

RIGHT TO LOVE



NAVTEJ SINGH JOHAR v. UNION OF INDIA: A TRANSFORMATIVE CONSTITUTION AND THE RIGHTS OF LGBT PERSONS

Published by Alternative Law Forum, Bangalore, India

Page intentionally left blank

RIGHT TO LOVE



NAVTEJ SINGH JOHAR v. UNION OF INDIA: A TRANSFORMATIVE CONSTITUTION AND THE RIGHTS OF LGBT PERSONS

Published by Alternative Law Forum, Bangalore, India

RIGHT TO LOVE

NAVTEJ SINGH JOHAR v. UNION OF INDIA: A TRANSFORMATIVE CONSTITUTION AND THE RIGHTS OF LGBT PERSONS

Published by:	Alternative Law Forum, Bangalore, India
Edition:	September, 2018
Edited by:	Arvind Narrain
Design and Editorial Assistance:	Vinay C
English Edition:	500 copies
Suggested Contribution:	Rs. 100/-
Printing:	National Printing Press, Bangalore

This monograph has been published for the purpose of promoting a better understanding of the Supreme Court of India's Navtej Singh Johar v. Union of India decision delivered by a 5-Judge bench on 6th September 2018. It is solely intended for non-commercial purposes and to enable further research, criticism, and review of the judgment. All materials extracted and reprinted are consistent with fair dealing principles. This volume may be distributed and republished for non-commercial or educational purposes with due attribution.

CONTENTS...1

1. Section 377 Timeline (1994-2018)	5
2. Introduction.....	9
3. Key Aspects of the Judgment	13
3.1 Tonality of the Judgment	13
3.2 Apology.....	14
3.3 Emphasis on Freedom to Choose in the Intimate Sphere	15
3.4 Expansive Interpretation of Privacy and Dignity.....	16
3.5 Recognition of the Right to Love.....	17
3.6 Stereotypical Perceptions of the LGBT persons Violates the Right to Equality and Non-Discrimination....	17
3.7 Constitutional Morality	18
3.8 Idea of Transformative Constitutionalism.....	19
3.9 Principle of Non-Retrogression	21
3.10 Combating Discrimination in Existing Laws including Relationship Recognition.....	21
3.11 Reading Down of Section 377 and its use post the Navtej decision	22
3.12 Responsibilities of different actors	22
3.12.1 The Union of India	22
3.12.2 State Governments	23
3.12.3 Mental health and medical professionals.....	23
3.12.4 Citizens Activists.....	24
4. Judgment by Dipak Misra C.J. and Khanwilkar J.	25

CONTENTS...2

5. Judgment by R.F. Nariman J.	33
6. Judgment by Dr Dhananjaya Y Chandrachud J.	39
7. Judgment by Indu Malhotra J.	57
8. Conclusion	63
9. APPENDICES	
Appendix A: The Law	67
Section 377 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860.....	67
Relevant Constitutional Provisions	67
Appendix B: The Judges	69
Appendix C: The Parties	71
Petitioners	71
Impleadment Applications	71
Respondent	71
Intervenors arguing for Retention of Section 377	72
Appendix D: Arguments	73
Arguments by the Petitioners and Intervenors against Section 377	73
Arguments by the Respondent: The Union of India	75
Arguments by Intervenors arguing for the Retention of Section 377	77
Appendix E: Transcript of Hearings in Navtej Singh Johar v. Union of India	79
10. Acknowledgements	111
11. Bio	112

1. SECTION 377 TIMELINE (1994-2018)

1994	ABVA files petition in Delhi High Court challenging Section 377 and was dismissed for non-prosecution as the group had become defunct.
2001	Naz files petition in Delhi High Court challenging Section 377.
2002	Joint Action Council Kannur (JACK) files an intervention on grounds that the law is required to prevent HIV from spreading.
2003	Government of India affidavit (Ministry of Home) supporting retention of law on grounds that criminal law must reflect public morality and that Indian society disapproved of homosexuality.
2004	The Delhi High Court dismisses petition stating that Naz Foundation was not affected by Section 377 and had no “locus standi” to challenge the law.
2004	The Delhi High Court rejects a review petition filed which challenged the above mentioned order.
2006	Naz Foundation files appeal and the Supreme Court passes order remanding the case back to the Delhi High Court for the matter to be heard on merits.
2006	National Aids Control Organisation (NACO) files an affidavit stating that the enforcement of Section 377 is a hindrance to HIV prevention efforts.
2006	B.P. Singhal files an intervention stating that homosexuality is against Indian culture and that the law needs to be retained.
2006	Voices Against 377 files an intervention supporting the petitioner and stating that Section 377 is violative of the fundamental rights of LGBT persons.

