Jus Corpus Law Journal

Open Access Law Journal – Copyright © 2026 – ISSN 2582-7820

Editor-in-Chief – Prof. (Dr.) Rhishikesh Dave; Publisher – Ayush Pandey

This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-Non-Commercial-Share Alike 4.0 International (CC-BY-NC-SA 4.0) License, which permits unrestricted non-commercial use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium provided the original work is properly cited.

The Right to Education of Disadvantaged Children in India: A Doctrinal Study of Legal Enforcement and Institutional Accountability

E.Bhavitha[a] Dr. Pooja B. Sudharma[b]

[a]KL University, Guntur, India [b]Assistant Professor, KL University, Guntur, India

Received 18 September 2026; *Accepted* 19 October 2026; *Published* 22 October 2026

Education, being a fundamental right of the Constitution of India, has the objective of equality, dignity and social justice. The Right of Children to Free and Compulsory Education Act, 2009 has been enacted to bring the constitutionally guaranteed right to free and compulsory education into the statute. These legal rights may not be fulfilled in terms of access to and completion of elementary education for economically weaker sections and socially disadvantaged groups of children. The problems have drawn stakeholders to discuss issues of implementation of statutory responsibilities and the responsibilities of the institutions mandated to implement the right to education. The present paper explores the legal landscape that regulates the educational rights of disadvantaged children in India, especially in relation to the implementation of the Right of Children to Free and Compulsory Education Act 2009. It examines constitutional frameworks, legal responsibilities, judicial rulings and methods of complaint and monitoring for compliance. Section 12(1)(c) gives special attention to the condition of having a minimum of 25% of the school's entry-level students from eligible children from weaker sections and disadvantaged groups for specified schools. The study is pursued by a doctrinal method using primary legal sources and relevant literature from academics. It suggests that the effectiveness of the right to education is not solely dependent on the recognition of the right in the Constitution, but also on the availability of procedures that are accessible, institutional responsibilities that are well established and enforcement mechanisms that are effective. The paper ends by proposing steps to enhance accountability and access to legal remedies and to promote substantive educational equality.

Keywords: *right to education, social exclusion, institutional accountability, legal enforcement, educational equality.*

INTRODUCTION

Education is the precondition for the exercise of almost every other right. It's the most practical and feasible way to escape intergenerational poverty, particularly for children born into poverty, children of those who are disadvantaged by caste or geographically isolated children. The framers of the Constitution understood this and put it in the unenforceable in court Article 45 of the Constitution, which was a Directive Principle and for which the State had to make an effort to achieve 'within ten years' of the Constitution's commencement. By 1960, it had been almost ten years since that deadline.

This change in the constitutional position took place in two steps: first, in the 1990s, through the judicial mediation of creativity; and second, in 2002, through constitutional amendment. The RTE Act 2009 then made the fundamental rights into a prescriptive list of rights and responsibilities. It is a rights-based, duty-driven Act, which the authors particularly highlight, as it imposes legal duties on the State, local authorities, schools and parents, and specifically targets disadvantaged children.

Despite this legal protection, there is still a lack of awareness, documentation problems, administrative delays and institutional non-compliance that disadvantaged children encounter. This paper analyses the constitutional and statutory provisions on education rights, issues facing implementation and the success of existing judicial and administrative relief in ensuring access to education in an equitable manner.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Despite the inclusion of the right to elementary education in the Indian Constitution, through Article 21A and the Right of Children to Free and Compulsory Education Act 2009, children from disadvantaged groups still face access barriers like poverty, discrimination, documentation problems, weak infrastructure, lack of implementation of statutory provisions, etc. Administrative delays and reimbursement delays are also a challenge in the enforcement of Section 12(1)(c), which ensures entry of at least 25% of students from eligible disadvantaged groups and weaker sections in specified schools at the entry level. The

problem, therefore, lies in the gap between the lack of effective enforcement of the right to education through institutional accountability and/or the availability of remedies.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

In the present research, the method employed is a doctrinal one which will be developed with analysis of the legal sources used such as a primary legal source and secondary legal source. The sources of primary information are the Constitution of India, the Right of Children to Free and Compulsory Education Act, 2009, amendments to the Act and Supreme Court & High Court Judgements. Secondary sources include books, research articles, government publications, committee publications and reports on the rights to education and social inclusion. The study critically examines the legal framework, the responsibilities, and enforcement mechanisms and identifies the gaps in implementation and suggests appropriate legal and institutional changes.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The concept of the right to education in India has been developed through amendments to the Constitution, legislation and interpretations in the courts. Mohini Jain case (1992) and Unni Krishnan case (1993) have laid down that education is a fundamental right to life. The right of free and compulsory education of children in Primary School was introduced through the Constitution by adding Article 21A, and later the RTE Act, 2009 was enacted to make it a reality. In both the cases of Society for Unaided Private Schools of Rajasthan v Union of India (2012) and Pramati Educational & Cultural Trust v Union of India (2014), the Supreme Court gave an interpretation of the ambit of the Act, keeping in mind the Constitution.

