

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL FOR LEGAL RESEARCH AND ANALYSIS



Open Access, Refereed Journal Multi Disciplinary
Peer Reviewed

www.ijlra.com

DISCLAIMER

No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored, transmitted, or distributed in any form or by any means, whether electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise, without prior written permission of the Managing Editor of the *International Journal for Legal Research & Analysis (IJLRA)*.

The views, opinions, interpretations, and conclusions expressed in the articles published in this journal are solely those of the respective authors. They do not necessarily reflect the views of the Editorial Board, Editors, Reviewers, Advisors, or the Publisher of IJLRA.

Although every reasonable effort has been made to ensure the accuracy, authenticity, and proper citation of the content published in this journal, neither the Editorial Board nor IJLRA shall be held liable or responsible, in any manner whatsoever, for any loss, damage, or consequence arising from the use, reliance upon, or interpretation of the information contained in this publication.

The content published herein is intended solely for academic and informational purposes and shall not be construed as legal advice or professional opinion.

**Copyright © International Journal for Legal Research & Analysis.
All rights reserved.**

ABOUT US

The *International Journal for Legal Research & Analysis (IJLRA)* (ISSN: 2582-6433) is a peer-reviewed, academic, online journal published on a monthly basis. The journal aims to provide a comprehensive and interactive platform for the publication of original and high-quality legal research.

IJLRA publishes Short Articles, Long Articles, Research Papers, Case Comments, Book Reviews, Essays, and interdisciplinary studies in the field of law and allied disciplines. The journal seeks to promote critical analysis and informed discourse on contemporary legal, social, and policy issues.

The primary objective of IJLRA is to enhance academic engagement and scholarly dialogue among law students, researchers, academicians, legal professionals, and members of the Bar and Bench. The journal endeavours to establish itself as a credible and widely cited academic publication through the publication of original, well-researched, and analytically sound contributions.

IJLRA welcomes submissions from all branches of law, provided the work is original, unpublished, and submitted in accordance with the prescribed submission guidelines. All manuscripts are subject to a rigorous peer-review process to ensure academic quality, originality, and relevance.

Through its publications, the *International Journal for Legal Research & Analysis* aspires to contribute meaningfully to legal scholarship and the development of law as an instrument of justice and social progress.

PUBLICATION ETHICS, COPYRIGHT & AUTHOR RESPONSIBILITY STATEMENT

The *International Journal for Legal Research and Analysis (IJLRA)* is committed to upholding the highest standards of publication ethics and academic integrity. All manuscripts submitted to the journal must be original, unpublished, and free from plagiarism, data fabrication, falsification, or any form of unethical research or publication practice. Authors are solely responsible for the accuracy, originality, legality, and ethical compliance of their work and must ensure that all sources are properly cited and that necessary permissions for any third-party copyrighted material have been duly obtained prior to submission. Copyright in all published articles vests with IJLRA, unless otherwise expressly stated, and authors grant the journal the irrevocable right to publish, reproduce, distribute, and archive their work in print and electronic formats. The views and opinions expressed in the articles are those of the authors alone and do not reflect the views of the Editors, Editorial Board, Reviewers, or Publisher. IJLRA shall not be liable for any loss, damage, claim, or legal consequence arising from the use, reliance upon, or interpretation of the content published. By submitting a manuscript, the author(s) agree to fully indemnify and hold harmless the journal, its Editor-in-Chief, Editors, Editorial Board, Reviewers, Advisors, Publisher, and Management against any claims, liabilities, or legal proceedings arising out of plagiarism, copyright infringement, defamation, breach of confidentiality, or violation of third-party rights. The journal reserves the absolute right to reject, withdraw, retract, or remove any manuscript or published article in case of ethical or legal violations, without incurring any liability.

IS POVERTY PARENTAL UNFITNESS? REPRODUCTIVE JUSTICE, CHILD PROTECTION AND SUBSTANTIVE EQUALITY IN COMPARISON TO FOREIGN LAWS

