

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, stored, transmitted, or distributed in any form or by any means, whether electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise, without prior written permission of the Managing Editor of the *International Journal for Legal Research & Analysis (IJLRA)*.

The views, opinions, interpretations, and conclusions expressed in the articles published in this journal are solely those of the respective authors. They do not necessarily reflect the views of the Editorial Board, Editors, Reviewers, Advisors, or the Publisher of IJLRA.

Although every reasonable effort has been made to ensure the accuracy, authenticity, and proper citation of the content published in this journal, neither the Editorial Board nor IJLRA shall be held liable or responsible, in any manner whatsoever, for any loss, damage, or consequence arising from the use, reliance upon, or interpretation of the information contained in this publication.

The content published herein is intended solely for academic and informational purposes and shall not be construed as legal advice or professional opinion.

**Copyright © International Journal for Legal Research & Analysis.
All rights reserved.**

ABOUT US

The *International Journal for Legal Research & Analysis (IJLRA)* (ISSN: 2582-6433) is a peer-reviewed, academic, online journal published on a monthly basis. The journal aims to provide a comprehensive and interactive platform for the publication of original and high-quality legal research.

IJLRA publishes Short Articles, Long Articles, Research Papers, Case Comments, Book Reviews, Essays, and interdisciplinary studies in the field of law and allied disciplines. The journal seeks to promote critical analysis and informed discourse on contemporary legal, social, and policy issues.

The primary objective of IJLRA is to enhance academic engagement and scholarly dialogue among law students, researchers, academicians, legal professionals, and members of the Bar and Bench. The journal endeavours to establish itself as a credible and widely cited academic publication through the publication of original, well-researched, and analytically sound contributions.

IJLRA welcomes submissions from all branches of law, provided the work is original, unpublished, and submitted in accordance with the prescribed submission guidelines. All manuscripts are subject to a rigorous peer-review process to ensure academic quality, originality, and relevance.

Through its publications, the *International Journal for Legal Research & Analysis* aspires to contribute meaningfully to legal scholarship and the development of law as an instrument of justice and social progress.

PUBLICATION ETHICS, COPYRIGHT & AUTHOR RESPONSIBILITY STATEMENT

The *International Journal for Legal Research and Analysis (IJLRA)* is committed to upholding the highest standards of publication ethics and academic integrity. All manuscripts submitted to the journal must be original, unpublished, and free from plagiarism, data fabrication, falsification, or any form of unethical research or publication practice. Authors are solely responsible for the accuracy, originality, legality, and ethical compliance of their work and must ensure that all sources are properly cited and that necessary permissions for any third-party copyrighted material have been duly obtained prior to submission. Copyright in all published articles vests with IJLRA, unless otherwise expressly stated, and authors grant the journal the irrevocable right to publish, reproduce, distribute, and archive their work in print and electronic formats. The views and opinions expressed in the articles are those of the authors alone and do not reflect the views of the Editors, Editorial Board, Reviewers, or Publisher. IJLRA shall not be liable for any loss, damage, claim, or legal consequence arising from the use, reliance upon, or interpretation of the content published. By submitting a manuscript, the author(s) agree to fully indemnify and hold harmless the journal, its Editor-in-Chief, Editors, Editorial Board, Reviewers, Advisors, Publisher, and Management against any claims, liabilities, or legal proceedings arising out of plagiarism, copyright infringement, defamation, breach of confidentiality, or violation of third-party rights. The journal reserves the absolute right to reject, withdraw, retract, or remove any manuscript or published article in case of ethical or legal violations, without incurring any liability.