Other concerns raised in Government reports and ASER assessments are infrastructure and learning outcomes/implementation. There is a large body of literature available that has analysed the constitutional right to education and the implementation challenges. With this concern, the present study critically examines the implementation of the RTE Act, 2009 and suggests some steps to ensure the effectiveness of the Act and children's education.

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

The aims of this study are:

- To trace the constitutional history of the right to education from Article 45 to Article 21A and to look at the application of the right to disadvantaged children.
- To examine the provisions of the RTE Act 2009 that safeguard disadvantaged children, especially Sections 2(d), 2(e), 3, 12 and 13.
- To explore how the judiciary has understood the right, including as regards private unaided schools and minority schools.
- To assess the conditions/structures of enforcement and accountability, such as local authorities, School Management Committees and the child rights commissions.
- To identify doctrinal and structural gaps within the system that block the effective enforcement of the system.
- To suggest legal and institutional changes that could enhance accountability.

CONSTITUTIONAL EVOLUTION OF THE RIGHT

From Directive Principle to Fundamental Right: The Directive Principle of State Policy has been transformed into a Fundamental Right. Education was originally in Part IV in both Article 45 and Article 41. Under Article 46, the weaker sections of society were given a special duty to advance educational interests, especially for the Scheduled castes and Scheduled Tribes. Initially, the court ruled that the DPs are non-justiciable under Article 37[1].

The turning point was *Mohini Jain v State of Karnataka*[2], in which the Supreme Court ruled that the right to education is inherent in the right to life guaranteed under Article 21 and that the imposition of capitation fees is unconstitutional. In *Unni Krishnan, J.P. v State of Andhra Pradesh*[3], the Court had moderated its reading to make it clear that the right to free education extends to all the citizens of the country till the age of 14, after which the right is subject to the limits of the economic capacity and development of the State. It was the direct judicial predecessor of Article 21A.

The Eighty-Sixth Amendment 2002: The Eighty-Sixth Amendment[4] had three impacts:

[1] 'The Evolution of the Right to Education in India: From Directive to Fundamental Right' (*The Law Institute*, 04 November 2025) <https://thelaw.institute/law-and-vulnerable-groups/evolution-right-to-education-india/> accessed 13 September 2026
[2] *Miss Mohini Jain v State of Karnataka and Ors* (1992) 3 SCC 666
[3] *Unni Krishnan, JP and Ors v State of Andhra Pradesh* (1993) 1 SCC 645
[4] Constitution (Eighty-Sixth Amendment) Act 2002

Article 21A: The State shall ensure that children of the age of six to fourteen years shall have the right to free and compulsory education;

Article 45: Children under the age of six will be entitled to early childhood care and education, which shall be provided in a manner as the State may by law determine; and

Article 51A(k): It shall be the fundamental duty of parents and guardians to provide early childhood care and education to children aged six to fourteen years. Rights are dependent on legislation, so the primary means of enforcement is the RTE Act. It also established a time lag of seven years between the constitutional amendment and the enabling Act, where the right was in principle, but not in practice.

Equality Provisions and Special Measures: The Constitution, by a special provision in Article 15(5), has authorised the State to make special provisions for the admission of the following classes to educational institutions other than minority institutions: socially and educationally backward classes; Scheduled Castes; Scheduled Tribes.[5] The Supreme Court has confirmed the provision in the context of State-funded institutions. In *Ashoka Kumar Thakur v Union of India*[6], Article 21A in conjunction with Article 15(5) gives the constitutional basis to compel the private schools to admit the disadvantaged children. Article 46 also gives a directive of its interpretation that 'The State should promote the educational interests of weaker sections and protect them from social injustice'.

THE STATUTORY FRAMEWORK OF THE RTE ACT 2009

'Disadvantaged' Child – The RTE Act distinguishes two overlapping categories in Section 2.

