

SC Verdict on Triple Talaq - II

Click here for Part I

 $n\n$

What is the issue?

 $n\n$

\n

• The recent SC verdict on triple talaq is commendable for undoing the gender injustice.

\n

 However, the judgement failed to address some crucial constitutional questions.

\n

 $n\n$

What are the shortcomings?

 $n\n$

\n

- Codification of personal laws A section of the Muslim Personal Law (Shariat) Application Act of 1937 has already recognised <u>triple talaq</u> as a statutory right and not a fundamental right.
- This brings it under the ambit of Article 13 of the Constitution and thereby providing for constitutional scrutiny.
- Bombay High Court decision in 1951 is often referred by courts to hold that personal laws doesnot come under Article 13.
- If the Supreme Court had held that personal laws are 'laws in force' under Article 13(1), the **problem of discrimination**, **arbitrariness and gender bias in all personal laws** would have been solved.

\n

• However the court has missed on this.

\n

- **Court's jurisdiction** One of the majority judges held that talaq-e-biddat found no mention in the Koran, and was no part of Muslim personal law.
- His judgement was based on the ground that talaq-e-biddat was un-Islamic, rather than unconstitutional.
- This raises the question as to whether secular courts have the jurisdiction to adjudicate on such grounds.
- Individual and community rights The basic unit of the Constitution, as Ambedkar said, is the individual.
- However, the minority judgement has placed community claims above the individual constitutional rights.
- It has advanced the view that religion could become the arbiter of individuals' civil status and civil rights.
- **Constitutional protection** There is a need for distinction between religious rituals and beliefs as against laws relating to tenancy, succession and marriage.

۱n

- This distinction has not been properly conveyed.
- **Gender Discrimination** The Muslim women who challenged triple talaq invoked the Constitution because there was no equivalent within their personal law system.

• The minority judgement denied this opportunity to an individual oppressed and unequally treated by her religious community.

• The value of a Supreme Court judgment lies in the possibilities and avenues that it opens for the future, for further progressive-oriented litigation. \n

 $n\n$

 $n\n$

Source: The Hindu

\n