18.09.2008	The matter is posted for final arguments before A.P. Shah and S. Muralidhar.
7.11.2008	The matter is reserved for judgment after 12 days of arguments.
2.07.2009	Judgment in Naz Foundation v. NCR Delhi delivered reading down Section 377 of the IPC to exclude sexual conduct between consenting adults in private.
7.07.2009	First Special Leave Petition (SLP) filed in the Supreme Court by Suresh Kumar Koushal challenging the Naz Foundation judgement
2009	<p>Fifteen other SLPs are filed challenging the Naz Foundation judgment by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Apostolic Churches Alliance v. Naz Foundation & Others. ● S.K. Tijarawala v. Naz Foundation & Others. ● Bhim Singh v. Naz Foundation & Others. ● B. Krishna Bhat v. Naz Foundation & Others. ● B.P. Singhal v. Naz Foundation & Others. ● S.D. Pratinidhi Sabha & Another v. Naz Foundation & Others. ● Delhi Commission for Protection of Child Rights v. Naz Foundation & Others. ● Ram Murti v. Government of NCT of Delhi & Others. ● Krantikari Manuvadi Morcha Party v. Naz Foundation & Others. ● Raza Academy v. Naz Foundation & Others. ● Tamil Nadu Muslim Munnetra Kazhagam v. Naz Foundation & Others.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Utkal Christian Council v. Naz Foundation & Others. ● Joint Action Council Kannur v. Naz Foundation & Others. ● All India Muslim Personal Law Board v. Naz Foundation & Others. ● Trust Gods Ministry vs. Naz Foundation & Others.
2009-2011	<p>Interventions filed supporting the Naz judgement by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Minna Saran and 18 other parents of LGBT persons. ● Dr. Shekhar Seshadri and 12 other mental health professionals. ● Nivedita Menon and fifteen other academics. ● Shyam Benegal (Film Director). ● Ratna Kapur and other legal academics.
13.02.2012	Final Arguments before the Supreme Court commence.
27.03.2012	Reserved for judgment after 15 days of arguments over 6 weeks.
11.12.2013	Supreme Court in Suresh Kumar Koushal reverses Naz and upholds the constitutionality of Section 377 thereby recriminalizing LGBT lives.
28.01.2014	Review petitions filed by the Union of India, Naz Foundation, Voices Against 377 and other petitioners rejected.
3.03.2014	Curative Petitions filed.
15.04.2014	In NALSA v. Union of India, the Court recognises the constitutional rights of transgender persons.

4.04.2014	Court agrees to hear curative petitions in open court
2016	Article 32 petition filed by Navtej Singh Johar arguing that Section 377 violated the right to equality, non-discrimination, privacy and dignity.
24.08.17	In Puttaswamy v. Union of India it was decided that privacy is a fundamental right and it was held that Koushal was a 'discordant note' in the rights jurisprudence of the Supreme Court
2018	Supreme Court lists Navtej Singh Johar as a matter to be heard by a five judge constitutional bench
2018	Additional Article 32 petitions challenging Section 377 filed by Keshav Suri, Avinash Pokkaluri and others (IIT students and alumni), Ashok Row Kavi and others, Arif Jafar and Dr. Akkai Padmashali and others (from transgender communities). Interventions were also filed by Voices Against 377, Minna Saran (representing parents of LGBT persons), Alok Sarin (representing mental health professionals), Nivedita Menon and other academics (representing teachers) and Naz Foundation.
17.07.2018	Final arguments commence in Navtej Singh Johar v. Union of India and after four days of arguments the case is reserved for judgment
6.09.2018	Judgment is pronounced in Navtej Singh Johar v. Union of India reading down Section 377 of the IPC.

2. INTRODUCTION

The 6th of September 2018 marked a historic victory for a vibrant and vociferous LGBT¹ movement, which for over seventeen years had been demanding the repeal of Section 377 of the Indian Penal Code. The Supreme Court in its decision in Navtej Singh Johar v. Union of India, struck down the 1860 law criminalising the lives of LGBT persons.

The decision itself built upon a history of struggle carried out relentlessly across the country which involved pride marches, protests, demonstrations as well as courageous individual acts of LGBT persons coming out in their workplaces, families as well as in the media. It is also important to remember those who contributed so much to the LGBT movement but are no more with us. Our collective efforts have opened out in ways small and big, a space in Indian society for tolerance and acceptance of sexual and gender diversity. The struggle of the last quarter century waged by thousands of people across the country has succeeded in creating a space of visibility and acceptance in Indian society around the loves and lives of the LGBT community.

To recapitulate briefly on some of the legal high points in the struggle against a law of colonial vintage. In 1950, the Indian Constitution came into force with the recognition that all persons had the right

¹ Short-hand for Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender. We have used the terminology adopted by the judges in the operative part of the judgment, while cognisant that there are a range of identities in the Indian context including Intersex, Queer, Hijra and many many more.

to equality, non-discrimination, life and personal liberty (see Appendix A for relevant provisions of the Indian Constitution). The significance of the Constitutional framework was that it gave the community the language of universal human rights, which would apply to all persons without discrimination.

However the Courts never saw fit to apply the constitutional framework to LGBT persons till the ground breaking decision in 2009 by the Delhi High Court in *Naz Foundation v. NCR Delhi*. For the first time, in Indian judicial history, Section 377 was judged against the parameters of the Constitution to find that the provision violated the right to equality, non-discrimination, dignity and privacy of LGBT persons and found Section 377 unconstitutional. In 2013, in *Suresh Kumar Koushal v. Naz Foundation*, in a widely criticised judgment, appositely captured by Vikram Seth as a “bad day for law and love”, a two-judge bench of the Supreme Court recriminalised LGBT lives.

In 2014, the Supreme Court in *NALSA v. Union of India* found that transgender persons were entitled to full rights under the Indian Constitution. In 2017, in *Puttaswamy v. Union of India*, a nine-judge bench’s decision of the Supreme Court found that that the right to privacy was a part of the fundamental rights chapter and that *Suresh Kumar Koushal* was one of the “discordant notes” in the rights jurisprudence of the Supreme Court.