Child Belonging to a Disadvantaged Group (Section 2(d)): A child from the following categories: (a) A child who is a member of any of the following Scheduled Caste and/or Scheduled Tribe groups; (b) A child from a socially and educationally backward class; (c) A child from any other group with any of the following social, cultural, economic, geographical, linguistic or Gender based disadvantage as may be specified by the appropriate Government by notification. Children with disabilities were added to this category in the 2012 amendment.

[5] Constitution (Ninety-Third Amendment) Act 2005
[6] *Ashoka Kumar Thakur v Union of India and Ors* (2008) 6 SCC 1

Child Belonging to a Weaker Section (Section 2(e)): Child whose parent/guardian's income in a financial year is less than the minimum income prescribed by the appropriate Government. There is an important consequence of the definitional design. The definition of 'disadvantage' is different from state to state, as the residual limb of Section 2(d) is subject to notification by the appropriate Government. Some states notify these groups; others do not, including children of migrant workers, orphans, transgender children, children of sex workers, and children of manual scavengers, who are living with HIV/AIDS. This provides states with discretion, which can be exercised sparingly, and it is the first point at which the right can be diluted.

Section 3: All children aged 6-14 are entitled to free and compulsory elementary education in the neighbourhood school until completion. It is not the duty of any child to pay any fee or charge which may be a barrier to their pursuit and completion of elementary education.

Sections 6 and 8 to 9: Schools to be established under central Rules, within a prescribed distance (under the central Rules, one kilometre in classes I-V and three kilometres in classes VI-VIII) are to be provided free of charge to students, with provision for admission, attendance and completion of schooling, and also instruction, infrastructure, teachers and learning materials under the responsibility of the appropriate Government and local authority.

Section 13: No screening needed or capitation fees when trying to get in.

Sections 16 and 17: relate to the no-detention policy (as amended) and ban corporal and mental abuse.

Section 12(1)(c): The Central Equity provision: A condition to be satisfied under Section 12(1)(c) is that in the entry-level class, at least 25 per cent of the child strength must comprise children belonging to weaker sections and disadvantaged groups and that the education in this class must be free and compulsory till it is completed. The school is reimbursed by the State for the per-child expenditure made by the State under section 12(2) or the actual per-child expenditure made by the school, whichever is less. This measure is the most far-reaching in terms of social integration in the Act and has been the most litigated. It asks three questions of doctrine: May it be applied to the right of private unaided schools to practice an

act under Article 19(1)(g)? May it be applied to Article 30(1) minority institutions? And who is accountable if the reimbursement mechanism breaks down?

Subsequent Amendments: Through the 2012 amendment, the definition of disadvantaged pupils was extended to include pupils with disabilities, and special schooling and home-based education were included as options. Right of Children to Free and Compulsory Education (Amendment) Act 2019 removed absolute bar on detention and made provisions for holding regular exam of the children in classes 5th and 8th in the state and detention if the children failed in the re-examination. The provision applies to disadvantaged children, as grade retention is highly correlated with dropouts among the first-generation learners[7].

JUDICIAL INTERPRETATION AND ENFORCEMENT

The judiciary has been instrumental in ensuring the right to education as enshrined in Article 21A and the Right of Children to Free and Compulsory Education Act, 2009 (RTE Act). Issues such as inadequate infrastructure facilities in schools, shortage of qualified teachers, public interest litigation (PILs) regarding caste discrimination, gender disparity and children's marginalisation have been taken up by courts.

However, there are certain difficulties in enforcing the right to education by the judiciary. Common problems in the effective implementation of judicial directives include lack of funds, inefficiency in administration and poor coordination between the judiciary and the executive branch. In addition, there will be no solution to the issues of structure and system in the education sector, whether at the level of judicial intervention or not, without any intervention in the field of education policy and effective action by the government[8].

In T.M.A. Pai Foundation v State of Karnataka[9], the Supreme Court has given autonomy to the private schools to set up and run educational institutions. Meanwhile, it accepted the state's right to impose reasonable regulations to ensure educational standards and to prevent

[7] Right of Children to Free and Compulsory Education (Amendment) Act 2012
[8] Riddhi Babubhai Patel and Rugvendra Vyas, 'The Role of Judiciary in Enforcing the Right to Education in India' (2023) 11(3) International Journal of Indian Psychology <https://ijip.in/articles/judiciary/> accessed 12 September 2026
[9] *TMA Pai Foundation and Ors v State of Karnataka and Ors* (2002) 8 SCC 481

maladministration and profiteering. The leading authority is Society for Unaided Private Schools of Rajasthan v Union of India[10].

