

right to dwell on pavements or in slums by the indig and the same was accepted as a part of right to li enshrined under Article 21; their ejection from t place nearer to their work would be deprivation their right to livelihood. They will be deprived their livelihood if they are evicted from their sh and pavement dwellings. Their eviction tantamounts t deprivation of their life. The right to livelihood i a traditional right to life, the easiest way o depriving a person of his right to life would be t deprive him of his means of livelihood to the point o abrogation. Such deprivation would not only derude the life of its effective content and meaningfulnes but it would make life impossible to live. The deprivation of right to life, therefore, must be consistent with the procedure established by law. In P.G. Gupta v. State of Gujarat [(1995) Supp. 2 SCC 182], another Bench of three Judges had considered the mandate of human right to shelter and read it into Article 19(1)(e) and Article 21 of the Constitution and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the Convention of Civic, Economic and Cultural Rights and had held that it is the duty of the State to construct houses at reasonable cost and make them easily accessible to the poor. The aforesaid principles have