Thus, both legal developments and social developments had made *Suresh Kumar Koushal* increasingly unviable. There was a sea change in the social and public perception of LGBT lives which was perhaps best captured in the contrast between the empathy that the judges who heard *Navtej Singh Johar* showed towards LGBT persons compared to the cruel indifference of the *Koushal* Court. In *Suresh Kumar Koushal*, the judges were adamant that the law criminalised sexual acts and not identities. The judges had contemptuously observed that LGBT persons were anyway a “minuscule minority” whose rights they referred to dismissively as “so-called rights”. The judges who heard *Navtej Singh Johar* were clear that Section 377 affected not only sexual acts but LGBT persons, that the right to privacy and dignity were real rights which applied to LGBT persons and that constitutional

morality mandated that the rights of every minuscule minority were deserving of constitutional protection (see Appendix C for the parties who appeared before the Court, Appendix D for Arguments made during the proceedings, and Appendix E for transcript summary of the proceedings before the Supreme Court).

After four days of hearing, the judgment was delivered on the 6th September 2018.

This short booklet aims to provide a roadmap to this judgment so that its implications can be better understood by LGBT persons as well as all those who are interested in the future of human rights.

The judgment itself is an acknowledgment of the breadth and depth of the LGBT movement and references fact-finding reports, narratives of persecution, academic writing, poetry, literature, philosophy, law, and jurisprudence, weaving these diverse sources together to make an argument that Section 377 is violative of the promise of the Indian Constitution.

We hope to pique the curiosity of the readers so that they go and read the full judgment which is available at the following web address:

https://www.sci.gov.in/supremecourt/2016/14961/14961_2016_Judgement_06-Sep-2018.pdf

For a detailed history of the case, including legal documents, analysis, and media coverage, also visit:

<http://orinam.net/377/> (or) 377.orinam.net

3. KEY ASPECTS OF THE JUDGMENT

The judgment in Navtej Singh Johar, delivered on 6th September 2018, spanned 493 pages and had four concurring judgments authored by Misra C.J.¹ speaking for himself and Khanwilkar J. with concurring judgments by Justices Nariman, Chandrachud and Malhotra (see Appendix B for a brief about the Judges). The Court traversed the fundamental rights protections of the Constitution to find that Section 377 of the Indian Penal Code (IPC) violated LGBT persons rights to dignity, equality, privacy and expression. The judgment itself was widely welcomed both by the LGBT community as well as by other social movements not just for the result, which was a decriminalisation of the intimate lives of LGBT persons, but also for the way the judges reached their conclusion. This section will highlight some of the key aspects of the judgment.

3.1 TONALITY OF THE JUDGMENT

What is most remarkable about the judgment is its tonality. It is not written in the register of cold logic, but with the emotional force of someone who is very moved by witnessing the unconscionable suffering inflicted on LGBT communities. The judges refer to the suffering of Oscar Wilde, Alan Turing, Khairati (the first reported decision on Section 377 which is of the arrest and torture of a transgender person singing in the streets), Nowshirwan (a Parsi shopkeeper arrested

2 C.J. : Chief Justice;
J. : Justice

under Section 377), the poetry of Vikram Seth and the agony of his mother Leila Seth (Vikram Seth's mother).

Chandrachud J. characterizes Section 377 as a “colonial legislation” which has made it criminal for “consenting adults for the same gender to find fulfillment in love”. Chandrachud J. notes that, “the offence under Section 377 of the Penal Code – has continued to exist for nearly sixty eight years after we gave ourselves a liberal constitution. Gays and Lesbians, Transgenders and Bisexuals continue to be denied a truly equal citizenship seven decades after independence”. The effect of legislations such as Section 377 on LGBT lives led him to observe that “civilization has been brutal”.

3.2 APOLOGY

This extended meditation on the suffering imposed upon LGBT persons results in a judicial apology. An apology in essence has two dimensions, namely the acknowledgment of having done a wrong and the expression of a willingness to atone for it. Navtej Singh Johar takes responsibility for having inflicted wrongs and seeks to atone for it.

This sentiment is best captured by Malhotra J. who says, “history owes an apology to the members of this community and their families, for the delay in providing redressal for the ignominy and ostracism that they have suffered through the centuries”.

This is important in the LGBT context, because the response to the unconscionable suffering which has been imposed upon LGBT persons is usually either indifference or pity. Rarely does one come across a judicial response which acknowledges complicity in the oppression and then promises atonement for having caused such suffering.

In *NALSA v. Union of India*, the Supreme Court noted the forms of suffering of the transgender community, but did not go so far as to acknowledge its role in causing the suffering. This resulted in an important judgment, but motivated by pity for the transgender community. However in *Navtej Singh Johar* when the Supreme Court acknowledged the harm that its own historic indifference to the plight

of the LGBT community had caused, it set the stage for a different kind of judgment.

The judgment broadened the ambit of its decision beyond individual petitioners to encompass the suffering of the entire LGBT community. The apology tendered in *Navtej Singh Johar* draws its strength and force from the other important apologies made for causing historic injustice; be it by the German nation to the Jews, by Canada to its indigenous inhabitants, by South African apartheid enforcers to those who suffered under their rule, and by the “regret” expressed by Britain for the spread of anti-sodomy laws in the Commonwealth.