A three-judge bench found the constitutionality of the RTE Act, including the provision of Section 12(1)(c), as a reasonable restriction under Article 19(6). The provision was confirmed once again by the Constitution Bench in Pramati Educational & Cultural Trust v Union of India[11], but excluding minority educational institutions. The cases of the High Courts, particularly the Delhi High Court, have played a significant role in bringing Section 12(1)(c) into practice in the following areas: the admission process, the need for reimbursement and parity in the treatment of children educated under the EWS category and the disadvantaged group category.

In Social Jurist v Government of NCT of Delhi[12], the Delhi High Court considered the duty of schools, which were provided with public land under concessional terms, to admit children from the economically weaker sections of society pursuant to the conditions laid down. This strand of judicial activity illustrates the role that courts have assigned to statutory duties and requirements imposed on the distribution of public benefits for their involvement in improving access to education for children in disadvantaged circumstances.

Dinesh Biwaji Ashtikar v State of Maharashtra:[13] On 13th January 2026, it gave directions to improve the implementation of Section 12(1)(c) with the assistance of a Bench of Justices P.S. Narasimha and A.S. Chandurkar. The case was brought about when the child was refused admission to a local school when there was space available at the local school. The Court noted several hurdles to the implementation, such as digital illiteracy, language barriers, insufficient parent support, and lack of visibility when seats are empty. The Court acknowledged that the provision contributes to good social integration of children and called for increased accountability of the educational authorities.

[10] *Society for Unaided Private Schools of Rajasthan v Union of India and Anr* (2012) 6 SCC 1
[11] *Pramati Educational & Cultural Trust v Union of India and Ors* AIR 2014 SC 2114
[12] *Social Jurist, A Civil Rights Group v Government of NCT of Delhi and Ors* AIRONLINE 2019 DEL 2149
[13] *Dinesh Biwaji Ashtikar v State of Maharashtra & Ors* (2026) INSC 56

Directions for Effective Implementation –

In Lucknow Public School, Eldico v State of Uttar Pradesh[14], the Supreme Court has clearly laid down that the neighbourhood school should provide admission to children eligible for admission under Section 12(1)(c) of the Act. It emphasised the importance of publishing seats before they become available, stating specific reasons for the denial of admission, and making sure that the admission would be reviewed by the educational authorities in time.[15]

Likewise, in Dinesh Biwaji Ashtikar, the Court asked State governments and Union Territories to file an affidavit in response to the Court's statutory requirement. The judicial interventions highlight that recognising the right to education is insufficient without effective implementation and institutional accountability. So, the Supreme Court has turned its attention from simply confirming the constitutionality of the provision to ensuring that the benefits of this provision are available in practice to disadvantaged children.

Institutional Architecture and Accountability –

The RTE Act distributes responsibility across several actors:

Actor	Principal Responsibility
Central Government	Academic authority, model rules, financing support, national monitoring
State Governments	Rule-making, school establishment, reimbursement, notification of disadvantaged groups
Local authorities	Admission, attendance, neighbourhood school mapping, grievance redressal under Section 32

[14] *Lucknow Public School, Eldico v State of Uttar Pradesh* (2026) INSC 422
[15] Advay Vora, 'The implementation mandate of the Right to Education Act' (*Supreme Court Observer*, 22 July 2026) <https://www.scobserver.in/journal/the-implementation-mandate-of-the-right-to-education-act/> accessed 12 September 2026

Schools	Admission under Section 12, compliance with norms, non-discrimination
School Management Committees (Section 21)	Monitoring functioning, preparing school development plans
NCPCR and State Commissions (Sections 31 to 32)	Examine safeguards, inquire into complaints, monitor implementation

Penalties and Sanctions: There are very few penalties in the Act, and these are mostly against private operators: Section 13(2) allows for a fine for charging capitation fees or screening; Section 18(5) allows for a fine for operating an unrecognised school. There is nothing similar when it comes to the penalty for public officials who don't put up schools or infrastructure or who don't compensate private schools. Section 36 also provides for the need for prior authorisation from a government official in order to bring a prosecution. Consequences for schools are asymmetric: sanctions are applied to their obligations, but not to the State's obligations.

