

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IJLRA welcomes submissions from all branches of law, provided the work is original, unpublished, and submitted in accordance with the prescribed submission guidelines.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.

MODERN FAMILIES AND PENAL LAW: RECONCILING CRIMINAL JUSTICE WITH CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS

AUTHORED BY - DEEPAK CHAHAL

Institute: Pursuing Ph.D from Punjabi University, Patiala



ABSTRACT

The transformation of family structures in contemporary society has significantly altered the relationship between criminal law and private life. Traditional legal assumptions about the family as a homogeneous, hierarchical, and heteronormative institution have given way to diverse configurations including live-in relationships, single-parent households, same-sex partnerships, blended families, and non-marital caregiving arrangements. This evolution has posed complex challenges for penal law, which continues to operate largely on conventional notions of family morality and gender roles. Criminal law increasingly intervenes in family spaces through offences relating to domestic violence, marital obligations, sexual conduct, caregiving duties, and child protection. While such intervention is often justified on grounds of protecting vulnerable individuals, it simultaneously raises constitutional concerns regarding equality, privacy, autonomy, and due process.¹ This paper critically examines whether existing penal frameworks adequately reconcile the objectives of criminal justice with constitutional rights in the context of modern families. Drawing upon constitutional jurisprudence, statutory analysis, and comparative perspectives, the study argues that penal law frequently lags behind social realities, resulting in doctrinal inconsistencies and rights-based conflicts. The paper contends that a constitutional re-orientation of criminal law is essential to ensure that state intervention in family life is both effective and rights-compliant.²

KEYWORDS: *Modern Families; Penal Law; Constitutional Rights; Criminal Justice; Privacy; Equality*

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This research adopts a doctrinal and analytical methodology, focusing on constitutional interpretation and criminal law theory. Primary sources include the Constitution of India, penal statutes regulating family conduct, and judicial decisions of the Supreme Court of India and High Courts. Particular emphasis is placed on Articles 14, 19, and 21, and the evolving jurisprudence on equality, personal liberty, and substantive due process. Secondary sources such as academic literature, law commission reports, and comparative constitutional materials are used to contextualise domestic developments. The study also draws on comparative insights from jurisdictions that have grappled with legal recognition of non-traditional family structures. The methodology is normative and critical, aiming to assess whether penal law

¹ M.P. Jain, *Indian Constitutional Law* (9th edn, LexisNexis 2022).

² Martha Albertson Fineman, *The Autonomy Myth: A Theory of Dependency* (The New Press 2004).

frameworks align with constitutional principles in light of changing social realities.

HYPOTHESIS

The paper is premised on the hypothesis that penal law in India continues to reflect outdated assumptions about family structures, and its failure to adapt to modern familial realities results in unconstitutional intrusions into privacy, equality, and personal liberty.

STATEMENT OF PROBLEM

The primary problem examined in this paper is the growing disconnect between contemporary family forms and the penal law framework governing them. Criminal law interventions within families are often designed around traditional marital and gender norms, rendering them ill-suited to address the realities of modern relationships. This misalignment results in selective protection, exclusion of non-traditional families, and disproportionate penal consequences. Moreover, criminal law's reliance on coercive mechanisms raises constitutional concerns when applied to intimate relationships characterised by consent, emotional interdependence, and autonomy. The absence of a constitutionally grounded approach to regulating modern families through penal law has led to inconsistent judicial reasoning, uncertainty in enforcement, and erosion of fundamental rights.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

This study seeks to address the following questions:

1. How have changing family structures challenged the traditional assumptions underlying penal law?
2. Does criminal law adequately protect individuals in modern family arrangements without violating constitutional rights?
3. How do constitutional principles of equality, privacy, and autonomy constrain penal intervention in family life?
4. What reforms are necessary to reconcile criminal justice objectives with constitutional rights in the context of modern families?

