

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL FOR LEGAL RESEARCH AND ANALYSIS



Open Access, Refereed Journal Multi Disciplinary
Peer Reviewed

www.ijlra.com

DISCLAIMER

No part of this publication may be reproduced or copied in any form by any means without prior written permission of Managing Editor of IJLRA. The views expressed in this publication are purely personal opinions of the authors and do not reflect the views of the Editorial Team of IJLRA.

Though every effort has been made to ensure that the information in Volume II Issue 7 is accurate and appropriately cited/referenced, neither the Editorial Board nor IJLRA shall be held liable or responsible in any manner whatsoever for any consequences for any action taken by anyone on the basis of information in the Journal.

Copyright © International Journal for Legal Research & Analysis

EDITORIAL TEAM

EDITORS

Dr. Samrat Datta

Dr. Samrat Datta Seedling School of Law and Governance, Jaipur National University, Jaipur. Dr. Samrat Datta is currently associated with Seedling School of Law and Governance, Jaipur National University, Jaipur. Dr. Datta has completed his graduation i.e., B.A.LL.B. from Law College Dehradun, Hemvati Nandan Bahuguna Garhwal University, Srinagar, Uttarakhand. He is an alumnus of KIIT University, Bhubaneswar where he pursued his post-graduation (LL.M.) in Criminal Law and subsequently completed his Ph.D. in Police Law and Information Technology from the Pacific Academy of Higher Education and Research University, Udaipur in 2020. His area of interest and research is Criminal and Police Law. Dr. Datta has a teaching experience of 7 years in various law schools across North India and has held administrative positions like Academic Coordinator, Centre Superintendent for Examinations, Deputy Controller of Examinations, Member of the Proctorial Board



Dr. Namita Jain

Head & Associate Professor

School of Law, JECRC University, Jaipur Ph.D. (Commercial Law) LL.M., UGC -NET Post Graduation Diploma in Taxation law and Practice, Bachelor of Commerce.



Teaching Experience: 12 years, AWARDS AND RECOGNITION of Dr. Namita Jain are - ICF Global Excellence Award 2020 in the category of educationalist by I Can Foundation, India. India Women Empowerment Award in the category of "Emerging Excellence in Academics by Prime Time & Utkrisht Bharat Foundation, New Delhi. (2020). Conferred in FL Book of Top 21 Record Holders in the category of education by Fashion Lifestyle Magazine, New Delhi. (2020). Certificate of Appreciation for organizing and managing the Professional Development Training Program on IPR in Collaboration with Trade Innovations Services, Jaipur on March 14th, 2019

Mrs.S.Kalpana

Assistant professor of Law

Mrs.S.Kalpana, presently Assistant professor of Law, VelTech Rangarajan Dr.Sagunthala R & D Institute of Science and Technology, Avadi. Formerly Assistant professor of Law, Vels University in the year 2019 to 2020, Worked as Guest Faculty, Chennai Dr.Ambedkar Law College, Pudupakkam. Published one book. Published 8 Articles in various reputed Law Journals. Conducted 1 Moot court competition and participated in nearly 80 National and International seminars and webinars conducted on various subjects of Law. Did ML in Criminal Law and Criminal Justice Administration. 10 paper presentations in various National and International seminars. Attended more than 10 FDP programs. Ph.D. in Law pursuing.



Avinash Kumar



Avinash Kumar has completed his Ph.D. in International Investment Law from the Dept. of Law & Governance, Central University of South Bihar. His research work is on "International Investment Agreement and State's right to regulate Foreign Investment." He qualified UGC-NET and has been selected for the prestigious ICSSR Doctoral Fellowship. He is an alumnus of the Faculty of Law, University of Delhi. Formerly he has been elected as Students Union President of Law Centre-1, University of Delhi. Moreover, he completed his LL.M. from the University of Delhi (2014-16), dissertation on "Cross-border Merger & Acquisition"; LL.B. from the University of Delhi (2011-14), and B.A. (Hons.) from Maharaja Agrasen College, University of Delhi. He has also obtained P.G. Diploma in IPR from the Indian Society of International Law, New Delhi. He has qualified UGC – NET examination and has been awarded ICSSR – Doctoral Fellowship. He has published six-plus articles and presented 9 plus papers in national and international seminars/conferences. He participated in several workshops on research methodology and teaching and learning.

