



INTERNATIONAL LAW
JOURNAL

**WHITE BLACK
LEGAL LAW
JOURNAL
ISSN: 2581-
8503**

Peer - Reviewed & Refereed Journal

The Law Journal strives to provide a platform for discussion of International as well as National Developments in the Field of Law.

WWW.WHITEBLACKLEGAL.CO.IN



WHITE BLACK
LEGAL.

DISCLAIMER

No part of this publication may be reproduced or copied in any form by any means without prior written permission of Editor-in-chief of White Black Legal

– The Law Journal. The Editorial Team of White Black Legal holds the copyright to all articles contributed to this publication. The views expressed in this publication are purely personal opinions of the authors and do not reflect the views of the Editorial Team of White Black Legal. Though all efforts are made to ensure the accuracy and correctness of the information published, White Black Legal shall not be responsible for any errors caused due to oversight or otherwise.

WHITE BLACK
LEGAL

EDITORIAL **TEAM**

Raju Narayana Swamy (IAS) Indian Administrative Service **officer**



Dr. Raju Narayana Swamy popularly known as Kerala's Anti Corruption Crusader is the All India Topper of the 1991 batch of the IAS and is currently posted as Principal Secretary to the Government of Kerala . He has earned many accolades as he hit against the political-bureaucrat corruption nexus in India. Dr Swamy holds a B.Tech in Computer Science and Engineering from the IIT Madras and a Ph. D. in Cyber Law from Gujarat National Law University . He also has an LLM (Pro) (with specialization in IPR) as well as three PG Diplomas from the National Law University, Delhi- one in Urban Environmental Management and Law, another in Environmental Law and Policy and a third one in Tourism and Environmental Law. He also holds a post-graduate diploma in IPR from the National Law School, Bengaluru

and a professional diploma in Public Procurement from the World Bank.

Dr. R. K. Upadhyay

Dr. R. K. Upadhyay is Registrar, University of Kota (Raj.), Dr Upadhyay obtained LLB , LLM degrees from Banaras Hindu University & Phd from university of Kota.He has succesfully completed UGC sponsored M.R.P for the work in the ares of the various prisoners reforms in the state of the Rajasthan.



Senior Editor

Dr. Neha Mishra



Dr. Neha Mishra is Associate Professor & Associate Dean (Scholarships) in Jindal Global Law School, OP Jindal Global University. She was awarded both her PhD degree and Associate Professor & Associate Dean M.A.; LL.B. (University of Delhi); LL.M.; Ph.D. (NLSIU, Bangalore) LLM from National Law School of India University, Bengaluru; she did her LL.B. from Faculty of Law, Delhi University as well as M.A. and B.A. from Hindu College and DCAC from DU respectively. Neha has been a Visiting Fellow, School of Social Work, Michigan State University, 2016 and invited speaker Panelist at Global Conference, Whitney R. Harris World Law Institute, Washington University in St.Louis, 2015.

Ms. Sumiti Ahuja

Ms. Sumiti Ahuja, Assistant Professor, Faculty of Law, University of Delhi,

Ms. Sumiti Ahuja completed her LL.M. from the Indian Law Institute with specialization in Criminal Law and Corporate Law, and has over nine years of teaching experience. She has done her LL.B. from the Faculty of Law, University of Delhi. She is currently pursuing Ph.D. in the area of Forensics and Law. Prior to joining the teaching profession, she has worked as Research Assistant for projects funded by different agencies of Govt. of India. She has developed various audio-video teaching modules under UGC e-PG Pathshala programme in the area of Criminology, under the aegis of an MHRD Project. Her areas of interest are Criminal Law, Law of Evidence, Interpretation of Statutes, and Clinical Legal Education.



Dr. Navtika Singh Nautiyal

Dr. Navtika Singh Nautiyal presently working as an Assistant Professor in School of law, Forensic Justice and Policy studies at National Forensic Sciences University, Gandhinagar, Gujarat. She has 9 years of Teaching and Research Experience. She has completed her Philosophy of Doctorate in 'Intercountry adoption laws from Uttranchal University, Dehradun' and LLM from Indian Law Institute, New Delhi.



Dr. Rinu Saraswat

Associate Professor at School of Law, Apex University, Jaipur, M.A, LL.M, Ph.D,

Dr. Rinu have 5 yrs of teaching experience in renowned institutions like Jagannath University and Apex University. Participated in more than 20 national and international seminars and conferences and 5 workshops and training programmes.

