ISSN: 2582-5526 www.thevoiceofcreativeresearch.com

The Voice of Creative Research

Vol. 6 & Issue 1 (January 2024)

https://doi.org/10.53032/tvcr/2024.v6n1.07

Research

Reclaiming Equality: A Critical Analysis of Muslim Women's Right to Extra- Judicial Divorce in India

VIJI. S
Assistant Professor of Law,
Government Law College,
Thiruvananthapuram, Kerala, India
Email: Vijisainulabdeen@gmail.com

Abstract

The gender discrimination faced by Indian Muslim women compared to their male counterparts under personal laws dealing with divorce has long been a subject of intense debate. The Constitution of India guarantees equality under Article 14, prohibits discrimination on the ground of sex under Article 15, ensures freedom of speech and expression under Article 19, guarantees the right to life and personal liberty under Article 21, and protects the freedom of religion under Article 25. While Muslim men have traditionally exercised the right to extra-judicial divorce by pronouncing talaq, Muslim women were long presumed to be constrained to approach judicial forums under the Dissolution of Muslim Marriages Act, 1939, and prove specific fault grounds under Section 2 to obtain a decree. However, the Holy Quran—the primary source of Islamic law—and classical Islamic jurisprudence recognize various forms of extra-judicial divorce at the instance of the wife, such as Talaq-e-Tawfeez, Khula, Mubara'at, and Faskh (alongside Ila, Zihar, and Lian), alongside the unilateral divorce rights enjoyed by men. Unfortunately, the Hon'ble High Court of Kerala in K.C. Moyin v. Nafeesa (1975 KLT 786), without fully appreciating Islamic jurisprudence and the constitutional spirit of gender equality, held that after the enactment of the 1939 Act, Muslim women were left with only a restricted right to seek divorce through court under Section 2. After a lapse of over seven decades, the correctness of K.C. Moyin v. Nafeesa was challenged. A Division Bench of the Hon'ble Kerala High Court in X v. Y (2021 (2) KLT 767 / Mat. Appeal No. 89 of 2020) overruled K.C. Moyin, holding that Muslim women possess an absolute, untrammeled right to invoke extra-judicial modes of divorce independent of the 1939 Act. Review petitions filed by Muslim clergy against this decision were subsequently dismissed (2021 KHC 558), reaffirming the constitutional spirit of gender justice. Nevertheless, as a state High Court judgment, its binding force is restricted to Kerala, leaving Muslim women in other parts of India subject to continuing legal ambiguity. Moreover, practical difficulties persist:

administrative authorities (such as passport offices) often refuse to recognize extra-judicial divorces initiated by women, forcing them to approach Family Courts for declaratory decrees. Thus, realizing the full potential of extra-judicial divorce rights for Muslim women remains an ongoing challenge.

Keywords: Khula, Extra-Judicial Divorce, Muslim Personal Law, Dissolution of Muslim Marriage Act 1939, Gender Justice, Islamic Jurisprudence

INTRODUCTION

The debate on gender justice—and more specifically, gender equality under various personal laws in India as compared to Muslim Personal Law—is an unending topic of discussion [Ref 1, 2]. In this article, I attempt to examine the origin and evolution of the right to divorce conferred upon Muslim women, alongside the legislative hindrances enacted during the colonial era that were unfortunately retained even after the commencement of the Constitution.

The Constitution of India—our supreme legislation and a living document upholding the dignity of all citizens—came into force on January 26, 1950. Article 14 of the Constitution declares equality before the law and equal protection of the laws, while Article 15 specifically prohibits discrimination based on religion, race, caste, sex, or place of birth [Ref 3].

Despite these constitutional guarantees, there has been persistent criticism that while Muslim men could resort to extra-judicial divorce by pronouncing unilateral talaq, Muslim women were rendered handicapped [Ref 4]. Women were forced to approach courts under the Dissolution of Muslim Marriages Act, 1939, and prove fault-based conditions (such as adultery, cruelty, or desertion) to obtain a divorce.

Resolving this disparity, the Hon'ble High Court of Kerala, while re-evaluating women's rights in X v. Y (2021 (2) KLT 767), concluded that there are no legal impediments under Mohammadan Law preventing a Muslim woman from resorting to extra-judicial divorce just like her husband [Ref 1].