LITERATURE REVIEW

Legal scholarship on family and criminal law has increasingly focused on the inadequacy of traditional legal frameworks in addressing contemporary familial realities. Early criminal law

theory largely treated the family as a stable institution governed by clearly defined roles, particularly within heterosexual marriage.³ Penal provisions regulating family conduct were premised on assumptions of economic dependency, gender hierarchy, and moral uniformity. However, sociological and legal studies have demonstrated that modern families are pluralistic, fluid, and shaped by individual choice rather than rigid social norms.⁴

Feminist legal scholarship has played a crucial role in exposing how criminal law historically reinforced patriarchal family structures. While penal intervention was necessary to address domestic violence and gender-based harm, scholars caution that criminal law often reproduces power asymmetries by positioning the state as the primary arbiter of family morality. The expansion of criminal law into domestic spaces has thus generated a paradox: it simultaneously empowers victims and subjects families to intrusive state control.⁵

Constitutional theorists emphasise that modern families are protected by fundamental rights relating to equality and personal liberty. The recognition of diverse family forms challenges the legitimacy of penal laws that privilege marriage or biological relationships over functional caregiving arrangements. Judicial developments recognising live-in relationships and non-traditional partnerships underscore the constitutional shift towards autonomy and dignity as organising principles of family life. However, criminal law has been slow to internalise this shift, often resulting in selective inclusion and exclusion.⁶

Comparative scholarship reveals that jurisdictions recognising plural family forms have increasingly relied on civil and protective mechanisms rather than punitive sanctions. Criminal law is reserved for clear instances of harm rather than used as a regulatory tool for family behaviour. This approach aligns with constitutional commitments to minimal intrusion and proportionality, offering a valuable reference point for reform.⁷

The literature thus highlights a critical tension between evolving constitutional understandings of family and the static nature of penal law. This tension necessitates a re-examination of criminal justice approaches to family regulation through a constitutional lens.

³ Jonathan Herring, *Family Law and the Criminal Justice System* (Oxford University Press 2010).

⁴ Flavia Agnes, *Law and Gender Inequality: The Politics of Women's Rights in India* (Oxford University Press 1999).

⁵ Reva B. Siegel, 'The Modernization of Marital Status Law' (1997) 79 *Georgetown LJ* 2127.

⁶ Martha Albertson Fineman, 'The Vulnerable Subject' (2008) 20 *Yale JL & Feminism* 1.

⁷ Ruth Gavison, 'Privacy and the Limits of Law' (1980) 89 *Yale LJ* 421.

CONSTITUTIONAL RECOGNITION OF MODERN FAMILY STRUCTURES (INTRODUCTORY ANALYSIS)

Indian constitutional jurisprudence has gradually moved away from a monolithic conception of the family. Judicial recognition of autonomy in choosing partners, cohabitation without marriage, and non-normative relationships reflects an evolving understanding of family as a site of personal liberty rather than moral conformity. Decisions such as *Shafin Jahan v. Asokan K.M.* and *Navtej Singh Johar v. Union of India* underscore the constitutional commitment to dignity and choice in intimate relationships. These developments have significant implications for penal law, which must now operate within a rights-oriented framework rather than traditional moral assumptions.⁸

PENAL LAW AND THE CHANGING CONCEPT OF FAMILY

Penal law in India has historically been structured around a narrow and formal conception of the family, primarily centred on heterosexual marriage, biological parenthood, and gendered domestic roles. Many criminal provisions regulating family conduct implicitly assume the existence of legally sanctioned marriage and traditional dependency structures. This framework is increasingly misaligned with contemporary social realities, where family life is characterised by diversity, fluidity, and individual choice. Live-in relationships, single-parent households, blended families, same-sex partnerships, and caregiving arrangements outside formal marriage have become visible and constitutionally acknowledged. Despite this transformation, penal law continues to operate through static categories that fail to reflect lived realities.⁹

This dissonance creates both inclusionary and exclusionary consequences. On the one hand, individuals in non-traditional family arrangements may be denied protection under criminal law because their relationships fall outside formal definitions. On the other hand, when criminal law does apply, it often does so in ways that inadequately respect autonomy and consent. The persistence of traditional assumptions within penal law thus results in selective recognition, uneven enforcement, and constitutional inconsistency.

⁸ *Shafin Jahan v. Asokan K.M.*, (2018) 16 SCC 368.

⁹ *E.P. Royappa v. State of Tamil Nadu*, (1974) 4 SCC 3.