Audit and Parliamentary Oversight: The performance audit of the implementation of the Right of Children to Free and Compulsory Education Act by the Comptroller and Auditor General of India (CAG) and the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Human Resource Development has highlighted issues such as lack of effective recruitment and training of teachers, inadequate infrastructure, poor utilisation of resources and lack of tracking of out-of-school children.[16]

Earlier, the Anil Bordia Committee[17](2010) suggested restructuring the Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan to align it with the goals and requirements of the RTE Act. The results show that it is not just about individual administrative failures that are responsible for the problems of

[16] *Report No.23 of 2017 - Compliance audit Union Government Implementation of Right of Children to Free and Compulsory Education Act, 2009* (Comptroller & Auditor Gen. of India 2017)
[17] Anil Bordia Committee, *Report of the Committee on Implementation of the Right of Children to Free and Compulsory Education Act, 2009 & Resultant Revamp of Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan* (Ministry of Human Resource Development 2010)

the right to education, but systemic failures in planning, the allocation of resources and implementation.

GAPS IN ENFORCEMENT

Implementation of Section 12(1)(c): The implementation of the provision of 25 percent reservation for economically weaker sections and disadvantaged groups as per the Right of Children to Free and Compulsory Education Act 2009 is yet another challenge, particularly for the equitable access of children belonging to economically weaker sections and disadvantaged groups. While the provision is clear that these children must be admitted to eligible private unaided schools at the entry level, the amount of reimbursement paid by State governments may not be as much as the actual cost per child of educating such children, causing financial concerns to the schools as well as to the government[18]. Further, lack of timely reimbursement and inadequate budgetary allocations could deter compliance by private institutions.[19]

Infrastructure and Teachers: Sections 19 and 25 and the Schedule set norms for classrooms, toilets, drinking water, pupil-teacher ratios and teacher qualifications[20]. The first three-year period to comply with requirements was to be completed in 2013, and there were substantial gaps in some states.

Children with Disabilities: The Rights of Persons with Disabilities Act, 2016, and the RTE Act made children with disabilities fall under the disadvantaged category and introduced inclusive education and reasonable accommodation. However, the lack of trained special educators, inaccessibility of buildings and lack of individualised support have prevented

[18] Hemlata Singha and Mithilesh Kumar Yadav, 'The Progressive Movement and Challenges in Implementation of RTE Act, 2009' (2023) 4(2) Chanakya Law Review 108 <https://www.cnlu.ac.in/wp-content/uploads/2025/04/The-Progressive-Movement-And-Challenges-In-Implementation-of-RTE-ACT-2009-by-Mrs.-Hemlata-Singh-Dr.-Mithilesh-Kumar-Yadav.pdf> accessed 12 September 2026

[19] Ms Madhu, 'Right to Education in India: Law, Implementation, Challenges and the Way Forward' (2025) 3 Journal of Emerging Trends and Novel Research 260 <https://rjpn.org/jetnr/viewpaperforall.php?paper=JETNR2511026> accessed 12 September 2026

[20] Dimple Kanojiya, 'The Right to Education Act 2009: Challenges in Implementation and Constitutional Right' (*Law Article*, 08 June 2024) <https://lawarticle.in/the-right-to-education-act-2009> accessed 12 September 2026

many of these children from attending schools or from getting individualised support in schools[21].

Documentation Barriers: The RTE Act is not helping marginalised families gain admission because they cannot produce documents, such as income and caste certificates. These administrative hurdles have a disproportionate impact on children in tribal areas and remote regions, thereby preventing eligible children from enrolling in free and compulsory elementary education. Eg: Documentation issues as one of the obstacles for RTE admissions feature in a 2025 survey conducted by the Ministry of Tribal Affairs, which explained that the children eligible for RTE admission in remote areas had difficulties in obtaining income and caste certificates.[22]

Learning Outcomes: Since 2010, enrolment has increased significantly, but independent evaluations carried out by ASER and other assessments have consistently revealed that many children in elementary schools lack basic reading and numeracy skills. The Act includes references to completion of elementary education and to quality, but includes no justiciable standard of learning.

Weak Institutional Oversight and Accountability: The weak monitoring system, weak monitoring of data and lack of coordination between the Central government and the State government are responsible for the poor performance of the RTE Act. Such gaps in accountability and the inability to timely identify and address implementation gaps are contributing to the fact that the project is not implemented in a timely manner.