AUTHORED BY - AMMARAH ISHAQ & MOHAMMED SALMAN SIDDIQUI¹

I. INTRODUCTION

Poverty is a deficit of resources, not a deficit of love. Modern child protective systems operate under a fundamental paradox: treating structural poverty as legal evidence of parental unfitness. Operating under the *parens patriae* doctrine, state agencies routinely mischaracterize systemic resource deficits such as housing instability, food insecurity, and transportation barriers, as individual parental failure, converting material hardship into grounds for coercive surveillance and forced family separation. At the core of this crisis lies a crucial legal distinction: a parent's material inability to provide basic needs due to poverty is fundamentally distinct from a deliberate refusal or failure to care. Forced separation over economic hardship inflicts severe, long-lasting developmental trauma on children, rendering state intervention counterproductive to child safety. While existing legal scholarship separately addresses reproductive choice, foster care administration, and welfare entitlements, the critical intersection, how socioeconomic deprivation actively erodes the post-birth right to parent without state disruption, remains under-analyzed. To bridge this gap, this paper asks when, if ever, socioeconomic deprivation can legitimately contribute to a finding of unfitness, arguing that material poverty must never, by itself, justify child removal. Employing a doctrinal, comparative, and human-rights methodology, this study examines India's constitutional and statutory framework alongside comparative legal doctrines across the United States, the United Kingdom, Canada, and South Africa to establish that states must fulfill positive social support obligations as a mandatory prerequisite to family separation.

II. CONCEPTUALIZING PARENTAL UNFITNESS AND THE PROXY MODEL

A. Distinguishing Culpable Conduct from Material

Legal systems conceptualize parental unfitness as a threshold finding that a parent is fundamentally incapable of, or unsuitable for, fulfilling minimal duties of child care, thereby justifying state interference with parental rights. Unfitness typically requires clear and convincing evidence that a parent's condition or conduct poses a severe, ongoing risk of physical or emotional harm to the child.² A rigorous legal analysis requires distinguishing parental conduct (what a parent does or fails to do through agency and fault) from parental material capacity (what a parent can physically or financially afford given available socioeconomic resources). Active neglect involves culpable conduct, whereas a lack of material capacity reflects passive environmental limitations beyond the parent's control³. Poverty is an economic condition characterized by a deficit of income, housing, nutrition, and basic necessities; neglect, in its true legal sense, is a failure to meet a minimal standard of care attributable to parental fault. Because poverty reflects systemic resource distribution while neglect implies behavioral fault, the two concepts cannot logically or legally be equated. The conflation is most acute in borderline scenarios where symptoms of poverty resemble neglect such as housing instability, unaddressed medical needs, lack of transportation, or leaving a child briefly unsupervised due to an imperative to work without accessible childcare⁴. In these situations, parents are routinely penalized for resource deficits rather than bad parenting.

B. The Middle-Class Norm and the Proxy

Child protective agencies and family courts frequently apply middle-class, suburban norms of good parenting that inadvertently convert economic privilege into a prerequisite for parental fitness. Parents who cannot afford optimal housing, private therapy, or commercial childcare are evaluated against material standards they cannot meet, transforming economic inequality into judicially sanctioned unfitness⁵. Consequently, socioeconomic status and associated spatial factors like rural isolation or residence in marginalized neighborhoods function as an improper proxy for parental competence. Under this proxy model, poor parents are subjected to heightened institutional scrutiny, and their poverty is treated as a *de facto enhancement of parental culpability* rather than a circumstance requiring state support.

III. REPRODUCTIVE JUSTICE AND THE RIGHT TO PARENT

A. Theoretical Origins and Three Core Rights

Developed by Black feminists and the SisterSong⁶ collective, the reproductive justice framework expands the concept of reproductive freedom far beyond the narrow liberal focus on individual choice, abortion, and contraception. Reproductive justice articulates three fundamental, indivisible rights:

1. The right not to have children;
2. The right to have children; and
3. The right to parent the children one has in safe, healthy, and supportive environments.

While legal and political discourse has heavily focused on the first two rights, the third dimension, the affirmative right to parent children in dignified conditions free from coercive state intrusion, has been systematically neglected⁷. This third dimension forms the critical theoretical pillar of this paper. Poverty directly jeopardizes the exercise of this third right⁸. When state systems weaponize material hardship to remove children from low-income homes, the legal guarantee of the right to have children becomes hollow; a parent who possesses the theoretical right to reproduce cannot meaningfully exercise it if poverty renders their family perpetually vulnerable to state dissolution.