However, an apology only has meaning if one wants to atone for the wrongdoing of the past. An apology is not only about the past but should really provide a pathway to the future. *Navtej Singh Johar* is rooted in a deep sense of responsibility for having been complicit in an egregious form of violation and then seeks to redress the wrong.

As Chandrachud J. puts it, “It is difficult to right the wrongs of history. But we can certainly set the course for the future. That we can do by saying, as I propose to say in this case, that lesbians, gays, bisexuals and transgenders have a constitutional right to equal citizenship in all its manifestations”.

This judgment can be seen as taking four different paths to “right the wrongs of history”. Misra C.J. wrote for himself and Khanwilkar J. Justices Nariman, Chandrachud and Indu Malhotra wrote separate concurring opinions. All justices agreed with the conclusion that Suresh Kumar Koushal was overruled and that Section 377 should be struck down insofar as it criminalised consenting sex between adults. However, they took different routes to arrive at their conclusion and in the process highlighted different aspects of the Constitution and how it applied to the lives of LGBT persons.

3.3 EMPHASIS ON FREEDOM TO CHOOSE IN THE INTIMATE SPHERE

The judges were unequivocal that Section 377 brutally intruded into a zone of intimate decision which is entitled to constitutional protection. As Chandrachud J. put it, “the choice of partner, the desire for personal intimacy and the yearning to find love and fulfillment in

human relationships have a universal appeal” and “the state has no business to intrude into these personal matters. Nor can societal notions of heteronormativity regulate constitutional liberties based on sexual orientation”.

The opinion of Misra J. invokes Johann Wolfgang von Goethe, who had said “I am what I am, so take me as I am” – to stress the right to develop one’s individuality against the demands of social conformity. Particularly in the context of LGBT persons, where the struggle is often to assert one’s personhood, in an isolating, ostracising environment in which heterosexuality is the norm, this constitutional protection given to intimate choices against the dictates of societal conformity cannot be overstated.

3.4 EXPANSIVE INTERPRETATION OF PRIVACY AND DIGNITY

The judges followed the ruling in *Puttaswamy v. Union of India*, which gave an expansive interpretation of privacy as not just meaning the right to do what one wants in the privacy of one’s home but also encompassing the right to make decisions about who one chooses to be intimate with. As Malhotra J. put it, “the right to privacy is not simply the ‘right to be let alone’, and has travelled far beyond the initial concept. It now incorporates the ideas of spatial privacy, and decisional privacy or privacy of choice”. Chandrachud J. addresses the concern that privacy is only about granting protection to acts behind closed doors, by stating that, “It must be acknowledged that members belonging to sexual minorities are often subjected to harassment in public spaces. The right to sexual privacy, founded on the right to autonomy of a free individual, must capture the right of persons of the community to navigate public places on their own terms, free from state interference”.

The question of privacy of choice was closely linked to the question of dignity. The sphere of dignity includes, “the right to carry such function and activities as would constitute the meaningful expression of the human self”. As per Misra C.J. if the freedom to exercise one’s choice of partner is curtailed it impacts an individual’s sense of dignity. Since Section 377 chills one’s ability to express oneself, especially in matters

so integral to selfhood, it impinges upon the sense of dignity of LGBT persons.

3.5 RECOGNITION OF THE RIGHT TO LOVE

In an evocative section, Chandrachud J. quotes Leila Seth C.J. to make the point that “what makes life meaningful is love”. The right to love emerges as a key aspect of the judgment with Chandrachud J. recognizing that, “the right to love and to find a partner, to find fulfilment in a same-sex relationship is essential to a society which believes in freedom under the constitutional order based on rights”. The right to love has elements of autonomy and dignity and the defence of the right to love is rooted in the notion of constitutional morality and the idea of a transformative constitution. When we say “constitutional morality” we mean that the values of the Constitution committed to protecting the dignity and autonomy of the individual should prevail over “social morality”, which in this context is essentially public disapproval or disgust of individual choices or identities. Further, our Constitution mandates that society must transform in the direction of greater respect for autonomy, dignity and choice of the individual, including in matters of whom one chooses to love.

Thus, the right to love has profound implications in a society in which love across lines of caste and religion are deeply transgressive. “The right to love” has the potential to disturb rigid social moralities and helps us to begin questioning the structures which keep in place the rigid hierarchies of Indian society be it on the lines of caste, religion, gender or sex. In fact Chandrachud J. appositely called “the right to love not just a separate battle for LGBT individuals but a battle for us all”.

3.6 STEREOTYPICAL PERCEPTIONS OF THE LGBT PERSON VIOLATES THE RIGHT TO EQUALITY AND NON-DISCRIMINATION

The judges were also clear that the guarantee of equality at its heart was the guarantee of equal citizenship. The criminalising ambit of Section 377 violated this guarantee as it “singles out people, by their private choices and marks them as ‘less than citizens – or less than human’”.

The harm of Section 377 is not just that it prohibits a form of intimate and personal choice but that it encodes a stereotypical morality which has deep ranging social effects. As Chandrachud J. put it, Section 377 “perpetuates a certain culture” based on “homophobic attitudes”, which make “it impossible for victims to access justice”. Stereotypes about the LGBT community are widespread and pervasive and it is these stereotypical perceptions that are responsible for the hatred, violence and discrimination faced by LGBT persons on a day-to-day basis.

One of the reasons for Section 377 being declared as unconstitutional is that it fosters prejudice against LGBT persons. This argument expands the scope of the anti-discrimination provision in Article 15 of the Constitution (see Appendix A for the text of Article 15).