Socioeconomic Inequalities and Social Discrimination: While there is free education, poverty, child labour and social and cultural inequalities still pose a restriction on children's access to education. In particular, caste discrimination and social exclusion can occur in the

[21] 'Major Gaps in Implementing the RTE Act: Issues and Solutions' (*Socio.Health*, 14 March 2026) <https://socio.health/women-in-economy/gaps-implementing-rte-act-issues-solutions/> accessed 12 September 2026

[22] 'The RTE Act and the Idea of Social Inclusion' (*Insights IAS*, 29 April 2026) <https://www.insightsonindia.com/2026/04/29/the-rte-act-and-the-idea-of-social-inclusion/> accessed 12 September 2026

education of Dalit children, especially in rural areas, contrary to the objectives of equality and inclusion in education[23].

FINDINGS

- The right is very clearly expressed, but not equally effective. The Supreme Court has upheld the most important equity mechanism under Section 12(1)(c) and, together with Article 21A, the right is a justiciable right with specific entitlements.
- The scope of protection is narrowed by exclusions. Pramati excludes minority institutions from the Act; the notion of disadvantage is determined at the State level through notification, and age limits exclude those in the early childhood and secondary education phase.
- Accountability is asymmetrical. Private schools are penalised; public authorities face few or no penalties. The grievance redressal process is still within the administration.
- Enforcement is by litigation. The most successful enforcement has been in the form of High Court orders in public interest cases, which are sporadic, expensive for the poor and have been reached too late to be useful.
- Quality and learning are not enough to be justiciable. The framework ensures access and infrastructure in a more reliable way than learning outcomes or freedom from discrimination.

RECOMMENDATIONS

- Establish an independent grievance redressal authority at the district level having the right to issue binding directions and provide compensation, and the authority has the power to appeal to the State Commission and the High Court.
- Bring in accountability for public bodies, such as departmental accountability for the lack of schools, for timely reimbursement of private schools and for action on complaints, and eliminate the previous sanction bottleneck in Section 36 for serious breaches.

[23] Mahnoor Ali, 'The Right to Education Act in India: Success and Challenges in Implementation' (Broken Chalk) <https://brokenchalk.org/the-right-to-education-act-in-india-success-and-challenges-in-implementation/> accessed 12 September 2026

- Ensure that notification of disadvantaged groups is standardised by ensuring that there is at least a national list in the Rules which states can supplement but not exclude.
- Reform Section 12(1)(c) administration: time-bound reimbursement through direct benefit transfer, simplified self-certification of eligibility, offline and assisted application channels, and an obligation on schools to integrate admitted children academically and socially.[24]
- Address the minority-institution gap, for example by voluntary participation incentives and by ensuring that disadvantaged children within minority communities are served through state-funded schooling.
- Improve the institutional capacity of School Management Committees (SMC) in terms of training, funding, information transparency and involving parents from disadvantaged groups in the committees.[25]
- Include an anti-discrimination and anti-segregation clause in the Act and make sure there is a complaint and sanction system.
- Extend the scope of the Act to early childhood and secondary levels of education, and integrate and formalise foundational learning outcomes as a measurable statutory criteria.[26]

CONCLUSION

The right to education is guaranteed under Article 21 A of the Constitution, and the RTE Act, 2009 is crucial in fostering equality and social justice in India. In spite of this, however, administrative inefficiencies, lack of infrastructure, documentation challenges and weak institutional accountability remain a persistent challenge to its effective implementation, especially on behalf of disadvantaged children.

---

[24] 'Implementation of the Right to Education Act, 2009: Where Do We Stand? Insights from the CSD 2024 Status Report' (*Education for All in India*) <https://educationforallinindia.com/implementation-of-the-right-to-education-act-2009-where-do-we-stand/> accessed 12 September 2026

[25] Ravi Ranjan Kumar Sharma, 'The Right to Education (RTE) Act, 2009 Impact and Implications: Challenges and the Way Forward' (2026) 4 International Journal of Advance Research in Multidisciplinary 245, 245–50 <https://multiresearchjournal.theviews.in/article/1037/the-right-to-education-rte-act-2009-impact-and-implications-challenges-and-the-way-forward> accessed 12 September 2026

[26] Goutam Patra, 'Implications of Right to Education Act, 2009 in Secondary School' (*Banipur BEd College*, 01 January 2021) <https://banipurbedcollege.org/e-learning-goutam-patra/RTE%20final%20hitangshu%20final.pdf> accessed 12 September 2026

The study indicates that there is a wide disjuncture in the application of the law, especially in the areas of institutional accountability. To address these challenges, it is crucial to enhance grievance redressal mechanisms, ensure timely compliance of public authorities, ease entry and strengthen monitoring systems.

The success of the right to education is not only dependent on the recognition of the right but also on effective implementation and the provision of quality elementary education for all children, in a manner that is dignified and equal.