B. Post-Birth Regulation as Reproductive Discipline

Applying reproductive justice to child protection requires extending analysis beyond pre-birth autonomy into post-birth family regulation. The state's routine surveillance and regulation of impoverished families function as a form of reproductive discipline, penalizing marginalized parents for having children while poor. Thus, this paper advances the central proposition that the fundamental right to reproduce cannot be severed from the substantive right to parent⁹. A legal regime that permits poverty to serve as proxy evidence of parental unfitness violates the core tenets of reproductive justice, converting state economic assistance into a prerequisite for legal parenthood. State intervention in family life is fundamentally anchored in the *parens patriae* power and the legitimate state obligation to safeguard children from actionable abuse, exploitation, physical violence, and severe harm. Child protective agencies fulfill an essential role when a child faces an imminent, demonstrable risk of serious harm that parents are unable or unwilling to mitigate. The integrity of the state's protective function depends on maintaining a clear focus on preventing actual injury to a child's physical or emotional well-being. However, state intervention carries severe unintended consequences when triggered inappropriately. Child protection legal apparatuses frequently operate under the unexamined assumption that

removing a child from an impoverished home represents the safer course. In reality, the act of forced state removal and placement into foster care often inflicts far greater trauma and developmental disruption than the material deprivation it purports to remedy¹⁰.

IV. PARENS PATRIAE, SYSTEMIC TRAUMA, AND PROPORTIONALITY

Forced family separation inflicts profound, irreversible physiological and psychological damage on children. The sudden rupture of primary caregiving relationships triggers a massive surge of stress hormones cortisol that alters the developing architecture of the child's brain, causing permanent neural damage¹¹. Furthermore, separation destroys critical attachment bonds, disrupts schooling, isolates children from siblings and community networks, and strips away cultural identity. Empirical studies reveal that former foster youth suffer from rates of post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD) twice as high as U.S. military veterans. Family preservation backed by concrete state support offers a rights-compatible alternative that protects children without dissolving the family unit¹². Providing low-income families with direct financial assistance, housing subsidies, food support, and accessible childcare directly alleviates poverty-induced stressors, significantly reducing child maltreatment allegations and foster care entries. Concrete economic support addresses the root environmental causes of family distress while preserving the essential emotional security of the home. Distinguishing poverty from neglect does not grant parents immunity from state intervention when real abuse or culpable misconduct occurs. Rather, it requires that child protection adjudications remain strictly harm-focused rather than poverty-focused. When a child faces actual harm or severe non-poverty risks, such as active physical abuse or severe unmanaged incapacitation, the state retains full authority to intervene to guarantee child safety. To uphold family integrity, family separation must strictly observe the principles of proportionality and last resort. State authorities must be legally required to evaluate, document, and exhaust all less restrictive support and preservation alternatives, including emergency financial aid, housing assistance, and family-based supportive services, before seeking court-ordered removal. Separation is legally permissible only when an extreme, imminent risk of harm cannot be mitigated by providing material and social support to the family home.

V. SUBSTANTIVE EQUALITY AND INTERSECTIONALITY

Formal equality mandates that the law treat similarly situated individuals in an identical manner under facially neutral rules. In child protection, statutory definitions of neglect and standards for child removal are typically drafted in formally neutral language, applying uniformly to all parents regardless of income or background. However, formal equality is fundamentally inadequate in child welfare because it operates on an unequal structural playing field. Applying facially neutral suitability or adequate housing requirements without accounting for pre-existing economic disparities produces grossly unequal results, effectively criminalizing poor parents for failing to meet middle-class standards they cannot financially afford. Formally neutral neglect laws exert a severe, disproportionate impact on economically disadvantaged families. Low-income parents are subjected to pervasive institutional surveillance, through public healthcare clinics, welfare offices, and mandatory reporting systems, that middle-class families escape. Consequently, identical parental behaviors or personal struggles (such as depression, temporary housing instability, or leaving a child briefly unsupervised) lead to mandatory reports, court intervention, and child removal for poor parents, while remaining private for affluent parents.

Child welfare adjudications routinely transform structural state failures into individual parental faults. Systemic deficiencies in the social safety net, such as the severe shortage of affordable housing, poverty-level wages, and the absence of subsidized childcare, create environmental hazards that agencies label as individual parental neglect. The state judges poor parents against normative standards while simultaneously withholding the material resources necessary to achieve them. The punitive weight of the child protection system falls heavily at the intersection of socioeconomic deprivation, race, gender, single parenthood, and geographic isolation. Low-income mothers of color and single mothers face heightened surveillance and racial disproportionality in foster care entry. In rural communities, spatial inequality, including extreme carelessness, lack of public transportation, housing shortages, and service deserts, compounds poverty, turning geographic isolation into a proxy for parental unfitness in judicial determinations. Substantive equality requires the legal system to move beyond formal neutrality and actively address the structural conditions producing vulnerability. Under a substantive equality framework, the state cannot use economic or spatial deprivation to justify terminating parental rights. Instead, the state must fulfill its affirmative constitutional duties to eliminate systemic barriers, provide basic social and economic support, and ensure that low-income and marginalized parents enjoy the real, substantive capacity to parent their children in safety and

dignity.