PRIVACY, AUTONOMY, AND PUNISHMENT: CONSTITUTIONAL CHALLENGES OF CRIMINAL LAW IN FAMILY SPACES

AUTHORED BY - DEEPAK CHAHAL

Institute: Pursuing Ph.D from Punjabi University, Patiala



ABSTRACT

The expansion of criminal law into the intimate domain of family life represents one of the most significant constitutional transformations of modern legal systems. Traditionally perceived as a private sphere insulated from state interference, the family has increasingly become a site of penal regulation through offences addressing domestic violence, marital cruelty, sexual abuse, reproductive conduct, and child protection. While such criminalisation is often justified on grounds of protecting vulnerable individuals, it simultaneously raises deep constitutional concerns relating to privacy, autonomy, dignity, and proportionality of punishment. In India, these tensions have intensified following the constitutional recognition of privacy as a fundamental right under Article 21, compelling a reassessment of the legitimacy and limits of penal intervention within domestic spaces.¹ This paper critically examines the constitutional challenges arising from the application of criminal law within family relationships, focusing on the balance between state obligation to prevent harm and the individual's right to decisional autonomy. Through doctrinal analysis of constitutional provisions, judicial precedents, and comparative jurisprudence, the study interrogates whether contemporary penal frameworks governing family conduct adhere to principles of substantive due process and proportionality. The paper argues that unrestrained criminalisation risks transforming criminal law into an instrument of moral governance rather than constitutional protection. It concludes by advocating a calibrated, rights sensitive approach that preserves family autonomy while ensuring accountability for genuine harm.²

KEYWORDS: *Privacy; Family Autonomy; Criminalisation; Constitutional Law; Punishment; Substantive Due Process*

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This research adopts a doctrinal and qualitative legal research methodology, grounded primarily in constitutional analysis. The study relies on primary legal sources including the Constitution of India, statutory provisions under criminal law affecting family spaces, and judicial decisions of the Supreme Court of India and various High Courts. Emphasis is placed on constitutional interpretation, particularly in relation to Articles 14, 19, and 21, and the evolution of substantive due process jurisprudence. Secondary sources such as academic books, peer reviewed journal articles, reports of law commissions, and international human rights

¹ Upendra Baxi, *The Crisis of the Indian Legal System* (Oxford University Press 1982).

² H.L.A. Hart, *Punishment and Responsibility* (2nd edn, Oxford University Press 2008).

instruments are extensively consulted to contextualise domestic developments within broader theoretical and comparative frameworks. The methodology also incorporates comparative constitutional insights from jurisdictions such as the United States, United Kingdom, and European human rights law to evaluate alternative models of regulating private family conduct. The research is analytical rather than empirical, seeking to assess normative coherence and constitutional compatibility rather than statistical outcomes.

HYPOTHESIS

The central hypothesis of this study is that although criminal law intervention in family spaces is often justified as a protective mechanism, excessive and poorly calibrated penal regulation undermines constitutional guarantees of privacy, autonomy, and dignity, thereby violating the principles of proportionality and substantive due process embedded in the Indian Constitution.

STATEMENT OF PROBLEM

The problem addressed in this research arises from the growing tendency of the state to regulate family life through criminal sanctions without adequate constitutional scrutiny. Family relationships, by their nature, involve intimacy, emotional complexity, and private decision making that cannot be easily accommodated within rigid penal frameworks. The increasing criminalisation of domestic conduct ranging from marital disputes and parenting practices to sexual relations and caregiving has blurred the line between legitimate state protection and intrusive moral regulation. In many instances, criminal law operates not merely as a deterrent against harm but as a coercive instrument that reshapes family behaviour through fear of punishment. This raises serious concerns regarding invasion of privacy, erosion of autonomy, misuse of penal provisions, and disproportionate punishment. The absence of a coherent constitutional framework to evaluate the legitimacy of such interventions has resulted in inconsistent judicial approaches and heightened vulnerability of both complainants and accused persons within family settings.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

This paper seeks to address the following research questions:

How far can the state legitimately intrude into family and domestic spaces through criminal law under the Indian Constitution?

What is the impact of the constitutional right to privacy on the scope and application of penal provisions governing family relationships?

Do existing criminal laws affecting family life satisfy the constitutional tests of proportionality, necessity, and substantive due process?

What normative principles should guide future criminalisation of conduct within the private sphere of the family?