The analysis of the equality guarantee is very important as while Navtej Singh Johar sees decriminalisation as an important assertion of “full moral citizenship”, it is the first step in the journey towards full equality of LGBT persons. As Chandrachud J. put it, “Decriminalisation is of course necessary to bury the ghosts of morality which flourished in a radically different age and time. But decriminalisation is a first step. The constitutional principles on which it is based have application to a broader range of entitlements”.

3.7 CONSTITUTIONAL MORALITY

This constitutional guarantee of the right to develop one’s personhood and the right to equal citizenship is firmly anchored in the notion of constitutional morality as referenced by Justices Misra, Nariman and Chandrachud. The denial of the right to dignity of LGBT persons is incompatible with the morality of the Constitution. As Chandrachud J. put it, “there is an unbridgeable divide between the moral values on which it [Section 377] is based and the values of the Constitution”.

The idea of “constitutional morality”, the judges derive from Ambedkar. In the Constituent Assembly, Ambedkar famously said that, “constitutional morality is not a natural sentiment. It has to be cultivated. We must realize that our people have yet to learn it”. The fact that “our people” have yet to imbibe constitutional morality leads

Ambedkar to the conclusion that, “Democracy in India is only a top-dressing on an Indian soil, which is essentially undemocratic”.

Constitutional morality is thus an ideal, rooted in the Constitution and Indian society must transform to bring social morality into conformity with the constitutional ideals of respect for the dignity and autonomy of all its citizens. The judiciary, the executive, the legislature, and the citizens must all work towards achieving this ideal of “constitutional morality”. The judgment in Navtej Singh Johar is one step in this journey of ensuring that social morality conforms to constitutional morality.

The idea that majority opinion should prevail over the right to dignity and liberty of the minority is explicitly rejected. As Nariman J. put it, “it is not left to majoritarian governments to prescribe what shall be orthodox in matters concerning social morality”.

By explicitly setting out the Court as a guarantor of minority rights, regardless of the opinion of “popular or legislative majorities”, the Court signals its determination to defend the Constitution. In a time when lynchings have become the order of the day and the government remains a mute spectator, the role that the Courts have to play in safeguarding the right to life of minorities of all stripes and hues cannot be overstated.

It should be noted that citizens too have a role to play in achieving a society based on constitutional morality. As Chandrachud J. put it, “Constitutional morality requires that all the citizens need to understand and imbibe the broad values of the Constitution”. The role of the Constitution is to produce “a social catharsis” and that “the ability of a society to survive as a free society will depend upon whether constitutional values can prevail over the impulses of the time”.

3.8 IDEA OF TRANSFORMATIVE CONSTITUTIONALISM

The logic of Navtej Singh Johar is anchored within what both Misra C.J. and Chandrachud J. call ‘a transformative constitution’. According to Misra C.J., “the purpose of having a constitution is to transform society’ to ‘embrace therein”, the “ideals of justice, liberty, equality

and fraternity”. The mandate to transform society in allegiance to the constitution is a task vested in the state, the judiciary, and in the citizen.

The mandate of a “transformative constitution” vested in the state, civil society, and the judiciary—and as Misra C.J. put it—is to make Indian society “more pluralistic and inclusive”. The Indian Constitution is not a status quoist document, but rather in Chandrachud J.’s words, “an essay in the acceptance of diversity” and “founded on a vision of an inclusive society which accommodates plural ways of life”.

The fact that the Constitution must transform and democratise relations in society, be it between dominant caste and oppressed caste, man and woman, as well as majorities and minorities of every stripe and hue is key to any understanding of the Constitution. If the deeply hierarchical relationships in society are not challenged and transformed, democracy would be meaningless and the Constitution would be mere words on paper.

This insight flows from Ambedkar who (cited by Chandrachud J.) famously said that “Without fraternity, liberty [and] equality could not become a natural course of things. It would require a constable to enforce them...Without fraternity equality and liberty will be no deeper than coats of paint”.

Unless one builds a society based on fraternal and egalitarian relations by combatting the divisions of caste, religion, gender and sexuality, the Constitutional promise of equal citizenship will remain a mirage. The Constitution mandates that we collectively build such a society.

If the idea of a “transformative constitution” is applied to the challenge to Section 377, then there is still a lot of work to be done post this remarkable judgment. If a law has taken root in our social, cultural, and a legal consciousness, the challenge of eliminating the prejudice which the law has fostered is still immense. One has to only think of the prejudice and violence still being faced at the hands of the state and society by “denotified” tribes even post the repeal of the colonial era Criminal Tribes Act in 1948.

It is this immense task of combatting the prejudicial attitudes which were encoded in Section 377 which has to continue. Nariman J. was

cognisant of this challenge and mandated the Union of India to give “wide publicity to the judgment” and conduct “sensitization and awareness training for government officials and in particular police officials in the light of observations contained in the judgment”.

While Nariman J. emphasises the role of the Union government in combatting prejudice and stereotypes in accordance with the principles of the judgment, Chandrachud J. issues an important plea to civil society to continue to work to combat prejudices and realise full equality for LGBT persons in line with the mandate of a transformative Constitution.