VI. INTERNATIONAL HUMAN RIGHTS FRAMEWORK

A. Universal Instruments (UDHR, ICCPR, ICESCR)

The international legal order recognizes the family as the natural and fundamental group unit of society, entitled to protection by society and the State under Article 16 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR). Furthermore, Article 25 of the UDHR¹³ affirms the right of every individual to an adequate standard of living, including food, clothing, housing, medical care, and necessary social services and guarantees special care and assistance to mother and child. Grounded in inherent human dignity and fundamental equality, the UDHR establishes that material hardship requires affirmative state assistance rather than punitive state dissolution of the family unit.

The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR) codifies binding protection against arbitrary or unlawful interference with family life and privacy under Article 17, while Article 23¹⁴ reiterates the State's duty to protect the family unit. In child protection contexts, coercive state intervention that separates children from their parents solely due to poverty-induced conditions constitutes an arbitrary interference with family integrity. Civil and political liberty guarantees lose meaningful substance when impoverished parents are subjected to state regulation and family disruption for lacking material resources that the state fails to provide.

Under Article 10 of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR), states parties must accord the widest possible protection and assistance to the family, particularly for its establishment and while it is responsible for the care and education of dependent children. Article 11 guarantees the right of everyone to an adequate standard of living, including adequate food, clothing, and housing, while Article 12¹⁵ mandates the highest attainable standard of physical and mental health. The ICESCR establishes that socioeconomic deficits are state development obligations to be fulfilled through progressive realization, rather than parental failures to be penalized through legal separation.

B. The UN Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC)

The UN Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC)¹⁶ establishes a holistic, rights-based framework for child protection. Article 2 prohibits discrimination of any kind, including on the basis of parental status or economic position, while Article 3 mandates that the child's best interests be a primary consideration. Crucially, Article 5 respects parental guidance rights, Article 9 explicitly prohibits separating a child from parents against their will except when

necessary for the best interests of the child, and Article 18 recognizes that parents have primary responsibility for child-rearing while requiring the State to render appropriate assistance to parents in performance of their child-rearing duties. Furthermore, Articles 19 and 27 combine child protection from violence with the state's positive obligation to extend material assistance regarding nutrition, clothing, and housing.

C. Operational Tension and Harmonious Synthesis

An apparent operational tension exists within international human rights law between the protective imperative to safeguard children from harm under Articles 3 and 19 of the CRC and the duty to respect family integrity under Article 9 of the CRC and Article 17 of the ICCPR. Child welfare administrative bodies frequently exploit this tension by prioritizing immediate removal under the guise of child protection, while treating the state's obligation to alleviate socioeconomic deprivation under ICESCR Article 11 and CRC Article 27 as non-enforceable policy goals. A harmonious human-rights synthesis requires reading civil, political, and socioeconomic rights as interdependent and indivisible guarantees. Child protection and family preservation are mutually reinforcing imperatives rather than conflicting objectives. International human rights law dictates that state assistance under Article 18(2) of the CRC must precede state removal under Article 9, ensuring that poverty-induced resource deficits are addressed through material support rather than punitive family dissolution.

VII. JURISDICTIONAL AND CONSTITUTIONAL COMPARISONS

A. India: Constitutional Mandates and Statutory Ambiguities

1) Articles 14, 15, 21, and Directive Principles

Article 14 of the Constitution of India guarantees equality before the law and equal protection of the laws, striking down state actions characterized by class bias or arbitrariness. In the child welfare domain, penalizing low-income parents for poverty-induced conditions while affluent parents face no institutional scrutiny for identical parental difficulties violates Article 14. Subjecting impoverished families to coercive regulation due to economic status establishes an unconstitutional, arbitrary classification. Article 15 prohibits state discrimination on grounds of religion, race, caste, sex, or place of birth, while empowering the state to make special provisions for women and children under Article 15(3). Substantive equality under Article 15 mandates that the state take affirmative measures to eliminate structural barriers facing disadvantaged parents. Using poverty or rural spatiality as grounds for child removal constitutes indirect, disparate-impact discrimination against socioeconomically marginalized families.

