicated victim assistance measures, such as compensation, legalaid, occupational rehabilitation, and health tracking services for victims of exploitation. Freezing existing Authorisation Committees under ICE over the same period will not onlyadd a layer of devolved oversight. Still, greater scrutiny and review will prevent procedural malpractice and graft from taking root while transplant approvals are issued.[xxxvi] Equally pressing is the needto improve consent mechanisms. However, enforcement of this requirement is weak, and the verification of donor choice is often cursory dueto the lack of transparency in the donor registration process. In response, laws must mandate that living donors undergo independent counselling from professionals not affiliated with the transplant team to demonstrate that no one was coerced or induced to donate.[xxxvii] Relationships between donors and recipients should be verified and cross-checked for unrelated transplants at multiple levels— hospitals, states, and the Centre. There is also a technological aspect with the digitisation of the histories of donors, and through biometrics, fraud and identity manipulation can bemitigated. Internationalcooperation mechanisms are needed because organ trafficking is a transnational crime. India should negotiate bilateral andmultilateral treaties with source and destination countries on the organ trade chain, allowing for easy extradition of traffickers, data exchange and joint investigations. At the international level, India is a party to the United Nations Convention Against Transnational Organized Crime (2000). Implementing the cooperation provisions in this treaty can substantiallyexpand the capacity of law enforcement. Fourth, agencies such as the CBI and the South Asia wing of Interpol should be empowered to initiate fishing expeditions against organ traffickers, especially whenit involves foreign nationals and syndicates operating via the borders.

The rise of transplant tourism must be checked bynaturalisation law restricting Indian citizens from travelling abroad for transplants. This declares that everycitizen should inform the health ministry or some relevant authority to let it know they will have their treatment done in another country. Indian law must criminalise not only travel to participate in an illegal transplant abroad but also take action against those who refuse tocomply. This would resemble the Israeli model, in which participants in illegal transplantsconducted abroad are subject to punishment.[xxxviii] In addition, medical brokers and travel agents that package this travel have to be criminally exposed to the Information Technology Act of 2000and consumer protection statutes. Ultimately, the best long-term solution to stop the black market for organs would be to strengthen India’s own domestic organdonation system, specifically increasing cadaver (deceased) donations. India has a vast donor pool in the humanorgan trade; however, the country has an abysmal cadaver donation rate because of ignorance, superstition, cultural beliefs, and bad infrastructure.[xxxix]The government should initiate national information campaigns, open registration points for donors and make discussions on organ donation a standard of end-of-life care in hospitals. A national registry of organ donors, real-time organ matching software and interstate coordination—to name a few—would make it much simpler to allocate organs and minimise the relianceon living donors. Moreover, a non-material benefit, like a priority in treating health facilities or recognising donor families, could mitigate the cultural obstacles against altruistic donation.[xl]

Therefore, organ trafficking and transplant tourism in India require a comprehensive andmulti-pronged legal and policy response, which should strike a balance between adequate deterrence and bioethical measures. The exploitation networks that thrive under the current system cannot be dismantled without the dissection of THOTA, donor empowerment, improvedenforcement capacity, international

assistance mechanisms and expanded ethical organ supply systems. Conclusion: The long-term systemic reform required of India can only be achieved through the domestication of proper functioning laws by aligning them with the international best practices, which in turn will take India towards a better organ transplantation regime where the beneficiaries have access to just and transparent systems in practice rather than being guided by the laws in principle.

VII CONCLUSION

Trafficking in and exchanging organs: intense and embrace the challenging legal problem in global health along with human rights law at the moment This article has explored the complex legal and ethical aspects of transplant tourism, centred specifically upon India. By reviewing such legal frameworks—international and domestic—both normative and practical in content, we demonstrate how they plan for a better future through ex-ante and ex-post designing. Yet, all too often, despitesuch legislation being present on paper, its application is ineffective, leading to the exploitation of the most vulnerable individuals in our society. This challenge is exacerbated by systemic loopholes, including weak monitoring, poor consent verification processes, andthe absence of legal provisions regulating cross-border transplants.

