

## Supreme Court Verdict on Section 377

### Why in news?

\n\n

\n

- A Constitution Bench of the Supreme Court has unanimously decriminalised homosexuality.

\n

- Click [here](#) to know more on the judicial journey of Section 377.

\n

\n\n

### What were the concerns with Section 377?

\n\n

\n

***"Whoever voluntarily has carnal intercourse against the order of nature with any man, woman or animal, shall be punished with imprisonment for life, or with imprisonment of either description for a term which may extend to ten years, and shall also be liable to fine."***

\n

\n\n

\n

- Section 377 creates a class of criminals, consisting of individuals who engage in consensual sexual activity.

\n

- It typecasts Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender, Queer (LGBTQ) individuals as sex-offenders.

\n

- It categorised their consensual conduct on par with sexual offences like rape and child molestation.

\n

- This has led to stigmatisation and condemnation of LGBTQ individuals in society.

\n

- It was a cause for institutional discrimination faced by the LGBTQ community in health care, which even led to ineffective HIV prevention and treatment.

\n

\n\n

## What was the judgment?

\n\n

\n

- The Bench unanimously held that criminalisation of private consensual sexual conduct between adults of the same sex was clearly unconstitutional.
- The court, however, held that the Section 377 would apply to “unnatural” sexual acts like bestiality.
- Sexual act without consent would also continue to be a crime under Section 377.

\n

\n\n

## What was SC's rationale?

\n\n

\n

- **Individual** - Bodily autonomy is individualistic as it is a matter of choice and is part of dignity.
- Sexual orientation is biological and innate, as an individual has no control over who they get attracted to.
- Any repression of this by the state will be a violation of free expression.
- **Rights** - Homosexuals, as individuals, have a fundamental right to live with dignity and possess full range of constitutional rights.
- These include sexual orientation, partner choice, equal citizenship and equal protection of laws.
- The State cannot decide the boundaries between what is permissible and not.

\n

\n\n

\n

- **Society** - Section 377 is based on deep-rooted gender stereotypes ingrained in the society.

\n

- It is a majoritarian impulse to subjugate a sexual minority to live in silence.

\n

- But the societal morality cannot override constitutional morality and fundamental rights.

\n

- **Nature** - The verdict noted that homosexuality was documented in 1,500 species and was not unique to humans.

\n

- This firmly dispels the prejudice that homosexuality is "against the order of nature".

\n

- **Right to love** - Section 377 speaks not just about non-procreative sex but also about forms of intimacy.

\n

- This, the court has acknowledged as the 'right to love'.

\n

- But the social order finds some of these 'disturbing'.

\n

- It is the result of limits imposed by structures such as gender, caste, class, religion and community.

\n

- These limits affect the "right to love" of not just the LGBTQ individuals, but of couples who make relationships across caste and community lines.

\n

- **Perception** - The recent parliamentary re-enactment of the Mental Healthcare Act of 2017 was mentioned.

\n

- The present definition in the Act makes it clear that homosexuality is not considered to be a mental illness.

\n

- It is reaffirmed that mental illness shall not be determined on the basis of non-conformity with moral, social, cultural, religious beliefs.

\n

- **Awareness** - The Centre was urged to take all measures to ensure that the judgment is given wide publicity.

\n

- Government was instructed to initiate programmes to reduce and eliminate the stigma against homosexuality.

\n

\n\n

\n

- Government officials and police will have to be given periodic sensitisation campaigns.

\n

\n\n

### **What are the shortcomings?**

\n\n

\n

- How the judgment operates on the ground is yet to be seen as recent orders on triple divorce and lynching have not had visible impact.

\n

- The judgment has opened up grey areas, and new guidelines will be needed.

\n

- e.g Say, a gay individual withdraws “consent” and lodges a complaint against their partner.

\n

- India’s laws on sexual assault do not recognise men as victims of rape. Police will now have to establish the principle of consent.

\n

\n\n

\n\n

**Source: The Hindu**

\n