Article 21 guarantees the right to life and personal liberty, which the Supreme Court of India has expansively interpreted to encompass human dignity, personal privacy, family autonomy, and reproductive choice. Family integrity is an essential facet of Article 21 dignity. Forcible state separation of children from loving parents due to material deprivation constitutes an unconstitutional violation of both parental and child rights to dignity and family life under Article 21¹⁷.

The Directive Principles of State Policy reinforce the constitutional mandate for family support. Article 39(e) and (f) direct the state to protect children against exploitation and ensure they are given opportunities to develop in a healthy manner and in conditions of freedom and dignity. Articles 41, 42, 45, and 47 require the state to secure public assistance, maternity relief, early childhood care, and adequate nutrition and public health. These principles establish that addressing childhood deprivation is a primary constitutional obligation of the state rather than an individual parental liability.

Indian constitutional jurisprudence has firmly recognized reproductive autonomy, bodily integrity, and family decision-making as intrinsic components of Article 21. However, judicial recognition of reproductive rights has historically focused on pre-birth choice, pregnancy, and contraception. Extending this jurisprudence requires recognizing that the substantive right to parent children post-birth without coercive state interference is an essential requirement of constitutional reproductive autonomy. Indian judicial decisions have increasingly incorporated the best interests of the child standard, affirming children's rights to health, education, development, and protection. However, constitutional jurisprudence also recognizes that a child's best interests are fundamentally tied to maintaining familial bonds and growing up within their biological family whenever safely possible. Forcing children into institutional custody due to parental poverty contradicts their overall constitutional well-being.

2) Juvenile Justice Act 2015/19 Gap Analysis

The Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act, 2015¹⁸ serves as India's primary statutory framework governing child protection. Under Section 2(14), the Act defines a child in need of care and protection to include children who are destitute, homeless, or whose parents are unfit or unable to care for them. Child Welfare Committees (CWCs) hold statutory authority to order institutionalization, foster care, or restoration. While the JJ Act incorporates principles of family-based care and restoration, the broad definition of unable to care creates statutory ambiguity that risks converting material poverty into grounds for institutionalization. A critical gap exists within Indian child protection law: statutory definitions fail to explicitly distinguish material poverty from culpable parental neglect. The JJ Act lacks an express poverty defense

or a mandatory requirement that state assistance be exhausted before CWCs can order child removal. Consequently, social welfare deficits are routinely mischaracterized as parental unfitness, creating an urgent need for legislative and judicial reform.

B. United States: Procedural Protections, CAPTA, and ASFA Timelines In the United States, the right to parent and maintain family integrity is recognized as a fundamental liberty interest protected by the Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment (*Santosky v. Kramer*¹⁹, *Troxel v. Granville*²⁰). State interference with parental rights requires compelling state interest and clear and convincing evidence. However, constitutional protections are frequently undermined in practice when lower state courts evaluate low-income parents against middle-class suitability benchmarks. Federal legislation under the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act (CAPTA) mandates state reporting and investigation systems for child abuse and neglect. However, CAPTA medicalized child welfare by framing neglect as individual parental pathology while decoupling anti-poverty financial support from child protection funding. Neglect definitions across U.S. state statutes remain extraordinarily vague, allowing caseworkers to classify housing instability, food insecurity, and lack of childcare as actionable neglect.

C. United Kingdom: The Children Act 1989 and Significant Harm Threshold

In the United Kingdom, child protection law is anchored in the Children Act 1989, which establishes the principle of parental responsibility and affirms that children are generally best brought up within their birth families. Section 1 of the Act mandates that the child's welfare shall be the court's paramount consideration, while establishing the no order principle, which dictates that a court should not make an order unless doing so is better for the child than making no order at all. Under Section 31 of the Children Act 1989, a court may only make a care or supervision order if it is satisfied that the child is suffering, or is likely to suffer, significant harm, and that the harm is attributable to the care given to the child, or likely to be given, not being what it would be reasonable to expect a parent to give. This statutory standard establishes a threshold that requires demonstrable harm tied directly to parental care rather than environmental circumstances alone.

