

# **Controversy around Art 35A**

#### Why in news?

\n\n

The Supreme Court is hearing a PIL petition challenging the constitutional validity of Article 35A.

\n\n

#### What is the controversy in Art 35A?

\n\n

∖n

 Article 35A allows the Jammu and Kashmir legislature to define the list of 'permanent residents' of the state, who -\n

\n\n

\n

1. are eligible to vote

\n

- 2. can work for the state government  $\n$
- 3. can own land, buy property n
- 4. can secure public employment and college admissions, etc.  $\slash n$

\n\n

\n

- Non-permanent residents are denied all these rights.  $\slashn$
- This article is being challenged on the ground of gender discrimination.  $\slash n$
- This is because a male resident will not lose the right of being a permanent resident even after marriage to a woman from outside.  $\n$
- A woman from outside the state shall became a permanent resident on marrying a male permanent resident of the state.  $\n$

- However, a daughter who is born state subject of J&K will loss the right of being a permanent resident on marrying an outsider.  $\n$
- It discriminates against women who marry outside the State from applying for jobs or buying property.  $\gamma_n$
- This is said to be **against the spirit of Article 14** of the Constitution which provides for equality before the law and the equal protection of the laws.  $\n$

\n\n

### Why is the case significant?

\n\n

\n

• Art 35A was added to the constitution through the Constitution (Application to Jammu and Kashmir) Order, 1954, a presidential order not yet ratified by the Parliament.

∖n

- It is being challenged that the provision was "unconstitutional" and approved without any debate in the parliament.  $\n$
- The J&K government sees Art 35A as offering the state a special position.  $\space{1mm}\space{1mm$
- On the other hand, the Centre differs on the grounds that it discriminates against women and is calling for a larger debate.  $\n$
- The issue is now getting a **political** tone leading to tensions between the state and the central government.  $\n$
- There are also apprehensions that any adverse order against the provision could give the state's **separatists** a chance to stir up **violence in the state**.  $\n$
- It is high time that the governments place the **rights and privileges of the people** of the state above political motives and deal it accordingly. n

\n\n

\n\n

## Source: The Hindu

∖n

