BLOGS

Sarla Mudgal v. Union of India: Landmark Case on Bigamy

Khushi Malviya · 16 Dec 2024

Sarla Mudgal v. Union of India deals with the issue of bigamy while addressing complex issues surrounding religion, personal law, and fundamental rights. Read this post to learn more!

Edit TABLE OF CONTENTS Facts of the Case Issues of the Case Judgement of the Case Aftermath of the Sarla Mudgal Case Significance of UCC Conclusion

Facts of the Case

The issue in this case arose when certain Hindu men converted to Islam solely for the purpose of marrying a second wife without divorcing their first spouse, as polygamy is permitted in Islam. Under the Hindu Marriage Act, 1955, bigamy is illegal, and any Hindu who remarries without divorcing his or her spouse can be prosecuted for bigamy under Section 494 of the Indian Penal Code (IPC).

In the case of Sarla Mudgal v. Union of India, two main petitioners brought forth their grievances. Kalyani, a NGO led by Sarla Mudgal, and Meena Mathur, who discovered that her husband, Jitender Mathur, had converted to Islam and remarried without dissolving their Hindu marriage.

Meena alleged that her husband used the conversion as a means to circumvent legal provisions against bigamy. Another petitioner, Geeta Rani, accused her husband Pradeep Kumar of physical and mental abuse, only to later discover that he had converted to Islam and married another woman.

Similarly, Sushmita Ghosh, married to G. C. Ghosh, found out that her husband had embraced Islam and intended to marry another woman, Vinita Gupta, after seeking a divorce from her.

These cases highlighted the issue of bigamy and conversion to Islam for the purpose of remarrying, leading to a legal challenge invoking Article 44 of the Indian Constitution for a uniform civil code.

Read More:Is Bigamy allowed in India?

Issues Identified in the Case

In the case, three main issues were discussed by the court:

1. Whether a Hindu husband married under Hindu law is allowed to embrace Islam and then conduct a marriage with another woman?
2. Whether the act of a Hindu husband embracing Islam and subsequently marrying another woman constitutes a violation of the principles of equality and non-discrimination enshrined in Article 14 and 15 of the Indian Constitution?
3. Whether the husband can be charged under Section 494 of the Indian Penal Code (IPC) for committing bigamy, considering the circumstances of conversion and remarriage?

Judgement and Analysis of Sarla Mudgal v. UoI

In the Sarla Mudgal judgment, the Supreme Court held that under the, **Hindu Marriage Act 1955,** the first marriage would need to be dissolved for the second marriage of a Hindu husband, solemnized after his conversion to Islam, to be considered legal. Therefore, the second marriage was deemed illegal under **Section 494 of the Indian Penal Code**.

The Supreme Court, in its judgment, held that:

1. A Hindu marriage solemnized under Hindu law could only be dissolved on specific grounds laid out in the Hindu Marriage Act, 1955. Conversion to Islam did not automatically dissolve the marriage.
2. A second marriage contracted after conversion without dissolving the first marriage would be considered bigamous and could be punished under Section 494 of the IPC.
3. A man cannot be allowed to exploit religious conversions to justify polygamy. The Court viewed this practice as a misuse of religious freedom guaranteed under Article 25 of the Constitution.

The Court emphasized that the act of converting to Islam with the intention to remarry, without a proper dissolution of the first marriage, would not protect the individual from prosecution for bigamy.

While the judgment did not issue directives for the implementation of a Uniform Civil Code, Justice Kuldip Singh urged the government to consider **Article 44 of the Constitution**. This case was seen as a significant precedent for the debate on the Uniform Civil Code, addressing conflicts arising from personal laws of different religions.

Justice Kuldip Singh's remark underscored the need for a uniform civil code for all citizens. Additionally, concerns were raised regarding the status and legitimacy of the second wife and children born from such marriages, which the court clarified were not addressed in this specific case but could be raised in future proceedings.

Aftermath of Sarla Mudgal v. Union of India

Lily Thomas v. Union of India (2000)

- In 2000, the Supreme Court revisited the Sarla Mudgal judgment following a review petition filed by Lily Thomas against it. Thomas argued that the decision violated fundamental rights like the freedom of religion (Articles 20, 21, 25, and 26).
- The Court dismissed the petitioner's claims, asserting that Sarla Mudgal's judgment didn't infringe upon the freedom of conscience or religious practice. It emphasized that religious freedom should not impede upon others' rights, as enshrined in Article 25.
- Responding to assertions that holding converts liable for polygamy would contradict Islamic law, the Court highlighted Prophet Mohammad's emphasis on marital purity. It rejected narrow interpretations of Islam, considering it a progressive and respected religion.

Law Commission on Voluntary Legal Declaration of Conversion

- The Law Commission has proposed measures to address loopholes in legislation and strengthen laws on bigamy, including voluntary legal procedures for religious conversion.
- The Commission's 235th report in 2010 recommended a voluntary declaration process for conversions to avoid legal ambiguities, particularly concerning polygamy.
- The procedure entails submitting a declaration within a month of conversion, mentioning original and converted religions, conversion details, and marital status.
- However, critics argue that this voluntary process may not be effective due to its optional nature and outdated offline format. They suggest compulsory declarations and modernized, possibly online, procedures for enhanced efficiency and accessibility.

Significance of Uniform Civil Code

The Ministry of Law and Justice informed the Supreme Court that directing Parliament to frame a Uniform Civil Code (UCC) is beyond the court's jurisdiction, urging the dismissal of PILs seeking UCC implementation.

The PILs aimed for uniformity in personal laws governing marriage, divorce, and adoption. The government emphasized that UCC enactment falls under legislative purview, highlighting **Article 44 of the Constitution**, a Directive Principle advocating for a UCC. Despite past initiatives like the 21st Law Commission's consultation paper on family law reforms, the UCC remains a policy decision for elected representatives.

A Uniform Civil Code (UCC) envisages a single law applicable to all religious communities concerning personal matters like marriage and inheritance. It's enshrined in Article 44 of the Constitution, aligning with the nation's secular democratic principles.

Challenges to its implementation include diverse customary practices among communities and the perception of majoritarianism. However, a UCC promises simplified laws, gender justice, and protection of vulnerable sections. The way forward involves building consensus with social reformers, gradual implementation, and codification of personal laws to uphold constitutional principles.

Conclusion

Sarla Mudgal v. Union of India is a landmark case that highlighted the potential for religious exploitation under personal laws in India. By emphasizing the need for a UCC, the judgment underscored the importance of ensuring justice and equality under a single legal framework that transcends religious boundaries.

Read More: Implementation of UCC in India