This has been corroborated bycase law in India and away, through which the trenchant themes of coercion, commodification and legal uncertainty are evident. Prominent cases, including “State of Maharashtra v. Dr. Amit Kumar and People v. Levy Izhak Rosenbaum”, have revealed national opuses fall short in successfully preventingand punishing the crime of illicit organ trade. However, these flaws in law rest on much more profound ethical tensions: the conflict between respect for autonomous choice against an exploitative system of supply and demand, the difficulty of truly informed consent within the context of economic vulnerability, and thefunctions of medical tourism industries that enable illegal or semi-legal transplant.

The Original Muslimversion Above Kickbacks: The Original Muslim version as transplant tourism evolves, so too does the imperative for coordinated, rights-respecting and transparent legal response. Here, this will not only require strengthening existing legal provisions such as THOTAbut also the introduction of ethical safeguards such as independent donor counselling and criminalising illicit overseas transplantation in domestic law. Further, India needs to look at comparative jurisdictions such as Spain, where divorce is allowed only on certain grounds73 or Israel, where divorce is based on mutual agreement within a year74 and even Iran, where women are considered longer in power once married75 who exercise her property independently76 apart from the formal provisions of the land,77 taking into consideration the successes as well as failures thereof. Bilateral treaties, information-sharing, and joint law enforcement initiatives that prevent traffickers fromoperating across borders are equally important.

Therefore, the challenge is balancing respecting individual dignity, human rights, and public health. Of course, there will need to be safeguards to ensure that the system is not exploited to the detriment of the poorest poor. Still, I will set the most sustainable and human solution for a system that fosters ethical organ donationoptions particularly (but of course not exclusively) through increased cadaver donations. Human trafficking, organ trade, and thisunholy marriage between the two thrive in a web of exploitation that will take the convergence of legal reform, ethical vigilance, and global solidarity to dismantle.

---

[i] United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime, *Global Report on Trafficking in Persons*, U.N. Sales No. E.14.V.10 (2014)

[ii] *Transplantation of Human Organs and Tissues Act*, No. 42 of 1994, India Code (1994)

[iii] Protocol to Prevent, Suppress and Punish Trafficking in Persons, Especially Women and Children, Nov. 15, 2000, 2237 U.N.T.S. 319

[iv] World Health Organization, *Guiding Principles on Human Cell, Tissue and Organ Transplantation*, WHO Doc. WHO/HTP/EHT/TSS/2008.1 (May 2010