ABOUT US

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL FOR LEGAL RESEARCH & ANALYSIS
ISSN

2582-6433 is an Online Journal is Monthly, Peer Review, Academic Journal, Published online, that seeks to provide an interactive platform for the publication of Short Articles, Long Articles, Book Review, Case Comments, Research Papers, Essay in the field of Law & Multidisciplinary issue. Our aim is to upgrade the level of interaction and discourse about contemporary issues of law. We are eager to become a highly cited academic publication, through quality contributions from students, academics, professionals from the industry, the bar and the bench. INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL FOR LEGAL RESEARCH & ANALYSIS ISSN 2582-6433 welcomes contributions from all legal branches, as long as the work is original, unpublished and is in consonance with the submission guidelines.

LIVE-IN RELATIONSHIPS: A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF THE LEGAL STATUS BEYOND JURISDICTIONS

AUTHORED BY - NIRAJ LOCHAN JHA

Advocate at Patna High Court, Patna, Bihar.

Abstract

The legal status of live-in relationships, defined as cohabitation without formal marriage, varies significantly across the globe, reflecting a complex interplay of cultural, legal, and societal factors. This article conducts a comparative analysis of the legal frameworks governing live-in relationships in five jurisdictions: the United States, India, Sweden, France, and Japan. It examines how statutory laws, judicial precedents, and societal attitudes influence the recognition and rights of cohabiting partners. Progressive nations like Sweden and France offer comprehensive legal protections, while countries such as India and Japan struggle with societal stigmas and limited legal recognition. The study highlights common themes such as gender equality, child welfare, and implementation challenges, alongside divergences rooted in cultural norms and legal traditions. By analyzing case laws, statutory provisions, and Law Commission recommendations, the article underscores the need for harmonized legal frameworks that reflect contemporary relationship dynamics. The research concludes by offering actionable recommendations, including public awareness campaigns, gender-sensitive reforms, and international collaboration to address transnational legal conflicts. These insights aim to bridge the gap between evolving societal values and traditional legal systems, fostering inclusivity and equity in family law globally.

Keywords: *Live-in relationships, cohabitation, comparative law, legal recognition, Comparative Study.*

Introduction

Live-in relationships, also referred to as cohabitation, are increasingly prevalent in contemporary societies worldwide. These arrangements offer partners the flexibility to live together without the formalities or obligations of marriage. However, the legal recognition and protection afforded to such relationships vary significantly across jurisdictions. This article undertakes a comparative study of the legal status of live-in relationships in different countries,

examining the interplay between law, culture, and societal attitudes.

The rise in cohabitation reflects broader societal shifts, including changing views on marriage, gender roles, and individual freedom. Despite these changes, legal systems often lag, leading to disparities in the rights and obligations of cohabiting partners. This research explores these disparities, focusing on five jurisdictions: the United States, India, Sweden, France, and Japan. These countries represent a spectrum of legal and cultural attitudes, providing a comprehensive understanding of how live-in relationships are regulated and perceived globally.

Legal Frameworks Across Jurisdictions

United States

In the United States, the regulation of live-in relationships varies by state. Historically, cohabitation was stigmatized and even criminalized under anti-cohabitation laws. However, societal attitudes have evolved, and most states now recognize the rights of cohabiting partners through common-law marriage doctrines or domestic partnership statutes.

Case Law and Statutes:

- In *Marvin v. Marvin* (1976), the California Supreme Court recognized that non-marital cohabitation agreements could be enforceable, marking a shift toward protecting cohabiting partners' rights.
- Common-law marriage, recognized in states like Texas and Colorado, allows partners to attain marriage-like rights if specific conditions are met, such as cohabitation and public representation as a married couple.
- Domestic partnership laws in states like California provide limited rights related to inheritance, healthcare, and property division.

However, the lack of a uniform federal framework leads to inconsistencies. The Law Commission of the United States has recommended that states adopt more standardized cohabitation agreements to address these disparities.

India

In India, live-in relationships present a unique interplay between progressive judicial interpretations and deeply entrenched cultural norms. Marriage is traditionally regarded as the cornerstone of Indian family life, governed by religious customs and personal laws. However, the judiciary has played a pivotal role in carving out rights for cohabiting partners, albeit within

a limited framework.