LITERATURE REVIEW (BEGINNING)

Scholarly engagement with the relationship between criminal law and family autonomy reveals a long standing tension between liberal constitutionalism and social reformist agendas. Classical legal theory treated the family as a private institution governed by personal laws, customs, and moral obligations, largely beyond the reach of state coercion. This approach was rooted in the belief that excessive legal intervention would disrupt familial harmony and undermine individual liberty.³ However, feminist legal scholarship fundamentally challenged this conception by exposing how the rhetoric of privacy often functioned as a shield for systemic violence and gender based oppression within households. Scholars argued that the so called “private” nature of family life had historically allowed abuse, exploitation, and inequality to flourish unchecked by law.⁴

Indian feminist legal scholars have consistently highlighted the necessity of criminal law intervention to address domestic violence, dowry related abuse, and marital cruelty. They contend that formal equality and dignity cannot be realised without dismantling patriarchal structures embedded within family institutions⁵. From this perspective, criminal law is viewed as a corrective tool essential for transforming unequal power relations. At the same time, constitutional theorists caution that criminalisation is an inherently coercive mechanism that must be deployed with restraint. Over reliance on penal sanctions risks producing adversarial outcomes that exacerbate familial breakdown rather than secure justice or rehabilitation.

Post liberal constitutional scholarship has further complicated this debate by reconceptualising privacy as a multidimensional right encompassing bodily integrity, decisional autonomy, and intimate relationships. The recognition of privacy as intrinsic to human dignity necessitates a re examination of the legitimacy of state punishment within family spaces.⁶ Scholars emphasise

³ Flavia Agnes, *Law and Gender Inequality: The Politics of Women's Rights in India* (Oxford University Press 1999).

⁴ Upendra Baxi, 'The Constitutional Future of Human Rights' (2008) 3 NUJS L Rev 1.

⁵ Reva B. Siegel, 'The Rule of Love: Wife Beating as Prerogative and Privacy' (1996) 105 Yale LJ 2117.

⁶ Catharine A. MacKinnon, *Toward a Feminist Theory of the State* (Harvard University Press 1989).

that while protection from harm is a compelling state interest, it cannot justify blanket criminalisation that disregards proportionality, procedural fairness, and contextual realities. Comparative literature from European human rights law similarly underscores that interference with family life must be strictly necessary in a democratic society and proportionate to the legitimate aim pursued.⁷

The existing literature thus reflects an unresolved dialectic between protection and autonomy, revealing the urgent need for a constitutional framework that reconciles criminal justice objectives with fundamental rights in the domestic sphere.

Beyond feminist and liberal constitutional scholarship, contemporary criminal law theorists have increasingly questioned the suitability of punitive frameworks for regulating intimate relationships. Penal law, by design, is accusatorial, coercive, and state centric, attributes that often sit uneasily with the relational and emotional complexities of family life. Scholars argue that when criminal law enters domestic spaces, it frequently displaces dialogue, mediation, and restorative possibilities with adversarial processes that deepen conflict and entrench mistrust. This critique does not deny the reality of harm within families but challenges the assumption that punishment is always the most effective or constitutionally legitimate response.⁸

Indian scholarship further highlights the problem of over criminalisation, where broad and vaguely framed offences invite discretionary enforcement. Such discretion, while intended to aid victims, can result in selective application, procedural abuse, and erosion of due process guarantees. Legal commentators have observed that criminal provisions governing family conduct often lack sufficient safeguards against misuse, leading to arrests and prosecutions that are disproportionate to the alleged harm. This has prompted judicial interventions seeking to recalibrate enforcement without undermining the protective intent of the law.

Comparative literature from jurisdictions influenced by the European Convention on Human Rights introduces an important analytical lens by treating family life as a protected constitutional value. Under this approach, state interference through criminal law must meet a high threshold of justification, demonstrating necessity, proportionality, and the absence of less intrusive alternatives. Scholars argue that such a framework offers a principled method to

⁷ onathan Herring, *Family Law and the Criminal Justice System* (Oxford University Press 2010).

⁸ Ruth Gavison, 'Privacy and the Limits of Law' (1980) 89 Yale LJ 421.

reconcile criminal justice objectives with respect for privacy and autonomy, a balance that remains underdeveloped in Indian constitutional discourse.

Taken together, the literature reveals a consensus that criminal law in family spaces operates at the intersection of competing constitutional values dignity, equality, privacy, and state responsibility without a stable doctrinal framework to harmonise them. This lacuna forms the theoretical foundation of the present study.