EQUALITY UNDER ARTICLE 14 AND DISCRIMINATORY PENAL FRAMEWORKS

Article 14 of the Constitution mandates equality before the law and equal protection of laws. In the context of family-related penal provisions, this principle demands that individuals in comparable situations receive comparable legal treatment. However, criminal law's privileging of certain family forms over others raises serious equality concerns. Penal provisions that hinge on marital status or gender roles often fail to accommodate the realities of modern families, thereby excluding individuals who do not conform to normative models.¹⁰

Judicial recognition of live-in relationships and non-marital partnerships as legitimate expressions of personal liberty has constitutional implications for criminal law. When penal protections or liabilities are tied exclusively to marriage, they risk discriminating against individuals who choose alternative forms of family life. Such differentiation requires a rational nexus with a legitimate state objective. In many cases, however, the distinction is rooted in moral preference rather than constitutional necessity.

Equality jurisprudence also requires scrutiny of gendered assumptions embedded in penal law. While protective measures addressing gender-based violence are constitutionally justified, the use of rigid gender binaries can undermine both fairness and effectiveness. Modern families increasingly challenge binary conceptions of dependency and power, necessitating penal frameworks that are sensitive to context rather than reliant on presumptive roles.

AUTONOMY, CONSENT, AND CRIMINAL LIABILITY

Autonomy is a foundational constitutional value that underpins personal liberty and decisional freedom. In the familial context, autonomy encompasses the right to choose one's partner, living arrangement, and mode of family life. Criminal law, however, often operates with limited sensitivity to consent and agency within intimate relationships. When consensual conduct between adults is subjected to criminal sanction, the state risks infringing decisional autonomy without sufficient justification.¹¹

Modern constitutional jurisprudence has affirmed that adult individuals are entitled to make intimate choices free from state coercion, so long as such choices do not cause harm to others.

¹⁰ Tarunabh Khaitan, *A Theory of Discrimination Law* (Oxford University Press 2015).

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

Penal law must therefore distinguish between coercive conduct warranting intervention and consensual behaviour deserving constitutional protection. Failure to draw this distinction results in criminalisation that is not harm-based but morality-driven.

The challenge is particularly acute in family contexts, where consent may be ongoing, relational, and situational rather than transactional. Criminal law's tendency to reduce complex interpersonal dynamics to static legal categories can produce outcomes that neither reflect reality nor advance justice. A constitutionally grounded penal approach must account for autonomy while remaining vigilant against exploitation and abuse.

PRIVACY AND STATE SURVEILLANCE OF FAMILY LIFE

The constitutional right to privacy imposes substantive limits on the state's authority to intrude into family life. Privacy in this context is not merely a spatial concept but a protection of intimate decision-making and relational autonomy¹². Penal law enforcement within family spaces often necessitates investigation into private communications, domestic arrangements, and personal relationships. Such intrusion, while sometimes necessary, must be carefully justified and narrowly tailored.

Excessive surveillance of family life through criminal processes risks normalising state oversight of intimate relationships. This has broader constitutional implications, as it alters the relationship between the individual and the state. Families may become sites of suspicion rather than autonomy, with criminal law functioning as a mechanism of regulation rather than protection. The constitutional challenge lies in ensuring that privacy is not sacrificed at the altar of enforcement efficiency.

The requirement of proportionality is particularly relevant here. Investigative and punitive measures must be commensurate with the seriousness of the alleged harm. Blanket criminalisation and aggressive enforcement undermine privacy and dignity, especially when less intrusive alternatives are available.

¹² Gobind v. State of Madhya Pradesh, (1975) 2 SCC 148.

CRIMINAL JUSTICE OBJECTIVES AND CONSTITUTIONAL LIMITS

Criminal justice aims to prevent harm, punish wrongdoing, and maintain social order. However, these objectives must be pursued within constitutional boundaries. In the context of modern families, the pursuit of criminal justice often collides with rights to equality, autonomy, and privacy. This collision reveals the limitations of a punitive paradigm that prioritises control over care and coercion over context.¹³

The constitutional mandate is not to abandon criminal law in family contexts but to recalibrate its role. Criminal justice must operate as a safeguard against serious harm rather than as a tool for enforcing conformity to traditional family norms. This requires a shift from formalistic definitions to functional analysis, from moral judgement to rights-based reasoning, and from automatic criminalisation to contextual assessment.