Judicial Developments:

- In *Lata Singh v. State of Uttar Pradesh* (2006), the Supreme Court upheld the right of individuals to live together without being married, emphasizing personal liberty under Article 21 of the Indian Constitution.
- The landmark case of *Indra Sarma v. V.K.V. Sarma* (2013) provided a nuanced understanding of live-in relationships, categorizing them into "relationships in the nature of marriage." The court held that such relationships, if fulfilling criteria like duration and exclusivity, could be recognized under the Protection of Women from Domestic Violence Act, 2005.
- In *D. Velusamy v. D. Patchaiammal* (2010), the Supreme Court further clarified that live-in-relationships meeting the "marriage-like" threshold were entitled to legal protections, including maintenance rights for women.

Statutory Provisions:

While no explicit legislation governs live-in relationships, several laws indirectly address the rights of cohabiting partners. The Domestic Violence Act, 2005, extends protection to women in "relationships in the nature of marriage," offering remedies against abuse and neglect. However, gaps remain in areas like property rights, inheritance, and child custody.

Law Commission Recommendations:

The 172nd Law Commission Report (2000) recommended amendments to family law statutes to address the realities of live-in relationships. It proposed extending maintenance rights and legal protections to women and children born out of such unions. However, these recommendations have yet to be implemented comprehensively, leaving cohabiting partners in a legal gray area.

Challenges and Societal Attitudes:

Despite judicial recognition, live-in relationships face significant societal resistance in India. Cultural and religious norms stigmatize non-marital cohabitation, often subjecting couples to ostracism and harassment. Women in such relationships remain particularly vulnerable, with limited access to financial security and social acceptance.

To bridge the gap between progressive judicial pronouncements and societal attitudes, comprehensive legislative reforms are essential. Statutes must explicitly recognize live-in relationships, ensuring legal clarity in areas like property division, child custody, and inheritance. Public awareness campaigns can help challenge societal stigmas, fostering a more inclusive environment for diverse family structures. By aligning legal frameworks with contemporary realities, India can safeguard the rights of individuals in live-in relationships while respecting cultural sensitivities.

Sweden

Sweden is among the most progressive countries regarding the legal recognition of live-in relationships. Cohabitation is widely accepted, and cohabitants enjoy extensive legal protections under the Cohabitation Act, 2003.

Legal Provisions:

- The Cohabitation Act provides a framework for property division, ensuring that cohabiting partners share assets equitably upon separation.
- Swedish law ensures that children born to cohabiting couples have the same rights as those born to married parents, including inheritance and parental support.

The legal framework reflects Sweden's commitment to gender equality and individual autonomy. The Swedish Law Commission has suggested further refinements to address emerging issues, such as international cohabitation agreements.

France

France has pioneered the legal recognition of live-in relationships through the Civil Solidarity Pact (PACS) introduced in 1999. PACS allows couples to formalize their relationship without marrying, offering legal protections in areas like taxation and property ownership.

Key Features:

- PACS provides a contractual alternative to marriage, granting cohabitants rights related to social security, inheritance, and joint property ownership.
- While PACS rights are less extensive than those of marriage, they represent a significant step toward recognizing diverse family structures.

Critics argue that the disparity between PACS and marriage perpetuates inequality. The French Law Commission has proposed expanding PACS rights to bridge this gap, particularly in areas

like child custody and spousal support.

Japan

In Japan, live-in relationships lack formal legal recognition, reflecting the country's conservative cultural values. Marriage remains the primary institution for family formation, and cohabiting couples have limited legal rights.

Challenges:

- Cohabiting partners do not automatically inherit property or access social security benefits.
- The absence of legal recognition leaves partners vulnerable in cases of separation or the death of a partner.

Despite these challenges, younger generations are increasingly opting for cohabitation. The Japanese Law Commission has recommended introducing basic legal protections for cohabiting partners, focusing on property rights and child welfare.

Comparative Analysis

The comparative study reveals significant disparities in the legal treatment of live-in relationships across jurisdictions. Countries like Sweden and France have adopted progressive frameworks, while nations such as India and Japan struggle to reconcile traditional values with modern realities.