This article analyzes the extent to which a Muslim woman's right to dissolve a marriage at her choice—without judicial intervention—is protected or unfairly constrained under Indian Personal Laws, keeping in mind the constitutional guarantees of equality and gender justice.

THE EVOLUTION OF DIVORCE & QURANIC FOUNDATIONS

Under Islamic jurisprudence, marriage as a social institution is a solemn covenant. A well-known Hadith recorded in Sunan Abi Dawud highlights: "Among all permitted things, the most detestable in the sight of God is divorce" (Sunan Abi Dawud, Book 13, Hadith 2173) [Ref 5].

Unlike early Hindu, Buddhist, and Jain systems where marriage was primarily viewed as an indissoluble sacrament, a Muslim marriage is a civil contract (Nikah) entered into by parties capable of contracting [Ref 6]. Proposal (Ijab), acceptance (Qubool), and consideration (Mahr) are the essential pillars required to validate a marriage in the presence of witnesses.

Because marriage is fundamentally a contract, provisions exist to dissolve or repudiate it if its terms can no longer be fulfilled. Far from denying women the right to release themselves from marriage, the Holy Quran explicitly establishes equal dignity and reciprocal rights between spouses.

> **HOLY QURAN — SURAH AL-BAQARAH (2:228)**
> *"And women shall have rights similar to the rights against them, according to what is equitable; but men have a degree over them. And Allah is Exalted in Might and Wise."*
> *— Translation: Abdullah Yusuf Ali / Sahih International [Ref 7]*

This verse establishes the foundational legal principle of reciprocal rights (*Ma'roof*). Regarding *Khula* (divorce initiated by the wife by returning or forfeiting dower), the Holy Quran explicitly lays down the framework in Surah Al-Baqarah 2:229:

> **HOLY QURAN — SURAH AL-BAQARAH (2:229) [FOUNDATION OF KHULA]**
> *"A divorce is only permissible twice: after that, the parties should either hold together on equitable terms, or separate with kindness. It is not lawful for you (men) to take back any of your gifts (from your wives), except when both parties fear that they would be unable to keep the limits ordained by Allah. If ye (judges/ community) do indeed fear that they would be unable to keep the limits ordained by Allah, there is no blame on either of them if she gives something for her freedom. These are the limits ordained by Allah; so do not transgress them."*
> *— Translation: Abdullah Yusuf Ali / Sahih International [Ref 7]*

This verse directly validates the right of the wife to buy back her freedom (*ifta'at*) by returning her dower or financial consideration if she fears the marriage can no longer fulfill its sacred obligations. In classical jurisprudence, this was famously enforced in the Hadith of Thabit ibn Qays's wife, Jamila, where Prophet Muhammad (PBUH) instructed Thabit to accept her return of his garden and release her through Khula without requiring any proof of fault or misconduct [Ref 8].

Furthermore, regarding mutual separation and peaceful termination, the Quran states in Surah An-Nisa 4:128:

> **HOLY QURAN — SURAH AN-NISA (4:128) [RECONCILIATION & DISSOLUTION]**
> *"If a woman fears ill-treatment or desertion on her husband's part, there is no blame on them if they arrange an amicable settlement between themselves; and such settlement is best..."*
> *— Translation: Abdullah Yusuf Ali [Ref 7]*

DIFFERENT FORMS OF DIVORCE AT THE OPTION OF THE WIFE

Muslim Personal Law recognizes several extra-judicial and judicial forms of divorce at the instance of the wife. The four major forms under Islamic jurisprudence are:

- **1. Talaq-e-Tawfeez (Delegated Divorce):** Based on the contractual nature of a Muslim marriage, specific clauses or conditions can be incorporated into the marriage deed (Nikahnama). These clauses empower the wife to pronounce talaq upon the husband's failure

to comply with specified conditions (or even unconditionally, if so reserved). Typical conditions include stipulations that the husband shall not take a second wife, shall treat wives equitably, or shall not fail to provide maintenance [Ref 1, 6].

