

## **Muslim Women (Protection of Rights on Marriage) Bill, 2017**

### **What is the issue?**

\n\n

\n

- Lok Sabha has passed the Muslim Women (Protection of Rights on Marriage) Bill, 2017.

\n

- The Bill is abound with a number of internal contradictions raising questions on the very purpose and intent.

\n

\n\n

\n

***Every punishment which does not arise from absolute necessity is tyrannical.***

\n

\n\n

### **What are the highlight provisions?**

\n\n

\n

- **Definition-** The Bill defines talaq as talaq-e-biddat (instant triple talaq) or any other similar form of talaq pronounced by a Muslim man resulting in instant and irrevocable divorce.

\n

- It makes all forms of declaration of talaq to be void i.e. not enforceable in law.

\n

- **Offence and penalty** - The Bill makes declaration of talaq a cognizable and non-bailable offence.

\n

- A husband declaring talaq can be imprisoned for up to 3 years along with a fine.

\n

- **Allowance** - A Muslim woman against whom talaq has been declared is entitled to seek subsistence allowance from her husband.  
 \n
- This applies to the woman and her dependent children.  
 \n
- The amount of the allowance will be decided by the Magistrate.  
 \n
- **Custody** - A Muslim woman against whom such talaq has been declared, is entitled to seek custody of her minor children.  
 \n
- The determination of custody will be made by the Magistrate.  
 \n

\n\n

### What are the anomalies?

\n\n

- **SC judgement** - The Supreme Court, earlier, invalidated the triple talaq practice by calling it arbitrary and unconstitutional.  
 \n
- Logically, the pronouncement of talaq-e-biddat does not dissolve the marriage, and this is the law of the land under Article 141.  
 \n
- Contradictorily, the Bill presumes that the “pronouncement” of talaq can instantaneously and irrevocably dissolve the marriage.  
 \n
- The bill thus seems to be misreading the SC’s judgment on talaq.  
 \n
- **Offence** - After rendering talaq-e-biddat inoperative, considering it a cognisable and non-bailable offence seems illogical.  
 \n
- It raises questions on the validity of the law that criminalises an act after conceding that it does not result in a crime.  
 \n
- **Post-divorce issues** - Making provisions on post-divorce matters like subsistence allowance and the custody, when the pronouncement (instant talaq) itself does not dissolve the marriage appear baseless.  
 \n

\n\n

### Why is this a case of over-criminalisation?

\n\n

\n

- **Necessity** - Criminal law is not necessarily a choice but a necessity.

\n

- It should be used only as a “last resort” and only for the “most reprehensible wrongs”.

\n

- Excessive use of criminal law for purposes it is ill-suited to tackle is the harsh reality of a modern state.

\n

- **Morality** - The realm of private morality and immorality falls more within the individual and social sphere.

\n

- Regulating it should largely come from the deliberations of the society and, making it the law’s business may not bring in the desired effect.

\n

- In this context, criminalising triple talaq would hardly help in building the moral commitments of Muslim husbands.

\n

- It is not the function of a civilised legal system.

\n

\n\n

\n\n

**Source: PRS India, The Indian Express**

\n