Judicial efforts to balance protection with restraint reflect an emerging constitutional consciousness, yet doctrinal clarity remains elusive. Without a coherent framework, penal law risks oscillating between overreach and under-enforcement, undermining both justice and rights.

OVER-CRIMINALISATION AND THE EXCLUSION OF NON-TRADITIONAL FAMILIES

One of the most pressing constitutional challenges in the regulation of modern families through penal law is the problem of over-criminalisation. Criminal law, by its very nature, is a blunt instrument that operates through coercion, stigma, and the threat of punishment. When such a mechanism is deployed to regulate intimate relationships and domestic arrangements, it frequently produces consequences that are disproportionate to the harm sought to be addressed. In the context of modern families, over-criminalisation manifests not only in excessive penal intervention but also in the selective exclusion of relationships that do not conform to traditional legal categories.¹⁴

Penal statutes often extend protection or impose liability based on formal markers such as marriage, biological parenthood, or gendered roles. As a result, individuals in live-in

¹³ *Arnesh Kumar v. State of Bihar*, (2014) 8 SCC 273.

¹⁴ *Handyside v. United Kingdom*, (1976) 1 EHRR 737.

relationships, same-sex partnerships, or informal caregiving arrangements may find themselves either unprotected by criminal law or unfairly targeted by it. This selective recognition undermines the constitutional promise of equality and dignity. The law, instead of responding to actual harm, becomes preoccupied with regulating legitimacy and conformity.

Moreover, excessive criminalisation tends to collapse complex relational disputes into adversarial legal contests. Familial conflicts that may be better addressed through dialogue, mediation, or civil remedies are converted into criminal allegations, triggering arrest, prosecution, and prolonged litigation. This not only burdens the criminal justice system but also exacerbates familial breakdown, economic insecurity, and emotional trauma. The constitutional cost of such overreach is significant, as it erodes trust in legal institutions and weakens the legitimacy of criminal law as a protective tool.

CHILLING EFFECTS ON AUTONOMY AND FAMILY DIVERSITY

The pervasive presence of criminal law in family life generates a chilling effect on individual autonomy and family diversity. When legal recognition and protection are contingent upon conformity to traditional norms, individuals may feel compelled to structure their relationships in ways that align with legal expectations rather than personal choice. This undermines the constitutional commitment to liberty and pluralism.

Modern families thrive on negotiated roles, shared responsibilities, and evolving identities. Criminal law, however, often imposes rigid expectations regarding behaviour, responsibility, and morality. The fear of criminal liability can deter individuals from exercising legitimate choices relating to cohabitation, caregiving, or exit from relationships. Such deterrence is constitutionally problematic because it restricts freedom not through direct prohibition but through implicit coercion.

From a rights-based perspective, the chilling effect of penal law is particularly concerning in light of the constitutional recognition of decisional autonomy. Autonomy is meaningful only when individuals can make choices without fear of disproportionate state sanction. When criminal law looms over private relationships as a constant threat, autonomy is reduced to a theoretical ideal rather than a lived reality.

COMPARATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL APPROACHES TO MODERN FAMILIES

Comparative constitutional jurisprudence offers valuable insights into reconciling criminal justice with family diversity. Jurisdictions that have embraced pluralistic conceptions of family life increasingly rely on civil, protective, and restorative mechanisms rather than punitive sanctions to address domestic harm. Criminal law is reserved for clear instances of violence, coercion, or exploitation, rather than used as a regulatory framework for family behaviour.

European human rights jurisprudence, for instance, treats family life as a protected constitutional value, requiring that any state interference be strictly necessary and proportionate. The emphasis is on safeguarding dignity and autonomy while ensuring protection from harm. Similarly, several jurisdictions recognise functional family relationships based on care, dependency, and emotional bonds rather than formal status. This functional approach allows the law to respond to real vulnerabilities without privileging specific family forms.

These comparative models demonstrate that it is possible to protect individuals within families without resorting to expansive criminalisation. By prioritising harm-based intervention and minimal intrusion, constitutional systems can preserve both justice and liberty. Such approaches provide a normative blueprint for reforming penal law in societies marked by family diversity.