THE CONSTITUTIONAL CONCEPT OF FAMILY, PRIVACY, AND AUTONOMY

The Indian Constitution does not explicitly define the concept of family, yet constitutional interpretation has consistently acknowledged family life as central to individual dignity and personal liberty. Article 21, which guarantees the right to life and personal liberty, has been expansively interpreted to include the right to live with dignity, autonomy, and freedom from arbitrary state interference. Family relationships form an essential component of this dignitarian framework, as they shape identity, emotional security, and social belonging.⁹

The constitutional right to privacy, as articulated by the Supreme Court, represents a decisive shift from earlier jurisprudence that viewed privacy narrowly or denied it independent constitutional status. Privacy is now recognised as encompassing spatial, informational, and decisional dimensions. Within family spaces, decisional privacy assumes particular importance, protecting intimate choices relating to marriage, procreation, sexual relations, child rearing, and domestic arrangements. This recognition fundamentally alters the constitutional terrain on which criminal law operates.¹⁰

Autonomy, closely linked to privacy, refers to the individual's capacity to make meaningful choices free from coercion. In the familial context, autonomy is inherently relational rather than purely individualistic. Decisions are often negotiated within webs of dependency, care, and responsibility. Criminal law, with its binary logic of guilt and innocence, struggles to accommodate this relational complexity. When penal sanctions are imposed without sensitivity to context, they risk reducing nuanced family dynamics to simplistic legal narratives that may

⁹ Gobind v. State of Madhya Pradesh, (1975) 2 SCC 148.

¹⁰ Navtej Singh Johar v. Union of India, (2018) 10 SCC 1.

neither reflect lived realities nor advance constitutional values.¹¹

STATE INTERVENTION AND THE JUSTIFICATION FOR CRIMINALISATION

The legitimacy of criminal law intervention within family spaces rests on the state's obligation to protect individuals from harm, particularly those who are structurally vulnerable. Violence, coercion, and abuse within families are not merely private wrongs but violations of fundamental rights. The state cannot abdicate responsibility under the guise of respecting privacy. Constitutional morality demands that dignity and equality prevail over social norms that perpetuate harm.¹²

However, constitutional legitimacy does not flow automatically from protective intent. Criminalisation must satisfy established constitutional tests, including legality, necessity, proportionality, and procedural fairness. The principle of necessity requires that criminal law be invoked only where non penal alternatives are insufficient to address the harm. In many family related disputes, civil remedies, protective orders, counselling, and restorative mechanisms may offer more effective and less intrusive solutions.

Proportionality further demands that the severity of penal sanctions correspond to the gravity of the harm caused. In the domestic sphere, criminal proceedings often generate collateral consequences that extend beyond the accused, affecting children, elderly dependents, and economic stability. These consequences raise serious constitutional questions when punishment produces harm disproportionate to the offence or undermines the welfare of those the law seeks to protect.¹³

SUBSTANTIVE DUE PROCESS AND PROCEDURAL CONCERNS

The evolution of substantive due process under Article 21 imposes substantive limits on legislative and executive action, including criminal law enforcement. Laws that are arbitrary, overbroad, or excessive in their application violate the guarantee of personal liberty even if procedurally valid. In the context of family related offences, substantive due process requires

¹¹ Suchita Srivastava v. Chandigarh Administration, (2009) 9 SCC 1.

¹² State of Maharashtra v. Mohd. Yakub, (1980) 3 SCC 57.

¹³ Aharon Barak, *Proportionality: Constitutional Rights and Their Limitations* (Cambridge University Press 2012).

careful scrutiny of statutory language, enforcement practices, and evidentiary standards.

Procedural safeguards assume heightened importance in family related criminal cases due to the private nature of the allegations and the potential for misuse. Arrests based solely on complaints, prolonged pre trial detention, and delayed trials can transform the criminal process itself into a form of punishment. Judicial observations on the misuse of certain penal provisions reflect not a denial of genuine harm but concern for constitutional fairness and balance.

The tension between effective enforcement and protection of due process underscores the need for calibrated procedural frameworks. Without such safeguards, criminal law risks becoming an instrument of oppression rather than justice, undermining public confidence and constitutional legitimacy.

COMPARATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL PERSPECTIVES

Comparative constitutional jurisprudence offers valuable insights into managing the intersection of criminal law and family life. European human rights law treats respect for family life as a core constitutional value, requiring that any interference be justified by compelling reasons and proportionate means. Criminal sanctions are regarded as measures of last resort, particularly in matters involving consensual adult relationships or parental decision making.

In the United States, substantive due process jurisprudence has historically protected family autonomy against excessive state intrusion, although the scope of such protection has fluctuated. Courts have emphasised that while the state may regulate to prevent harm, it cannot impose uniform moral standards on diverse family arrangements without violating liberty interests.

These comparative approaches underscore the importance of restraint, contextual analysis, and respect for pluralism. They demonstrate that constitutional democracies can protect vulnerable individuals without resorting to blanket criminalisation that erodes privacy and autonomy.

CRIMINAL PUNISHMENT IN FAMILY SPACES: DETERRENCE, MORALITY, AND COERCION

Punishment has traditionally been justified in criminal jurisprudence through theories of deterrence, retribution, rehabilitation, and societal denunciation of wrongdoing. However,

when applied within family spaces, these justifications acquire a distinct constitutional character. Unlike conventional public offences, family related crimes occur within intimate relationships marked by emotional bonds, economic interdependence, and long term social consequences. The imposition of criminal punishment in such contexts often disrupts not only the accused but the entire familial structure, including children and dependents who are neither perpetrators nor complainants.

Deterrence, frequently cited as the primary justification for criminalising domestic conduct, operates unevenly within family settings. The threat of punishment may deter some forms of violence, yet it may also silence victims who fear social stigma, economic insecurity, or familial breakdown resulting from prosecution. Retributive approaches, which emphasise moral blameworthiness, risk conflating genuine harm with socially disapproved behaviour, thereby converting criminal law into a vehicle for enforcing dominant moral norms rather than protecting constitutional rights.

The coercive nature of punishment becomes particularly problematic when criminal law enters areas involving consensual adult relationships, parenting choices, or marital disputes. In such cases, penal sanctions function less as tools of justice and more as mechanisms of social control. Constitutional morality, as articulated in Indian jurisprudence, requires that law be grounded in individual dignity and freedom rather than majoritarian morality. When punishment is imposed to regulate private morality rather than prevent concrete harm, it violates this constitutional ethos.

OVER CRIMINALISATION, MISUSE, AND THE CHILLING EFFECT ON AUTONOMY

A significant constitutional concern associated with criminal law in family spaces is the phenomenon of over criminalisation. Broadly worded offences, combined with discretionary enforcement, create conditions where ordinary domestic disagreements are transformed into criminal allegations. This not only burdens the criminal justice system but also generates a chilling effect on personal autonomy. Individuals may refrain from exercising legitimate choices in family life due to fear of criminal consequences, thereby undermining decisional privacy.

Judicial observations regarding misuse of family centric penal provisions must be understood

within this constitutional context. While misuse does not negate the reality of domestic harm, it highlights structural deficiencies in the design and implementation of criminal law. Arrest first approaches, delayed trials, and inadequate scrutiny of complaints can convert criminal proceedings into instruments of harassment. Such outcomes offend the principle that punishment should follow adjudication, not precede it.

The chilling effect extends beyond the accused to society at large. Excessive penal intervention fosters a culture of surveillance within family life, eroding trust and intimacy. Constitutional democracy cannot sustain a legal order where private relationships are governed primarily by fear of criminal sanction rather than mutual respect and accountability.

TOWARDS A CONSTITUTIONAL FRAMEWORK FOR CRIMINAL LAW IN FAMILY SPACES

Reconciling criminal justice with constitutional rights in family contexts requires a normative framework grounded in constitutional principles rather than ad hoc judicial balancing. First, the principle of harm based criminalisation must guide legislative and judicial action. Criminal law should intervene only where conduct causes or poses a serious risk of tangible harm to life, bodily integrity, or fundamental dignity. Moral disapproval or social discomfort cannot serve as sufficient justification.