Common Themes and Divergences

- 1. Legal Recognition:** Legal recognition of live-in relationships varies significantly. Sweden provides comprehensive legal frameworks that equate cohabitation to marriage in many aspects, while Japan offers minimal recognition, reflecting its cultural conservatism. France's PACS offers a middle ground, granting legal protections without the full status of marriage. In the United States, recognition depends on state-specific statutes, creating inconsistencies. India's judicial approach acknowledges live-in relationships but lacks a robust statutory framework. These variations underscore the influence of cultural and societal norms on legal systems, necessitating tailored reforms to address the unique contexts of each jurisdiction.

- 2. Cultural Attitudes:** Cultural attitudes toward live-in relationships deeply influence legal frameworks. In progressive societies like Sweden, cohabitation is widely accepted and supported by law. Conversely, countries like India and Japan grapple with conservative norms that stigmatize non-marital unions. France demonstrates a shift toward accepting diverse family structures, while the United States reflects a patchwork of societal attitudes. Understanding these cultural contexts is crucial for designing effective legal policies. Public awareness campaigns and societal dialogues can help bridge the gap between traditional values and contemporary realities, fostering greater acceptance and inclusivity.
- 3. Gender Equality:** Legal frameworks for live-in relationships often reflect societal commitments to gender equality. Sweden exemplifies this with laws ensuring equitable treatment in property division and parental responsibilities. In contrast, women in countries like India and Japan face vulnerabilities due to the absence of comprehensive legal protections. France's PACS includes provisions that address some gendered disparities, while the United States offers varying degrees of protection depending on state laws. Strengthening gender-sensitive policies globally can mitigate these inequalities, ensuring that women in live-in relationships have access to financial security, legal remedies, and equal opportunities.
- 4. Child Welfare:** The welfare of children born to cohabiting couples varies across jurisdictions. Sweden prioritizes children's rights, ensuring equal treatment regardless of parental marital status. France extends similar protections through PACS, while the United States depends on state-specific laws. In India and Japan, children often face challenges related to legitimacy, inheritance, and parental responsibility. Legal reforms must emphasize the best interests of the child, providing clear frameworks for custody, support, and inheritance. Addressing societal stigmas and ensuring equal rights for all children can promote a more inclusive and supportive environment.
- 5. Implementation Gaps:** Effective implementation of legal provisions remains a challenge. In Sweden and France, robust systems ensure that cohabitation laws are enforced consistently. However, in countries like India and Japan, societal resistance and administrative inefficiencies hinder the realization of legal protections. The United States faces implementation challenges due to its fragmented legal landscape. Strengthening institutional mechanisms, training legal professionals, and promoting public awareness are essential for bridging these gaps. Collaborative efforts between governments, civil society, and international organizations can enhance the

effectiveness of legal frameworks, ensuring equitable treatment for cohabiting partners globally.

Challenges and Recommendations

- 1. Harmonizing Legal Frameworks:** The absence of uniform legal standards for live-in relationships across jurisdictions creates confusion and inequities, especially in transnational cases. Countries should adopt standardized cohabitation agreements that ensure basic rights for cohabiting partners, such as property sharing, inheritance, and access to social benefits. These agreements can help mitigate legal uncertainties and provide a foundation for equitable treatment. International conventions or regional agreements could serve as platforms for establishing minimum standards while allowing for cultural and societal specificities.
- 2. Public Awareness:** Societal stigma against live-in relationships remains a significant barrier in many countries, limiting the acceptance and protection of cohabiting partners. Public awareness campaigns are essential for fostering a supportive environment. These initiatives should highlight the legal rights of cohabitants, address misconceptions, and promote the understanding of diverse family structures. Media, educational institutions, and community organizations can play pivotal roles in shaping positive societal attitudes, ultimately influencing policy and legal reforms.
- 3. Gender Equality:** Women in live-in relationships often face vulnerabilities related to financial dependency, property rights, and domestic violence. Legal reforms must prioritize gender equality to address these issues. Governments should ensure that cohabiting women have access to legal remedies and protections equivalent to those available in marriage. This includes enforceable agreements on property division, maintenance, and protection from abuse. Strengthening gender-sensitive laws can contribute to the broader goal of achieving equality in domestic partnerships.
- 4. Child Welfare:** Children born to cohabiting couples often face legal and societal challenges, including questions of legitimacy, inheritance, and parental responsibility. Laws must prioritize the welfare of these children, ensuring their access to equal rights and opportunities. Measures such as automatic recognition of parental rights, equitable inheritance laws, and access to social benefits can mitigate these challenges. Governments must also address the psychological and social impacts on children, promoting policies that safeguard their well-being and security.