D. Canada: Indigenous Disproportionality and Structural Reform

In Canada, child welfare is regulated primarily at the provincial and territorial level, guided by the best interests of the child standard alongside constitutional principles under the Canadian

Charter of Rights and Freedoms. Section 7 of the Charter guarantees the right to life, liberty, and security of the person, which Canadian courts have applied to protect family integrity against arbitrary state disruption. Canada's child welfare system exhibits extreme structural discrimination against Indigenous families, resulting in the massive over-representation of First Nations, Inuit, and Métis children in out-of-home care, a crisis directly linked to the legacy of residential schools and systemic underfunding. The Canadian Human Rights Tribunal (CHRT) explicitly ruled that the Canadian government's discriminatory underfunding of child and family services on reserves incentivized child removal over family support. Canadian child protection practice has historically conflated poverty, substandard housing, and community isolation with parental neglect. Provincial child welfare statutes have allowed caseworkers to treat poverty-induced living conditions as risk factors justifying child apprehension, disproportionately impacting low-income, single-mother, and Indigenous households.

E. South Africa: Justiciable Socioeconomic Rights as a Transformative Model

The Constitution of the Republic of South Africa, 1996 provides one of the world's most progressive constitutional frameworks for child rights. Section 28(1)(b) guarantees every child the right to family care or parental care, or to appropriate alternative care when removed from the family environment, while Section 28(2) establishes that a child's best interests are of paramount importance in every matter concerning the child. Unlike traditional constitutional models, the South African Constitution enshrines fully justiciable socioeconomic rights. Section 26 guarantees the right of access to adequate housing, Section 27 guarantees access to healthcare, food, water, and social security, and Section 28(1)(c)²¹ guarantees children basic nutrition, shelter, basic health care services, and social services. The Children's Act 38 of 2005 operationalizes Section 28 of the South African Constitution, establishing a comprehensive statutory model that prioritizes prevention, early intervention, and community-based family support services. Under the Act, a child in need of care and protection is defined with a focus on actual abuse, abandonment, or severe harm, explicitly separating poverty from parental unfitness.

South African constitutional jurisprudence establishes that the state cannot cite poverty-induced lack of shelter or food as a justification for terminating parental rights or placing children in alternative care. Instead, the state must fulfill its primary obligation under Sections 27 and 28 to provide social assistance such as the Child Support Grant and emergency housing assistance, to enable parents to care for their children. South Africa offers a transformative model where state socioeconomic obligations serve as a constitutional prerequisite to family separation.

IX. ANALYSIS: THE POVERTY-PARENTAL UNFITNESS NEXUS

The Poverty–Parental Unfitness Nexus is the administrative pipeline that systematically converts structural economic hardship into individual parental fault. It begins when material poverty creates acute deficits in housing, nutrition, and childcare, triggering pervasive institutional surveillance from welfare agencies and mandatory reporters. Under this heightened scrutiny, caseworkers and courts misinterpret environment-driven hardship as behavioral neglect, framing legal proceedings around alleged parental pathology while deliberately ignoring the structural state failures that caused the deprivation. A rigorous legal framework must distinguish culpable parental misconduct from systemic infrastructure deficits such as food deserts, spatial isolation, and absent social safety nets, because penalizing parents for state developmental failures represents an unconstitutional inversion of legal responsibility. Compounded by race, caste, single parenthood, and geography, socioeconomic status functions as an improper proxy for unfitness, weaponizing poverty as a *de facto* enhancement of parental culpability. Ultimately, this nexus severely infringes upon reproductive freedom by reducing legal parenthood to a privilege reserved for the wealthy, while inflicting catastrophic, long-term developmental trauma and PTSD on children through forced separations that cause far greater harm than the material poverty state interventions purport to remedy.

X. PROPOSED REFORMS AND LEGISLATIVE SAFEGUARDS

To align child protection with human rights principles, the state's legal responsibility must shift from a purely negative obligation of non-interference to an affirmative, positive obligation of family support. The state's *parens patriae* authority must be deployed as a protective shield to strengthen vulnerable families through social assistance, rather than as a coercive sword to dismember them.

A. Positive State Duties and Redefining Reasonable Efforts

State assistance must be a mandatory prerequisite to any coercive state intervention. Before questioning parental fitness or initiating removal proceedings, state agencies must fulfill their positive duties by providing accessible, concrete material supports including housing vouchers, food assistance (SNAP), childcare subsidies, medical care, and direct cash transfers. Social science demonstrates that providing concrete economic support directly reduces CPS involvement, child maltreatment reports, and foster care entries. The legal doctrine of reasonable efforts must be substantively redefined to mandate economic and material

assistance. Currently, agencies satisfy reasonable efforts by imposing onerous, multi-step service plans while withholding the material resources necessary to complete them. Under a rights-based framework, reasonable efforts must legally require state agencies to provide direct financial and material assistance equivalent to what the state would otherwise spend to maintain the child in foster care.