TOWARDS A RIGHTS-COMPATIBLE PENAL FRAMEWORK FOR MODERN FAMILIES

Reconciling criminal justice with constitutional rights in the context of modern families requires a fundamental reorientation of penal law. First, criminalisation must be grounded in demonstrable harm rather than moral judgement or traditional assumptions. Penal law should intervene only where conduct seriously infringes life, bodily integrity, or core dignity. Relationship status or conformity to social norms should not determine either protection or liability.

Second, proportionality must operate as a substantive constraint on both legislation and enforcement. Penal responses should be calibrated to the gravity of harm and sensitive to

collateral consequences for dependents and caregivers. Arrest and incarceration should be measures of last resort, particularly in domestic contexts where alternative remedies may be more effective and less destructive.

Third, the legal system must embrace a pluralistic understanding of family life. Functional caregiving relationships, chosen families, and non-marital partnerships deserve constitutional recognition and protection. Penal law must adapt to these realities rather than force individuals into outdated legal categories.

Finally, restorative and preventive approaches should be integrated into the criminal justice framework. Counselling, mediation, protective orders, and community-based interventions offer constitutionally compatible tools for addressing family-related harm without undermining autonomy. Such measures align with the constitutional vision of dignity, equality, and liberty.

CONCLUSION & FINDINGS

This study finds that penal law in India remains inadequately equipped to address the realities of modern family life. Criminal law continues to reflect traditional assumptions that are increasingly incompatible with constitutional jurisprudence on equality, privacy, and autonomy. The resulting framework produces both over-criminalisation and exclusion, undermining the protective and legitimising functions of criminal justice. The absence of a coherent, rights-based approach has led to inconsistent judicial outcomes and heightened constitutional tensions. Comparative constitutional models illustrate that a restrained, harm-based penal framework is both feasible and normatively desirable.

Modern families represent a fundamental shift in the social and constitutional landscape, one that demands a corresponding evolution in penal law. While the state bears a legitimate responsibility to protect individuals from domestic harm, this obligation must be fulfilled in a manner consistent with constitutional rights. Criminal law cannot serve as a default mechanism for regulating family life without eroding autonomy, equality, and dignity. A constitutionally sound approach requires restraint, proportionality, and recognition of family diversity. By re-centring criminal justice around harm prevention rather than moral regulation, the law can reconcile its protective mandate with the constitutional freedoms that define a democratic society. The future of penal law in family contexts must therefore lie in constitutional fidelity rather than punitive excess.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BOOKS

- Agnes F, *Law and Gender Inequality: The Politics of Women's Rights in India* (Oxford University Press 1999).
- Ashworth A, *Principles of Criminal Law* (7th edn, Oxford University Press 2013).
- Austin G, *The Indian Constitution: Cornerstone of a Nation* (Oxford University Press 1966).
- 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).
- Fineman MA, *The Autonomy Myth: A Theory of Dependency* (The New Press 2004).
- Hart HLA, *Law, Liberty and Morality* (Oxford University Press 1963).
- Herring J, *Family Law and the Criminal Justice System* (Oxford University Press 2010).
- Jain MP, *Indian Constitutional Law* (9th edn, LexisNexis 2022).
- Khaitan T, *A Theory of Discrimination Law* (Oxford University Press 2015).

ARTICLES & JOURNALS

- Fineman MA, 'The Vulnerable Subject' (2008) 20 Yale Journal of Law & Feminism 1.
- Gavison R, 'Privacy and the Limits of Law' (1980) 89 Yale Law Journal 421.
- Siegel RB, 'The Modernization of Marital Status Law' (1997) 79 Georgetown Law Journal 2127.

CASES

- Justice K.S. Puttaswamy (Retd.) v. Union of India, (2017) 10 SCC 1.
- Navtej Singh Johar v. Union of India, (2018) 10 SCC 1.
- Joseph Shine v. Union of India, (2019) 3 SCC 39.
- Deepika Singh v. Central Administrative Tribunal, (2022) 7 SCC 1.
- Arnesh Kumar v. State of Bihar, (2014) 8 SCC 273.