Dr. Nitesh Saraswat

E.MBA, LL.M, Ph.D, PGDSAPM

Currently working as Assistant Professor at Law Centre II, Faculty of Law, University of Delhi. Dr. Nitesh have 14 years of Teaching, Administrative and research experience in Renowned Institutions like Amity University, Tata Institute of Social Sciences, Jai Narain Vyas University Jodhpur, Jagannath University and Nirma University.

More than 25 Publications in renowned National and International Journals and has authored a Text book on Cr.P.C and Juvenile Delinquency law.



Subhrajit Chanda

BBA. LL.B. (Hons.) (Amity University, Rajasthan); LL. M. (UPES, Dehradun) (Nottingham Trent University, UK); Ph.D. Candidate (G.D. Goenka University)

Subhrajit did his LL.M. in Sports Law, from Nottingham Trent University of United Kingdoms, with international scholarship provided by university; he has also completed another LL.M. in Energy Law from University of Petroleum and Energy Studies, India. He did his B.B.A.LL.B. (Hons.) focussing on International Trade Law.

ABOUT US



WHITE BLACK LEGAL is an open access, peer-reviewed and refereed journal providededicated to express views on topical legal issues, thereby generating a cross current of ideas on emerging matters. This platform shall also ignite the initiative and desire of young law students to contribute in the field of law. The erudite response of legal luminaries shall be solicited to enable readers to explore challenges that lie before law makers, lawyers and the society at large, in the event of the ever changing social, economic and technological scenario.

With this thought, we hereby present to you

CASE COMMENTARY ON SARLA MUDGAL V. UNION OF INDIA (1995)

AUTHORED BY - AKSHAT HEGDE & BALPREET KAUR BHATTI

KES' Shri Jayantilal H. Patel Law College.

I. INTRODUCTION

The landmark judgment in *Sarla Mudgal v. Union of India* (1995) marked a significant development in Indian family law, addressing the conflict between religious conversion and personal law obligations. The Supreme Court examined cases where Hindu men converted to Islam solely to contract second marriages without dissolving their existing Hindu marriages. The Court ruled that such conversions could not nullify matrimonial duties under Hindu law and that a second marriage in these circumstances constitutes bigamy under Section 494 of the Indian Penal Code. This judgment emphasized the sanctity of the first marriage, aiming to protect women from misuse of religious conversion for marital advantage. Additionally, it reignited the call for a Uniform Civil Code under Article 44 of the Constitution to harmonize personal laws and prevent exploitation arising from diverse legal standards across India's communities.¹

II. BACKGROUND

The Sarla Mudgal case involved four writ petitions under Article 32 of the Indian Constitution, addressing issues of bigamy and religious conversion. The first petition, Writ Petition 1079/89, was filed by Sarla Mudgal, president of the NGO KALYANI, and Meena Mathur. Meena was married to Jitender Mathur, who converted to Islam and married another woman, Sunita Narula (alias Fathima), despite their existing Hindu marriage. Meena argued that the conversion was merely a strategy to bypass Section 494 of the Indian Penal Code (IPC), which prohibits bigamy.

In *Writ Petition 347/1990*, Sunita Narula, Jitender's second wife, claimed that Jitender, after

¹ (PDF) case comment: Sarla Mudgal vs. Union of India, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/371606685_CASE_COMMENT_SARLA_MUDGAL_vs_UNION_OF_INDIA (last visited Oct 14, 2024).

their Islamic marriage, reverted to Hinduism under pressure from his first wife, leaving her without legal protection or maintenance under either Hindu or Muslim law.

In *Writ Petition 424/1992*, Geeta Rani stated that her husband, Pradeep Kumar, physically abused her and later converted to Islam to marry another woman, Deepa, which she claimed was solely to facilitate the second marriage.

The final case, *Civil Writ Petition 509/1992*, was filed by Sushmita Ghosh, who sought to prevent her husband, G.C. Ghosh, from marrying Vinita Gupta after he converted to Islam, arguing that their Hindu marriage was still valid.