- **2. Khula (Redemption by the Wife):** Khula is the exclusive right of a Muslim wife to release herself from the marriage tie simply because she no longer wishes to remain in the union. She is not required to establish fault or failure on the husband's part. Even a dutiful husband who fulfills all matrimonial obligations falls within the purview of Khula if the wife experiences irreconcilable aversion. In exchange for being released, the wife typically returns her Mahr (dower) as sanctioned under Surah Al-Baqarah 2:229 [Ref 1, 7].
- **3. Mubara'at (Mutual Discharge):** Mubara'at is dissolution by mutual consent where both spouses agree to terminate the marriage because continuing it would cause hardship and agony. It is comparable to mutual consent divorce under Section 13B of the Hindu Marriage Act, 1955, and Section 28 of the Special Marriage Act, 1954 [Ref 1, 9].
- **4. Faskh (Judicial Dissolution/Annulment):** Faskh refers to judicial intervention to decree a dissolution at the instance of the wife through an authority or court. While the above modes are extra-judicial, Faskh historically provided a judicial remedy when an extra-judicial resolution (such as a husband refusing to assent to Khula) could not be finalized directly [Ref 1, 10].

Apart from these primary forms, classical jurisprudence also addresses minor forms of marital separation or abstention, such as Ila (vow of continence), Zihar (injurious assimilation), and Lian (false charge of adultery) [Ref 6, 10].

THE DISSOLUTION OF MUSLIM MARRIAGES ACT, 1939

The gender equality enjoyed by Muslim women in classical Islamic law faced significant restriction during the British colonial period. Following 1857, colonial courts applied British legal concepts to personal law matters [Ref 1, 4]. Influenced by restrictive interpretations, colonial administrators came to view divorce as an exclusive patriarchal right vested in men through Talaq, ignoring the extra-judicial rights conferred on women by Quranic texts.

By the early 20th century, growing demand for social reform led to the passage of the Dissolution of Muslim Marriages Act, 1939 [Ref 10]. The statutory object was to consolidate and clarify the law relating to suits for dissolution of marriage by Muslim women. However, in judicial interpretation, the Act was long misconstrued as having replaced all extra-judicial divorce rights of Muslim women, restricting them strictly to court litigation under Section 2.

Grounds under Section 2 of the 1939 Act:

- • **Clause (i) – Absence of Husband:** Whereabouts unknown for 4 years.
- • **Clause (ii) – Maintenance Failure:** Failure to provide maintenance for 2 years.
- • **Clause (iii) – Imprisonment:** Husband sentenced to imprisonment for 7 years or more.
- • **Clause (iv) – Marital Obligations:** Failure to perform marital obligations for 3 years.
- • **Clause (v) – Impotency:** Husband was impotent at the time of marriage and continues to be so.
- • **Clause (vi) – Insanity/Disease:** Insanity for 2 years, or suffering from leprosy or virulent venereal disease.

- • **Clause (vii) – Option of Puberty:** Marriage contracted before age 15 repudiated before reaching age 18 (provided the marriage was not consummated).
- • **Clause (viii) – Cruelty:** Habitual assault, association with evil repute, forced immorality, property deprivation, or inequitable treatment among co-wives.
- • **Clause (ix) – Other Recognized Grounds:** Any other ground recognized as valid for dissolution under Muslim law.

Important Provisos & Statutory Qualifications:

- • **Under Clause (i):** A decree takes effect only after 6 months; if the husband appears within that period and satisfies the court of his readiness to perform marital duties, the decree is set aside.
- • **Under Clause (iii):** No decree is passed until the prison sentence becomes final.
- • **Under Clause (v):** The court must, on the husband's application, allow 1 year for him to prove he has ceased to be impotent.

POST-CONSTITUTIONAL ERA AND JUDICIAL REFORMS

With the adoption of the Constitution of India in 1950, gender equality was enshrined as a fundamental right under Articles 14 and 15 [Ref 3]. While codification took place for Hindu personal laws in 1955-56, Muslim personal law was left largely uncodified, leading courts to rely on restrictive colonial precedents [Ref 4, 10].

In K.C. Moyin v. Nafeesa (1975 KLT 786), a Single Judge of the Kerala High Court held that a Muslim woman could under no circumstances dissolve her marriage outside the court under the 1939 Act [Ref 11].