B. Procedural and Statutory Safeguards

Family courts must enforce institutional accountability by placing the burden of proof squarely on state agencies^[14]. Before a court can entertain an application for child removal or court-ordered supervision, the petitioning agency must formally document that it has identified the family's specific socioeconomic needs, offered accessible material supports, and exhausted all less restrictive family-preserving alternatives. Systemic accountability requires establishing robust statutory and procedural safeguards for families. States must pass legislation such as Family Miranda mandates requiring CPS investigators to inform parents of their constitutional rights at the outset of an investigation. Furthermore, states must eliminate anonymous hotline reporting to prevent malicious or biased reports, restrict invasive middle-of-the-night home entries, and ensure that public defense providers are fully funded to vigorously defend family integrity.

C. Proportionality Test, Harm Realities, and Kinship Placement

State-ordered family separation must be governed by the strict constitutional standard of proportionality. Grounded in human rights jurisprudence, any proposed separation must satisfy a four-part test: (1) it must pursue a legitimate aim (protecting a child from serious harm); (2) it must be suitable to achieve that aim; (3) it must be strictly necessary, meaning no less restrictive measure exists; and (4) it must be proportionate in the narrow sense, ensuring that the severe trauma of separation does not outweigh the risk of remaining at home.

Family separation is legally impermissible if less restrictive supportive measures can protect child safety. Providing in-home homemaking assistance, emergency rental subsidies, food aid, voluntary day care, or mental health support within the home routinely eliminates safety concerns without dissolving the family unit.

Child welfare determinations must be strictly grounded in evidence of actual, demonstrable, and imminent harm to a child's physical or emotional health. Courts must firmly reject class-biased speculative assumptions regarding low-income living conditions and eliminate the judicial practice of ordering removals under the discarded safer course doctrine. Hard evidence

from the COVID-19 pandemic confirms that when removal rates plummeted by over 50%, child safety metrics remained completely stable, proving that high removal rates are entirely unnecessary for child protection. In rare cases where temporary removal is genuinely necessary to prevent imminent physical injury, placement with fit and willing extended family members (kinship care) must be legally prioritized over non-kin foster care. When temporary state custody occurs, state authorities must actively facilitate, rather than obstruct, family restoration. States must end counterproductive practices that exacerbate poverty during foster care such as terminating TANF welfare benefits, cancelling housing vouchers, seizing child Social Security benefits, or billing poor parents for foster care costs. Furthermore, rigid federal timelines under the Adoption and Safe Families Act (ASFA) which mandate termination of parental rights if a child is in care for 15 or 22 months must be reformed so that poor parents are not permanently stripped of their children due to structural housing and economic delays beyond their control.

XIII. THE POVERTY-SENSITIVE PARENTAL FITNESS TEST

A. Operational Framework

To operationalize substantive equality and reproductive justice within child welfare proceedings, this paper formulates a signature legal contribution: the Poverty-Sensitive Parental Fitness Test. Designed as a mandatory, multi-step judicial framework, this test replaces vague, class-biased "suitability" standards with an objective, rights-affirming standard that family court judges and administrative bodies must execute before any order of child removal or finding of parental unfitness can be lawfully issued.

B. The 8-Prong Judicial

Before a state authority can legitimately remove a child or find a parent legally unfit based on conditions associated with economic hardship, the petitioning agency must prove, and the presiding judge must explicitly find on the record, compliance with the following eight sequential inquiries:

- **Actual Harm vs. Speculative Risk:** Prove demonstrable, imminent physical harm beyond subjective assumptions.
- **Causation & Attribution:** Attribute safety risks to culpable misconduct rather than systemic poverty.
- **Structural Deprivation:** Identify the specific material deficiency (e.g., housing, food,

childcare).

- Positive State Support: Provide direct, unconditional financial and material assistance to fix the deficit.
- Family Preservation: Attempt and exhaust all less restrictive in-home services.
- Necessity & Proportionality: Prove removal is strictly necessary to prevent danger that in-home aid cannot fix.
- Net Trauma Assessment: Weigh removal trauma against the risk of remaining home to prevent greater harm.
- Proxy Audit: Ensure class, race, caste, or geographic isolation were not improper proxies for unfitness.