3.9 PRINCIPLE OF NON-RETROGRESSION

As a pre-emptive warning to the forces which may seek to overturn the judgment, Misra C.J., outlines the doctrine of non-retrogression according to which, “the State should not take measures or steps that deliberately lead to retrogression on the enjoyment of rights either under the Constitution or otherwise”. In simple terms, the principle of non-retrogression means that rights once recognised cannot be taken away. The Court is asserting that Suresh Kumar Koushal was wrong because it took away a right which had been recognized by the Delhi High Court’s Naz Foundation judgment and implicitly stating that if one were to apply the principle of non-retrogression, Navtej Singh Johar cannot be reversed.

3.10 COMBATTING DISCRIMINATION IN EXISTING LAWS INCLUDING RELATIONSHIP RECOGNITION

One of the pathways to the future lies in the findings that discrimination against LGBT persons is a violation of the Constitutional guarantee of equality of all persons and non-discrimination on grounds of sex. On the question of recognition of same-sex partnerships and marriage Chandrachud J. is clear that the direction of comparative law leads to the conclusion that, “the law cannot discriminate against same-sex relationships. It must also take positive steps to achieve equal protection”. Chandrachud J. indicates that the court may be “inclined to concur with the accumulated wisdom reflected in these judgments”.

3.11 READING DOWN SECTION 377 AND ITS USE POST THE NAVTEJ SINGH JOHAR V. UNION OF INDIA DECISION

It is important to note that the judges did not strike down Section 377 in its entirety but rather noted that it would no more apply to “consenting sex between adults”. This means that Section 377 will continue to apply with respect to non-consensual sex between adults as well as any sex between an adult and a child regardless of consent.

With respect to the declaration of reading down as Malhotra J. observes:

The declaration of the aforesaid reading down of Section 377 shall not, however, lead to the re-opening of any concluded prosecutions, but can certainly be relied upon in all pending matters whether they are at the trial, appellate, or revisional stages.

3.12 RESPONSIBILITIES OF DIFFERENT ACTORS

3.12.1 THE UNION OF INDIA

The Union of India took the position that it would leave the matter of the “constitutional validity [of] Section 377 to the extent it applies to ‘consensual acts of adults in private’ to the wisdom of the Court”. The position of the Union of India was castigated by Chandrachud J. who noted that, “we would have appreciated a categorical statement of position by the government, setting out its views on the validity of Section 377 and on the correctness of Koushal... The statement of the Union government does not concede to the contention of the petitioners that the statutory provision is invalid”.

The point being made by Chandrachud J. is that in a matter involving the constitutional rights of a section of the population, no government bound by the Constitution should have taken the position of “leaving matters to the wisdom of the court”.

The Union Government has not shown that it is open to being educated by the Court. Even though the Indian National

Congress, CPM, and CPI(ML) have welcomed the judgment, the Union Government has maintained a stony silence. This is particularly troubling as the Union Government has a heavy responsibility in taking forward the mandate of the judgment to educate both its officers as well as the general public in the principles of constitutional morality and the rights to equality, privacy and dignity as it applies to LGBT persons.

As a necessary first step, Nariman J. ordered, the “Union of India shall take all measures to ensure that this judgment is given wide publicity through the public media, which includes television, radio, print and online media at regular intervals, and initiate programs to reduce and finally eliminate the stigma associated with such persons. Above all, all government officials, including and in particular police officials, and other officers of the Union of India and the States, be given periodic sensitization and awareness training of the plight of such persons in the light of the observations contained in this judgment”.

3.12.2 STATE GOVERNMENTS

While the responsibilities of the state government are not specifically addressed, one can note that the Constitutional responsibility to combat violence and discrimination against LGBT persons vests also in State Governments. The State Governments too must undertake a popularisation of the judgment in all media and also ensure that circulars are issued by their respective Director General of Police (DGP) to ensure that no cases are registered under Section 377 against consenting adults.

3.12.3 MENTAL HEALTH AND MEDICAL PROFESSIONALS

Three out of the five judges systematically reference the role of the medical profession in addressing the rights of the LGBT population. Chandrachud J. notes that “mental health professionals can take this change in the law as an opportunity to re-examine their own views of homosexuality”. He notes that, “medical practice must share the responsibility to help

individuals, families, workplaces and educational and other institutions to understand sexuality completely in order to facilitate the creation of a society free from discrimination where LGBT individuals like all other citizens are treated with equal standards of respect and value for human rights”.

Mental health practitioners should also ensure that their practice is in conformity with the law as laid down by the Supreme Court judgment.

3.12.4 CITIZEN ACTIVISTS

Citizen activists also have a role to play in the transformation of Indian society in line with the concepts of “constitutional morality”. As Chandrachud J. notes, “Constitutional morality requires that all the citizens need to have a closer look at, understand and imbibe the broad values of the Constitution, which are based on liberty, equality and fraternity. Constitutional morality is thus the guiding spirit to achieve the transformation which above all, the Constitution seeks to achieve”.