This erroneous view stood for 46 years until a Division Bench of the Kerala High Court (Justice A. Muhamed Mustaque and Justice C.S. Dias) in X v. Y (2021 (2) KLT 767 / Mat. Appeal No. 89 of 2020) comprehensively overruled K.C. Moyin v. Nafeesa [Ref 1]. The Court undertook a thorough academic and legal study of the Quran and classical Islamic jurists, holding:

- **1. Absolute Right:** The right of a Muslim woman to invoke extra-judicial modes of divorce (Khula, Talaq-e-Tawfeez, Mubara'at) is an absolute, untrammeled right grounded in Islamic law and the Holy Quran.
- **2. Supplementary Nature of 1939 Act:** The Dissolution of Muslim Marriages Act, 1939, was enacted to extend judicial remedies to women where extra-judicial forms could not be achieved—not to abolish or curtail their pre-existing Quranic rights.

Review petitions filed by clergy challenging this decision were emphatically dismissed in RP No. 365 of 2021 (2021 KHC 558), with the High Court reiterating that a woman's right to Khula is unilateral and does not depend on the husband's consent or court decree, provided she fulfills the requirement of returning dower [Ref 12].

CONCLUSION

The long-standing right of Muslim women to invoke extra-judicial divorce on equal footing with men was formally reaffirmed 71 years after the Constitution came into force. However, because X v. Y is a judgment of the Kerala High Court, its binding authority is restricted to Kerala, serving as persuasive precedent in other Indian states [Ref 1, 12].

Moreover, practical hurdles persist: administrative authorities—such as passport offices and marriage registrars—frequently refuse to record extra-judicial divorces initiated by women through Khula, compelling them to approach Family Courts for declaratory decrees. Realizing the full spirit of gender justice and Quranic equality across India remains an ongoing effort.

References

1. X v. Y (2021 (2) KLT 767 / Mat. Appeal No. 89 of 2020) – Hon'ble High Court of Kerala (Bench comprising Hon'ble Mr. Justice A. Muhamed Mustaque & Hon'ble Mr. Justice C.S. Dias).
2. Shayara Bano v. Union of India & Ors. (2017) 9 SCC 1 – Hon'ble Supreme Court of India (Declaring Unilateral Instant Triple Talaq / Talaq-e-Biddat unconstitutional).
3. The Constitution of India, 1950 – Articles 14 (Equality Before Law), 15 (Prohibition of Sex Discrimination), 19 (Freedom of Expression), 21 (Right to Life & Dignity), and 25 (Freedom of Religion).
4. Fyzee, Asaf A.A., Outlines of Muhammadan Law (5th ed., edited by Tahir Mahmood, Oxford University Press, 2008).
5. Sunan Abi Dawud, Book 13 (Kitab Al-Talaq), Hadith No. 2173: 'The most detestable of lawful things to Allah is divorce.'
6. Mulla, Dinshah Fardunji, Principles of Mahomedan Law (22nd ed., LexisNexis, 2017).
7. The Holy Quran: Text, Translation and Commentary by Abdullah Yusuf Ali (Tahrike Tarsile Quran, 2001); Surah Al-Baqarah (2:228, 2:229) & Surah An-Nisa (4:128).
8. Sahih al-Bukhari, Book 68 (Kitab Al-Talaq), Hadith No. 5273 (Narrated by Ibn 'Abbas regarding the Khula of the wife of Thabit ibn Qays).
9. The Hindu Marriage Act, 1955 (Section 13B) & The Special Marriage Act, 1954 (Section 28) – Statutory provisions for divorce by mutual consent.
10. The Dissolution of Muslim Marriages Act, 1939 (Act No. VIII of 1939) – Section 2 (Grounds for decree for dissolution of marriage).
11. K.C. Moyin v. Nafeesa (1975 KLT 786) – Single Bench decision of Kerala High Court (Overruled by X v. Y (2021)).
12. RP No. 365 of 2021 in Mat. Appeal No. 89 of 2020 (2021 KHC 558) – Order in Review Petition dismissing challenges by Muslim religious organizations.