Second, proportionality must operate as a substantive constraint on both legislation and enforcement. Penal provisions should be narrowly tailored, and punishment should reflect the gravity of harm without producing excessive collateral damage. Procedural safeguards, including preliminary scrutiny, mediation where appropriate, and protection against arbitrary arrest, are essential components of this framework.

Third, restorative and rehabilitative approaches must be prioritised alongside punitive mechanisms. Family related harm often arises from structural stressors, power imbalances, and social conditioning that cannot be effectively addressed through incarceration alone. Restorative justice models, counselling, and civil protective remedies offer constitutionally compatible alternatives that preserve autonomy while ensuring accountability.

Finally, constitutional adjudication must consistently foreground privacy and decisional autonomy as limiting principles. The state's role is to protect individuals from harm, not to

prescribe ideal family structures or behaviours. Criminal law must function as a last resort, deployed with restraint and constitutional humility.

CONCLUSION & FINDINGS

The study finds that criminal law has expanded significantly into family spaces without a coherent constitutional framework governing such intervention. While the protective rationale underlying this expansion is legitimate, the absence of proportionality and procedural safeguards has resulted in over criminalisation and rights erosion. The constitutional right to privacy, particularly in its decisional dimension, substantially narrows the scope of permissible state intrusion into family life. Existing penal approaches often fail to account for the relational nature of family autonomy, leading to punitive outcomes that undermine dignity rather than secure justice. Comparative constitutional jurisprudence demonstrates that protection and autonomy are not mutually exclusive but require principled balancing grounded in constitutional values.

The criminalisation of conduct within family spaces represents a critical test of constitutional governance in a democratic society. While the state bears an undeniable obligation to protect individuals from domestic harm, this responsibility must be exercised within the constraints of privacy, autonomy, and proportionality. Unrestrained penal intervention risks transforming criminal law into an instrument of moral regulation, eroding the very freedoms it seeks to protect. A constitutionally sound approach demands restraint, contextual sensitivity, and commitment to substantive due process. By reimagining criminal law as a carefully calibrated tool rather than a default response, constitutional democracy can safeguard both individual dignity and family autonomy. The future of criminal justice in family spaces must therefore lie not in expanding punishment, but in deepening constitutional fidelity.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BOOKS

Agnes F, *Law and Gender Inequality: The Politics of Women's Rights in India* (Oxford University Press 1999).

Barak A, *Proportionality: Constitutional Rights and Their Limitations* (Cambridge University Press 2012).

Baxi U, *The Crisis of the Indian Legal System* (Oxford University Press 1982).

Baxi U, *Human Rights in a Posthuman World* (Oxford University Press 2007).

Hart HLA, *Punishment and Responsibility* (2nd edn, Oxford University Press 2008).

Herring J, *Family Law and the Criminal Justice System* (Oxford University Press 2010).

Jain MP, *Indian Constitutional Law* (9th edn, LexisNexis 2022).

MacKinnon CA, *Toward a Feminist Theory of the State* (Harvard University Press 1989).

ARTICLES AND JOURNALS

Baxi U, 'The Constitutional Future of Human Rights' (2008) 3 NUJS Law Review 1.

Feldman D, 'Secrecy, Dignity or Autonomy? Views of Privacy as a Civil Liberty' (1994) 47 Current Legal Problems 41.

Gavison R, 'Privacy and the Limits of Law' (1980) 89 Yale Law Journal 421.

Siegel RB, 'The Rule of Love: Wife Beating as Prerogative and Privacy' (1996) 105 Yale Law Journal 2117.

Hart HLA, 'Social Solidarity and the Enforcement of Morality' (1967) 35 University of Chicago Law Review 1.

CASES

Justice K.S. Puttaswamy (Retd.) v. Union of India, (2017) 10 SCC 1.

Maneka Gandhi v. Union of India, (1978) 1 SCC 248.

Navtej Singh Johar v. Union of India, (2018) 10 SCC 1.

Joseph Shine v. Union of India, (2019) 3 SCC 39.

Arnesh Kumar v. State of Bihar, (2014) 8 SCC 273.

Joginder Kumar v. State of Uttar Pradesh, (1994) 4 SCC 260.