These cases exposed the misuse of religious conversion to practice polygamy and sparked discussions on the need for a Uniform Civil Code.²

III. ISSUES IN THE SARLA MUDGAL CASE:

1. ***Validity of Second Marriage After Conversion to Islam:*** Whether a Hindu husband, married under Hindu law, can lawfully solemnize a second marriage after converting to Islam without dissolving the first marriage under Hindu law.
2. ***Impact of Conversion on First Wife's Rights:*** Whether the second marriage, conducted after conversion, is valid for the first wife who remains Hindu, and whether her marital rights are affected.
3. ***Bigamy Under Section 494 IPC:*** Whether a Hindu husband who converts to Islam and marries again without dissolving the first marriage is guilty of bigamy under Section 494 of the IPC.
4. ***Protection of Rights Under Personal Laws:*** Whether the second wife, married under Muslim law, is entitled to legal protection and maintenance if the husband reverts to Hinduism.
5. ***Uniform Civil Code:*** Whether the legal challenges in these cases demonstrate the need for a Uniform Civil Code in India to address inconsistencies between personal laws.

² (PDF) case comment: Sarla Mudgal vs. Union of India, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/371606685_CASE_COMMENT_SARLA_MUDGAL_vs_UNION_OF_INDIA (last visited Oct 14, 2024).

IV. KEY CONTENTIONS IN SARLA MUDGAL V. UNION OF INDIA

A. PETITIONERS' CONTENTIONS:

1. ***Circumvention of Legal Obligations:*** The petitioners argued that Hindu men converting to Islam to marry additional wives was a deliberate strategy to evade the provisions of the Hindu Marriage Act, 1955, which prohibits bigamy for Hindus.
2. ***Impact on Women's Rights:*** They contended that such conversions negatively impact the rights of women, particularly first wives, who may find themselves without legal recourse or recognition in the event of a bigamous marriage. This undermines their social status and legal protections.
3. ***Need for Legal Reform:*** The petitioners emphasized the urgent need for legislative reforms to protect women from the consequences of bigamy and ensure that personal laws do not perpetuate gender discrimination.
4. ***Violation of Fundamental Rights:*** They argued that allowing bigamous marriages through conversion violates women's fundamental rights to equality, dignity, and protection under Articles 14, 15, and 21 of the Indian Constitution.³

B. RESPONDENTS' CONTENTIONS:

1. ***Rights Under Shari'ah Law:*** The respondents asserted that Shari'ah law permits a man to have multiple wives, emphasizing that conversion should not be viewed as a tool to evade legal restrictions but rather as an expression of personal and religious freedom.
2. ***Constitutional Right to Freedom of Religion:*** They argued that the right to practice one's religion, as protected by Article 25 of the Indian Constitution, includes the freedom to marry by one's faith, which encompasses the practice of polygamy in Islam.
3. ***Cultural and Religious Autonomy:*** The respondents contended that personal laws are reflective of the cultural and religious identities of communities, and the state should not interfere in individuals' private matters, including their marital choices.
4. ***Legality of Conversion:*** They maintained that a lawful conversion to Islam is legally valid and should be respected, allowing individuals to fully exercise their religious beliefs without interference from the state.

³(PDF) case comment: Sarla Mudgal vs. Union of India, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/371606685_CASE_COMMENT_SARLA_MUDGAL_vs_UNION_OF_INDIA (last visited Oct 14, 2024).

V. IMPACTS OF THE CASE

1. ***Effect on Private Laws:*** The Sarla Mudgal case has positive ramifications for Indian personal laws about marriage, specifically those about Muslims and Hindus. The ruling placed a strong focus on the Uniform Civil Code, which would harmonize marriage laws across religious traditions to address systemic disparities that allow marriage under certain personal laws but prohibit it under others.
2. ***Laws Concerning Hindu Matrimony:*** Since Hindu law traditionally only recognizes monogamy, the ruling strengthens the legal position against bigamy in the eyes of Hindus. The ruling could lead to tighter enforcement of bigamy laws, protecting the rights of women who would otherwise be married off without their knowledge or consent. This is compatible with a larger movement advocating for women's equality and rights in marriage.
3. ***Laws Governing Muslim Marriage:*** However, polygamy is permitted under Muslim personal law—but only under specific restrictions. Nonetheless, the aforementioned custom of polygamous marriages was contested in the historic Sarla Mudgal v. Union of India case, with the contention being that the practice is incompatible with contemporary human rights norms. In essence, it asserts that gender inequality and the exploitation of women would continue if polygamous marriages were permitted since research indicates that these arrangements frequently cause emotional distress and a lower standard of living for wives.
4. ***Social Implication:*** The overall effect on the wider societal aspect of the judgment by the courts in Sarla Mudgal goes beyond the legal framework and fundamentally hits the women's rights scenario regarding protection against bigamy.
5. ***Women's Rights:*** The judgment will likely enhance the rights of women by requiring gender equality in marital relations. Winning a UCC challenges the patriarchal norms that have often positioned women as inferior in both Hindu and Muslim societies. Promoting cultural practices that sanction polygamy has been shown to emboss discrimination based on gender and mental torture upon women.⁴
6. ***Protection Against Bigamy True judgment:*** It leads to strong protection against bigamy. Bigamy is mostly associated with psychological and financial harm against women. Some research has also found that polygamous marriages heighten the rate of