- 5. Adaptation to Change:** The dynamic nature of relationships necessitates periodic reviews and updates of legal frameworks. Legislators must anticipate emerging trends, such as international cohabitation and non-traditional family structures, to ensure that laws remain relevant. Engaging in dialogue with stakeholders, including legal experts, social scientists, and civil society, can provide valuable insights into evolving societal needs. Adaptive legal systems can bridge the gap between tradition and modernity, fostering inclusive and equitable societies.

Conclusion

The legal status of live-in relationships is shaped by cultural, legal, and societal factors. This comparative study highlights the progress and challenges in various jurisdictions. By harmonizing legal frameworks and addressing societal attitudes, nations can ensure that live-in relationships are recognized and protected, reflecting the realities of modern family life.

The findings underscore the importance of a multi-faceted approach to reform. Cultural sensitivities must be balanced with progressive legal provisions to ensure inclusivity. For instance, countries like Sweden and France demonstrate the potential of robust legal frameworks to safeguard cohabiting partners' rights without undermining societal values. Meanwhile, nations like India and Japan highlight the challenges of navigating traditional norms while accommodating contemporary relationship dynamics.

Furthermore, the study reveals that legal recognition alone is insufficient. Effective implementation, public awareness, and societal acceptance are equally crucial for fostering a supportive environment. Governments must also address the unique vulnerabilities faced by women and children in live-in relationships, ensuring equitable treatment and protection.

In an increasingly interconnected world, harmonizing legal frameworks across borders can also mitigate conflicts and uncertainties in transnational cases. Collaborative efforts, such as international conventions or regional agreements, could provide a platform for sharing best practices and establishing minimum standards.

Ultimately, the evolution of live-in relationships reflects broader shifts in societal values and individual autonomy. By embracing these changes, legal systems can contribute to a more inclusive and equitable society, recognizing diverse family structures while safeguarding

fundamental rights. The path forward requires bold yet thoughtful reforms, bridging the gap between tradition and modernity.

References

1. *Marvin v. Marvin*, 18 Cal. 3d 660 (1976).
2. *Lata Singh v. State of Uttar Pradesh*, AIR 2006 SC 2522.
3. *Indra Sarma v. V.K.V. Sarma*, (2013) 15 SCC 755.
4. *D. Velusamy v. D. Patchaiammal*, (2010) 10 SCC 469.
5. *Protection of Women from Domestic Violence Act*, 2005 (India).
6. *172nd Law Commission Report*, Government of India (2000).
7. *Cohabitation Act*, 2003 (Sweden).
8. *Civil Solidarity Pact (PACS)*, France (1999).
9. *Family Law Act*, California (USA).
10. *Common-law Marriage Statutes*, Colorado (USA).
11. *Texas Family Code, Title 1, Chapter 2* (USA).
12. *Domestic Partnership Act*, California (USA).
13. *Swedish Law Commission Report on Cohabitation* (2018).
14. *French Law Commission Report on PACS Reforms* (2015).
15. *Japanese Civil Code, Articles 723–725* (Japan).
16. *UN Women Report on Gender Equality and Cohabitation* (2020).
17. *European Court of Human Rights, Oliari and Others v. Italy*, Application Nos. 18766/11 and 36030/11 (2015).
18. *International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR)*, Article 23.
19. *Report on Family Law Reforms*, Law Commission of England and Wales (2019).
20. *Australian Family Law Amendment (De Facto Financial Matters and Other Measures) Act* 2008.
21. *Canadian Cohabitation Agreements Act*, Ontario.
22. *New Zealand Property (Relationships) Act* 1976.
23. *South African Domestic Partnerships Bill* (2008).
24. *National Commission for Women, India, Report on Live-in Relationships* (2012).
25. *Human Rights Watch Report on Non-Marital Relationships and Legal Protections* (2021).