XII. SCHOLARLY CONTRIBUTIONS AND CONCLUSION

This paper bridges three historically isolated legal disciplines Reproductive Justice, Child Protection, and Substantive Equality into a unified rights-based framework that exposes how legal systems weaponize structural poverty to dismantle vulnerable families. By expanding reproductive justice beyond pre-birth autonomy into post-birth family regulation, it establishes that the right to reproduce is legally hollow if state apparatuses use economic deprivation to dissolve low-income homes post-birth. Through a comparative analysis spanning India, the United States, the United Kingdom, Canada, and South Africa, this study demonstrates that equating resource deficits with parental neglect is a pervasive global phenomenon. To dismantle this Poverty–Parental Unfitness Nexus, the paper introduces a concrete, operational legal standard, the Poverty-Sensitive Parental Fitness Test, requiring state agencies to exhaust positive material support as a mandatory prerequisite to family separation. Answering its core inquiry, the paper concludes that material poverty reflects structural state failure, not behavioral unfitness; wealth does not equal parenting competence, nor does poverty constitute bad parenting. Because forced removal inflicts severe, long-lasting developmental trauma on children, protecting child safety and preserving family integrity are mutually reinforcing imperatives best achieved through state assistance rather than coercive regulation. Ultimately, this paper calls for a rights-based transformation of global child protection law, ensuring that no parent is deemed unfit simply for being poor and that every child enjoys the fundamental right to grow up safely within their biological family.

- ¹ Authors, final year students of University College of Law, Osmania University, Hyderabad, Telangana.
- ² Josh Gupta-Kagan, *Distinguishing Family Poverty from Child Neglect*, 109 Iowa L. Rev. 1541 (2024).
- ³ Janet L. Wallace & Lisa R. Pruitt, *Judging Parents, Judging Place: Poverty, Rurality, and Termination of Parental Rights*, 77 Mo. L. Rev. 95 (2012).
- ⁴ Melissa Friedman & Daniella Rohr, *Reducing Family Separations in New York City: The COVID-19 Experiment and a Call for Change*, 123 Colum. L. Rev. Forum 251 (2023).
- ⁵ Dorothy Roberts, *Shattered Bonds: The Color of Child Welfare* (2002).
- ⁶ Andrea Elliott, *Invisible Child: Poverty, Survival & Hope in an American City* (2021).
- ⁷ Dorothy Roberts, *Torn Apart: How the Child Welfare System Destroys Black Families and How Abolition Can Build a Safer World* (2022).
- ⁸ Leroy H. Pelton, *For Reasons of Poverty: A Critical Analysis of the Public Child Welfare System in the United States* (1989).
- ⁹ Maxine Eichner, *The Free-Market Family: How the Market Crushed the American Family and How to Fix It* (2020).
- ¹⁰ Michele Estrin Gilman, *The Poverty Defense*, 47 U. Rich. L. Rev. 495 (2013).
- ¹¹ Anna Arons, *An Unintended Abolition: Family Regulation During the COVID-19 Crisis*, 12 Colum. J. Race & L. Forum 1 (2022).
- ¹² Lisa R. Pruitt, *Spatial Inequality as Constitutional Infirmity: Equal Protection, Child Poverty and Place*, 71 Mont. L. Rev. 1 (2010).
- ¹³ Universal Declaration of Human Rights, G.A. Res. 217 (III) A, U.N. Doc. A/810, arts. 16, 25 (Dec. 10, 1948).
- ¹⁴ International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, Dec. 16, 1966, 999 U.N.T.S. 171, arts. 17, 23.
- ¹⁵ International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, Dec. 16, 1966, 993 U.N.T.S. 3, arts. 10, 11, 12.
- ¹⁶ Convention on the Rights of the Child, Nov. 20, 1989, 1577 U.N.T.S. 3, arts. 2, 3, 5, 9, 18, 19, 27.
- ¹⁷ India Const. arts. 14, 15, 21, 39(e)–(f), 41, 47.
- ¹⁸ The Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act, 2015, No. 2 of 2016, § 2(14) (India).
- ¹⁹ *Santosky v. Kramer*, 455 U.S. 745 (1982) (establishing clear and convincing evidence standard for termination of parental rights and warning against cultural/class bias).
- ²⁰ *Troxel v. Granville*, 530 U.S. 57 (2000) (affirming presumption that fit parents act in the best interests of their children).
- ²¹ *Government of the Republic of South Africa v. Grootboom* 2001 (1) SA 46 (CC) (establishing state's positive constitutional obligations regarding shelter and child welfare under Sections 26 and 28).