⁴ Case analysis: Sarla Mudgal V/S Union of India, LEGAL SERVICE INDIA - LAW, LAWYERS AND LEGAL RESOURCES, <https://www.legalserviceindia.com/legal/article-9651-case-analysis-sarla-mudgal-v-s-union-of-india.html> (last visited Oct 15, 2024).

poverty and emotional maltreatment, besides low levels of education among children. Through such judicial changes, these reforms will develop conditions in which women's rights are advanced and practised.

7. **Social Change:** This verdict also has sociological implications regarding societal views on marriage and gender identity. While discussing the UCC, there may be a possibility that such discussion might alter the public viewpoint on polygamy and its consequences. Advocates believe that because of these legal changes, more balanced family relationships and improved social welfare benefits can be expected.

It is concluded that the case of Sarla Mudgal affects not only the personal laws regulating marriage but also impacts Indian women's rights and social culture regarding marital practices.

VI. CRITICAL ANALYSIS⁵

1. **Empowerment of Women:** The Sarla Mudgal case is often viewed as a watershed moment in the fight for women's rights in India. By affirming that a Hindu man cannot legally remarry without dissolving his first marriage, the Supreme Court provided a robust legal foundation for women to assert their rights. This empowerment is crucial in a societal context where many women may lack awareness of their legal rights and may feel trapped in oppressive marital situations.
2. **Clarification of Personal Laws:** The judgment clarified the legal implications of bigamy under Hindu law, which was historically ambiguous. By establishing that bigamy is a punishable offence, the ruling aimed to protect the sanctity of marriage and ensure that women are not treated as secondary or disposable in marital relationships.
3. **Promotion of Gender Equality:** The court's emphasis on gender equality aligned with constitutional values, which are foundational to India's legal framework. The ruling argued that personal laws should not infringe on women's rights, thus pushing the narrative for reform in personal laws towards more equitable treatment across communities.
4. **Catalyst for Legal Reform:** The judgment invigorated discussions about the need for a Uniform Civil Code (UCC). Advocates argue that a UCC would provide a secular framework for marriage and divorce that applies equally to all citizens, thereby

⁵ Sarla Mudgal v. Union of India (Air 1995 SS 1531): Bigamy and conversion under Islam in India, International Journal of Law Management & Humanities (2021), <https://ijlmh.com/paper/sarla-mudgal-v-union-of-india-air-1995-ss-1531-bigamy-and-conversion-under-islam-in-india/> (last visited Nov 3, 2024).

reducing inconsistencies and discrimination in personal laws. The case brought this issue to the forefront of legal and political discourse in India.

5. **Social Awareness:** The ruling sparked greater public discourse about personal laws, their implications, and the rights of women. This increased awareness can empower more women to challenge oppressive practices and seek legal remedies. The case became emblematic of the broader movement toward gender justice, encouraging advocacy and reform efforts.
6. **Complexity of Personal Laws:** Critics argue that the ruling may have oversimplified the intricate realities of personal laws, which are deeply intertwined with cultural and religious identities. The application of a uniform framework could inadvertently disregard the diverse beliefs and practices of various communities, potentially alienating those who see their laws as integral to their cultural identity.
7. **Potential Backlash:** The push for a Uniform Civil Code may provoke resistance from conservative factions within different communities. Such backlash can manifest in social and political unrest, as some groups may perceive reforms as a threat to their traditional values and practices. This resistance could hinder the progress toward gender equality and legal reform.
8. **Implementation Challenges:** While the ruling provides a legal framework for protecting women, its practical effectiveness is contingent on enforcement. In many regions, women face significant social stigma when they seek legal redress, making it challenging for them to leverage the protections afforded by the judgment. Additionally, local customs and patriarchal structures may undermine formal legal protections.⁶
9. **Limited Scope:** The case primarily addressed issues related to Hindu and Muslim marriage laws, which means that women from other religious communities or those in interfaith marriages might not benefit directly from the ruling. This limitation raises questions about the inclusivity of the legal discourse surrounding marriage and gender rights.
10. **Judicial Activism Concerns:** Some legal scholars express concerns about judicial overreach, arguing that the judiciary should not intervene in matters of personal law, which they believe should be governed by community norms and practices. This