[v] *Declaration of Istanbul on Organ Trafficking and Transplant Tourism*, The Transplantation Society & International Society of Nephrology, Istanbul, May 2008
[vi] *The Transplantation of Human Organs and Tissues Act*, No. 42 of 1994, § 9(1), India Code (1994), amended by Act 16 of 2011
[vii] *State of Maharashtra v. Dr. Amit Kumar*, 2008 SCC 2341 (India)
[viii] *Laxmi Kant Pandey v. Union of India*, (1984) 2 SCC 244 (India)
[ix] *A. Navin Kumar v. Authorisation Committee*, 2016 SCC OnLine Mad 18294 (India)
[x] *Manik Taneja v. Govt. of NCT Delhi*, 2012 SCC OnLine Del 3401 (India)
[xi] *United States v. Rosenbaum*, No. 09-cr-00415 (D.N.J. 2011)
[xii] Human Rights Commission of Pakistan, *Annual Report 2010*, at 113–14 (highlighting illegal kidney transplants in Lahore hospitals)
[xiii] United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime, *Trafficking in Persons for Organ Removal in Egypt*, UNODC (2017)
[xiv] *World Health Organization*, *Guiding Principles on Human Cell, Tissue and Organ Transplantation*, WHA Res. 63.22 (2010)
[xv] S.V. Subramanian & Veena Das, "*Organ Trafficking and the Female Body: A Case Study in South Asia*", *Lancet* 384, no. 9959 (2014): 563
[xvi] Martha C. Nussbaum, *Creating Capabilities: The Human Development Approach* (Harvard Univ. Press 2011)
[xvii] Global Observatory on Donation and Transplantation, *Global Database on Donation and Transplantation*
[xviii] Arthur J. Matas, "Why We Should Develop a Regulated System of Kidney Sales," *Curr. Opin. Organ Transplant.*, 16(2): 201–05 (2011)
[xix] Council of Europe, *Convention Against Trafficking in Human Organs*, CETS No. 216 (2015)
[xx] Susanne Lundin, *Organ Economy: Organ Trafficking in the Global Market*, 32 *Body & Society* 3–4 (2016)
[xxi] Amir Mansour-Ghanaei et al., "The Iranian Model of Paid and Regulated Living-Unrelated Kidney Donation," *Nephrol. Dial. Transplant.* 27 (2012): 3053
[xxii] Mahdavi-Mazdeh, M., "Organ Transplantation in Iran: Current Status and Future Challenges," *Nephrol. Dial. Transplant.* 27.2 (2012): 293–298
[xxiii] Hippen, Benjamin E., "In Defense of a Regulated Market in Kidneys from Living Vendors," *J. Med. Philos.* 33.6 (2008): 593–618
[xxiv] Delmonico, Francis L. et al., "Ethical Incentives—Not Payment—for Organ Donation," *N. Engl. J. Med.* 346.25 (2002): 2002–2005
[xxv] Bagheri, A., "Compensated Kidney Donation: An Ethical Review of the Iranian Model," *Kennedy Inst. Ethics J.* 16.3 (2006): 269–282
[xxvi] Matesanz, R., "The Spanish Model of Organ Donation," *Nephrol. Dial. Transplant.* 18 Suppl 8 (2003): vi–viii
[xxvii] ONT Spain, "*Organ Donation and Transplantation Activities*,"
[xxviii] The Organ Transplant Act, 5768-2008 (Isr.)
[xxix] Lavee, J. et al., "Prevention of Transplant Tourism: The Israeli Model," *Am. J. Transplant.* 13.3 (2013): 582–585
[xxx] Jacob Lavee & Tamar Ashkenazi, "How Israel Used the Law to Improve Organ Donation Rates," *BMJ* 343 (2011): d5723
[xxxi] Scheper-Hughes, N., "The Global Traffic in Human Organs," *Curr. Anthropol.* 41.2 (2000): 191–224
[xxxii] Philippine Organ Donation Act, R.A. No. 7170 (1991)
[xxxiii] Rizvi, S.A. et al., "Commercial Transplantation in Pakistan: Results from a Single Centre," *Transplantation* 79.6 (2005): 631–636
[xxxiv] Transplantation of Human Organs and Tissues Act, 2010 (Pak.)
[xxxv] Protocol to Prevent, Suppress and Punish Trafficking in Persons, Especially Women and Children, Nov. 15, 2000, 2237 U.N.T.S. 319
[xxxvi] *The Transplantation of Human Organs and Tissues Act*, No. 42 of 1994, § 9, India Code (1994), amended by Act 16 of 2011
[xxxvii] Francis L. Delmonico et al., "Ethical Incentives—Not Payment—for Organ Donation," *N. Engl. J. Med.* 346.25 (2002): 2002–2005
[xxxviii] Organ Transplant Act, 5768-2008 (Isr.)
[xxxix] Shroff, Sunil, "Legal and Ethical Aspects of Organ Donation and Transplantation," *Indian J. Urol.* 25.3 (2009): 348–355

[xl] Abouna, George M., "Organ Shortage Crisis: Problems and Possible Solutions," *Transplant Proc.*, 40.1 (2008): 34–38