

Web Portal for Registering Live-in Relationships | Rajasthan | 30 Jan 2025

Why in News?

The **Rajasthan High Court** has directed the **state government** to launch a **web portal** for **registering live-in relationships.**

Key Points

- Reason for the Order: Several live-in couples face threats from family and society, leading them to file petitions under <u>Article 226</u> seeking protection under <u>Article 21.</u>
 - Article 226 provides the High Courts the authority to bring a lawsuit against a government entity if any citizen's rights and freedoms are violated.
 - The High Court has **broad powers** to **issue orders and writs** to any person or authority under Article 226 of the Indian Constitution.
- The court noted that while live-in relationships are not explicitly addressed in Indian law, SC has ruled in several cases such as <u>Khushboo vs Kannaiammal (2010)</u>, <u>Lata Singh vs State of UP (2006)</u> and <u>Indira Sarma vs V.K. Sarma (2013)</u> that such relationships are not criminal and fall under the right to life and personal liberty guaranteed by Article 21.
- Necessity to Regulate: The court highlighted the need to regulate live-in relationships, noting that they lack social approval and may create legal complications, especially for women and children.
- Establishment of Authority: Until a law is enacted, the court ordered the creation of a competent authority in each district to register and address grievances of live-in couples.
 - The government must submit a compliance report by **1st March, 2025,** outlining the steps taken.
- Legal Clarification on Married Persons: The court referred to a larger bench the issue of whether married individuals in live-in relationships, without divorce, can seek protection.
- New Legal Format for Live-in Couples:
 - The court's order also included the preparation of a formal registration format that all couples entering into live-in relationships must complete. The document would require couples to agree to specific terms before entering such relationships. Key provisions in the format would include the following:
 - Child Support: Both partners would be obligated to agree on a "child plan" outlining their respective responsibilities for the <u>education, healthcare</u>, and general upbringing of any children born from the relationship.
 - **Maintenance:** The male partner would be held responsible for financially supporting the non-earning female partner and any children resulting from the relationship, ensuring their economic security.

Landmark Judgments Upholding Constitutional Morality

- Lata Singh vs State of UP (2006):
 - Directed protection for inter-caste and inter-religious couples from harassment and violence.
- S. Khushboo vs Kanniammal & Anr. (2010):
 - Declared sexual relations between **consenting adults outside marriage** as legal and within the right to privacy.

- Naz Foundation vs Government of NCT of Delhi (2009):
 - Decriminalized consensual homosexual acts between adults, declaring <u>Section 377</u> of the Indian Penal Code as a violation of rights.
- Joseph Shine vs Union of India (2018):
 - Decriminalized <u>adultery</u> and declared it a violation of the rights to equality, dignity, privacy, and autonomy.
- Navtej Singh Johar vs Union of India (2018):
 - Affirmed the <u>rights of LGBTQ+</u> individuals to express their sexual orientation and identity with dignity.
- Shafin Jahan vs Asokan K.M. (2018):
 - Upheld the right to marry a person of one's choice regardless of religion or caste, nullifying the annulment of a Hindu-Muslim marriage.
- Shakti Vahini vs Union of India (2018):
 - Condemned honour killings and violence against inter-caste and inter-religious couples, issuing guidelines for prevention and protection.



PDF Refernece URL: https://www.drishtiias.com/statepcs/31-01-2025/rajasthan/print