⁶ Case analysis: Sarla Mudgal V/S Union of India, LEGAL SERVICE INDIA - LAW, LAWYERS AND LEGAL RESOURCES, <https://www.legalserviceindia.com/legal/article-9651-case-analysis-sarla-mudgal-v-s-union-of-india.html> (last visited Oct 15, 2024).

perspective raises fundamental questions about the role of the judiciary in shaping social norms and whether such interventions are warranted or appropriate.

VII. CONCLUSION

The Sarla Mudgal case is regarded as a turning point in the legal and social discourse of India, shedding light on the complex relationships that exist between women's rights, personal laws, and societal norms. In addition to strengthening women's legal defences against the pernicious practice of bigamy, the Supreme Court's decision made clear how urgently personal law reform is needed to bring it into compliance with the Constitution's guarantee of gender equality. This significant ruling promoted a unified legal system that crossed religious boundaries and sparked a wider discussion about the possibility of a Uniform Civil Code.

However, there are some complicated ramifications to the decision. The drive for uniformity in personal laws runs the risk of oversimplifying the complex web of cultural identities and could incite opposition from socially conservative groups. This poses important queries regarding how to strike a balance between the preservation of various cultural traditions and progressive legal reform. Moreover, the practical effectiveness of the decision depends on how it is put into practice since deeply ingrained patriarchal beliefs can seriously obstruct women's access to the legal system.

The Sarla Mudgal case represents a significant moment in India's legal and social landscape, highlighting the tensions between tradition and modernity, individual rights and communal identity. While the judgment has positively impacted women's rights and encouraged discussions about necessary legal reforms, it also underscores the complexities involved in reforming personal laws within a diverse and pluralistic society. Balancing the need for reform with respect for cultural practices and community identity remains a crucial challenge in advancing gender equality in India. The ongoing dialogue about these issues is essential for fostering a legal environment that is both equitable and respectful of India's rich cultural tapestry.

In summary, the Sarla Mudgal case captures the potential for legal progress as well as the difficult obstacles that come with it. It is a powerful reminder that although strong legal protections are essential for defending rights, realizing true gender equality requires a thorough

social revolution that values women's dignity and the complexities of cultural identities. The continuing conversation about these issues will be essential to creating a future in which women's rights are actively promoted and celebrated across India, rather than just being codified in legislation.⁷

Reference: -

(PDF) case comment: Sarla Mudgal vs. Union of India, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/371606685_CASE_COMMENT_SARLA_MUDGAL_vs_UNION_OF_INDIA (last visited Oct 14, 2024).

Case analysis: Sarla Mudgal V/S Union of India, Legal Service India - Law, Lawyers and Legal Resources, <https://www.legalserviceindia.com/legal/article-9651-case-analysis-sarla-mudgal-v-s-union-of-india.html> (last visited Oct 15, 2024).

Case analysis of Sarla Mudgal v. Union of India Air 1951 SCC 635, https://probono-india.in/Indian-Society/Paper/405_Case Analysis on Sarla Mudgal v. Union of India - Shristi Khandelwal.docx (last visited Nov 3, 2024).

Sarla Mudgal v. Union of India (Air 1995 SS 1531): Bigamy and conversion under Islam in India, International Journal of Law Management & Humanities (2021), <https://ijlmh.com/paper/sarla-mudgal-v-union-of-india-air-1995-ss-1531-bigamy-and-conversion-under-islam-in-india/> (last visited Nov 3, 2024).

Case comment: Sarla Mudgal v Union of India, <https://www.juscorpus.com/wp-content/uploads/2022/07/59.-Sumati-Narayan.pdf> (last visited Nov 3, 2024).

⁷ Case analysis: Sarla Mudgal V/S Union of India, Legal Service India - Law, Lawyers and Legal Resources, <https://www.legalserviceindia.com/legal/article-9651-case-analysis-sarla-mudgal-v-s-union-of-india.html> (last visited Oct 15, 2024).