4. JUDGMENT BY DIPAK MISRA , C.J. AND KHANWILKAR, J.

The judgment began by quoting the great German thinker, Johann Wolfgang von Goethe who had said, "*I am what I am, so take me as I am*". The judgment also quoted Arthur Schopenhauer who had said "*No one can escape from their individuality.*" (para 1)

The judges go on to emphasise the importance of individuality:

The emphasis on the unique being of an individual is the salt of his/her life. Denial of self-expression is inviting death. Irreplaceability of individuality and identity is grant of respect to self. This realization is one's signature and self-determined design. One defines oneself. That is the glorious form of individuality. (para 1)

A person belonging to the said community does not become an alien to the concept of individual and his individualism cannot be viewed with a stigma. The impact of sexual orientation on an individual's life is not limited to their intimate lives but also impacts their family, professional, social and educational life. (para 16)

Referring to the Indian Constitution, under a sub-heading "The Constitution – an organic charter of progressive rights", the judges note:

A democratic Constitution like ours is an organic and breathing document with senses which are very much alive to its surroundings, for it has been created in such a manner that

it can adapt to the needs and developments taking place in the society. (para 83)

This guarantee of recognition of individuality runs through the entire length and breadth of this dynamic instrument. (para 86)

Under a sub-heading titled, “Transformative constitutionalism and the rights of LGBT community”, the judges note:

The ultimate goal of our magnificent Constitution is to make right the upheaval which existed in the Indian society before the adopting of Constitution.....Therefore the purpose of having a constitution is to transform the society for the better and this objective is the fundamental pillar of transformative constitutionalism. (para 95)

The concept of transformative constitutionalism has at its kernel a pledge, promise and thirst to transform the Indian society so as to embrace therein, in letter and spirit, the ideals of justice, liberty, equality and fraternity as set out in the Preamble to our Constitution. (para 96)

The society has changed much now, not just from the year 1860 when the Indian Penal Code was brought into force but there has also been continuous progressive change. In many spheres, the sexual minorities have been accepted. They have been given space after the NALSA judgment but the offence punishable under Section 377 IPC, as submitted, creates a chilling effect. The freedom that is required to be attached to sexuality still remains in the pavilion with no nerves to move. The immobility due to fear corrodes the desire to express one’s own sexual orientation as a consequence of which the body with flesh and bones feels itself caged and a sense of fear gradually converts itself into a skeleton sans spirit. (para 106)

Misra C.J. indicates that the court has played a pro-active role in taking forward the idea of a “transformative constitution” through its decisions such as NALSA v. Union of India, implying that the removal of Section 377 would be in line with this vision.

In a section titled, “Constitutional morality and Section 377 IPC” the judges note:

The concept of constitutional morality is not limited to the mere observance of the core principles of constitutionalism as the magnitude and sweep of constitutional morality is not confined to the provisions and literal text which a Constitution contains, rather it embraces within itself virtues of a wide magnitude such as that of ushering a pluralistic and inclusive society, while at the same time adhering to the other principles of constitutionalism. It is further the result of embodying constitutional morality that the values of constitutionalism trickle down and percolate through the apparatus of the State for the betterment of each and every individual citizen of the State. (para 111)

The society as a whole or even a minuscule part of the society may aspire and prefer different things for themselves. They are perfectly competent to have such a freedom to be different, like different things, so on and so forth, provided that their different tastes and liking remain within their legal framework and neither violates any statute nor results in the abridgement of fundamental rights of any other citizen. (para 115)

It is the responsibility of all the three organs of the State to curb any propensity or proclivity of popular sentiment or majoritarianism. Any attempt to push and shove a homogeneous, uniform, consistent and a standardised philosophy throughout the society would violate the principle of constitutional morality. Devotion and fidelity to constitutional morality must not be equated with the popular sentiment prevalent at a particular point of time. (para 116)

Any asymmetrical attitude in the society, so long as it is within the legal and constitutional framework, must at least be provided an environment in which it could be sustained, if not fostered. It is only when such an approach is adopted that the freedom of expression including that of choice would be allowed to prosper and flourish and if that is achieved, freedom

and liberty, which is the quintessence of constitutional morality, will be allowed to survive. (para 117)

We may hasten to add here that in the context of the issue at hand, when a penal provision is challenged as being violative of the fundamental rights of a section of the society, notwithstanding the fact whether the said section of the society is a minority or a majority, the magna cum laude and creditable principle of constitutional morality, in a constitutional democracy like ours where the rule of law prevails, must not be allowed to be trampled by obscure notions of social morality which have no legal tenability. The concept of constitutional morality would serve as an aid for the Court to arrive at a just decision which would be in consonance with the constitutional rights of the citizens, howsoever small that fragment of the populace may be. The idea of number, in this context, is meaningless; like zero on the left side of any number. (para 120)

In the garb of social morality, the members of the LGBT community must not be outlawed or given a step-motherly treatment of malefactor by the society. If this happens or if such a treatment to the LGBT community is allowed to persist, then the constitutional courts, which are under the obligation to protect the fundamental rights, would be failing in the discharge of their duty. A failure to do so would reduce the citizenry rights to a cipher. (para 122)

We must not forget that the founding fathers adopted an inclusive Constitution with provisions that not only allowed the State, but also, at times, directed the State, to undertake affirmative action to eradicate the systematic discrimination against the backward sections of the society and the expulsion and censure of the vulnerable communities by the so-called upper caste/sections of the society that existed on a massive scale prior to coming into existence of the Constituent Assembly. These were nothing but facets of the majoritarian social morality which were sought to be rectified by bringing into force the Constitution of India. Thus, the adoption

of Constitution, was, in a way, an instrument or agency for achieving constitutional morality and means to discourage the prevalent social morality at that time. A country or a society which embraces constitutional morality has at its core the well-founded idea of inclusiveness (para 123)

In a section titled, "Perspective of human dignity", the judges note:

When biological expression, be it an orientation or optional expression of choice, is faced with impediment, albeit through any imposition of law, the individual's natural and constitutional right is dented. Such a situation urges the conscience of the final constitutional arbiter to demolish the obstruction and remove the impediment so as to allow the full blossoming of the natural and constitutional rights of individuals. This is the essence of dignity and we say, without any inhibition, that it is our constitutional duty to allow the individual to behave and conduct himself/herself as he/she desires and allow him/her to express himself/herself, of course, with the consent of the other. That is the right to choose without fear. It has to be ingrained as a necessary pre-requisite that consent is the real fulcrum of any sexual relationship. (para 132)

In a section titled, "Privacy and its concomitant aspects", the judges overrule Suresh Kumar Koushal v. Naz Foundation citing Puttaswamy v. Union of India:

Regarding the view in Suresh Koushal's case to the effect that the Delhi High Court in Naz Foundation case had erroneously relied upon international precedents in its anxiety to protect the so-called rights of LGBT persons, the nine-Judge Bench [in Puttaswamy] was of the opinion that the aforesaid view in Suresh Koushal (supra) was unsustainable. The rights of the lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender population, as per the decision in Puttaswamy (supra), cannot be construed to be "so-called rights" as the expression "so-called" seems to suggest the exercise of liberty in the garb of a right which is illusory. (para 164)

The judges went on to expressly overrule Suresh Kumar Koushal:

The observation made in Suresh Koushal (supra) that gays, lesbians, bisexuals and transgenders constitute a very minuscule part of the population is perverse due to the very reason that such an approach would be violative of the equality principle enshrined under Article 14 of the Constitution. The mere fact that the percentage of population whose fundamental right to privacy is being abridged by the existence of Section 377 in its present form is low does not impose a limitation upon this Court from protecting the fundamental rights of those who are so affected by the present Section 377 IPC. (para 169)

In a section titled, “Progressive realization of rights” the judges note:

The doctrine of progressive realization of rights, as a natural corollary, gives birth to the doctrine of non-retrogression. As per this doctrine, there must not be any regression of rights. In a progressive and an ever-improving society, there is no place for retreat. The society has to march ahead. (para 188)

The doctrine of non-retrogression sets forth that the State should not take measures or steps that deliberately lead to retrogression on the enjoyment of rights either under the Constitution or otherwise. (para 189)

The aforesaid two doctrines lead us to the irresistible conclusion that if we were to accept the law enunciated in Suresh Koushal's case, it would definitely tantamount to a retrograde step in the direction of the progressive interpretation of the Constitution and progressive realization of rights. It is because Suresh Koushal's view gets wrongly embedded with the minuscule facet and assumes criminality on the bedrock being guided by a sense of social morality. It discusses about health which is no more a phobia and is further moved by the popular morality while totally ignoring the concepts of privacy, individual choice and the orientation. Orientation, in certain senses, does get the neuro-impulse to express while seeing the other gender. That apart, swayed by data, Suresh Koushal fails to appreciate

that the sustenance of fundamental rights does not require majoritarian sanction. Thus, the ruling becomes sensitively susceptible. (para 190)

In a section titled, “The litmus test for survival of Section 377”, the judges note:

In view of the above authorities, we have no hesitation to say that Section 377 IPC, in its present form, abridges both human dignity as well as the fundamental right to privacy and choice of the citizenry, howsoever small. As sexual orientation is an essential and innate facet of privacy, the right to privacy takes within its sweep the right of every individual including that of the LGBT to express their choices in terms of sexual inclination without the fear of persecution or criminal prosecution. (para 229)

Further, Section 377 IPC fails to take into account that consensual sexual acts between adults in private space are neither harmful nor contagious to the society. On the contrary, Section 377 trenches a discordant note in respect of the liberty of persons belonging to the LGBT community by subjecting them to societal pariah and dereliction. Needless to say, the Section also interferes with consensual acts of competent adults in private space. Sexual acts cannot be viewed from the lens of social morality or that of traditional precepts wherein sexual acts were considered only for the purpose of procreation. This being the case, Section 377 IPC, so long as it criminalises consensual sexual acts of whatever nature between competent adults, is manifestly arbitrary. (para 239)

That apart, any display of affection amongst the members of the LGBT community towards their partners in the public so long as it does not amount to indecency or has the potentiality to disturb public order cannot be bogged down by majority perception. Section 377 IPC amounts to unreasonable restriction as it makes carnal intercourse between consenting adults within their castle a criminal offence which is manifestly

not only overboard and vague but also has a chilling effect on an individual's freedom of choice. (para 246)

In view of the test laid down in the aforesaid authorities, Section 377 IPC does not meet the criteria of proportionality and is violative of the fundamental right of freedom of expression including the right to choose a sexual partner. Section 377 IPC also assumes the characteristic of unreasonableness, for it becomes a weapon in the hands of the majority to seclude, exploit and harass the LGBT community. It shrouds the lives of the LGBT community in criminality and constant fear mars their joy of life. They constantly face social prejudice, disdain and are subjected to the shame of being their very natural selves. Thus, an archaic law which is incompatible with constitutional values cannot be allowed to be preserved. (para 247)

In a section titled "Conclusions", the judges note:

(xiii) Section 377 IPC, in its present form, being violative of the right to dignity and the right to privacy, has to be tested, both, on the pedestal of Articles 14 and 19 of the Constitution as per the law laid down in Maneka Gandhi (supra) and other later authorities.

(xvi) An examination of Section 377 IPC on the anvil of Article 19(1)(a) reveals that it amounts to an unreasonable restriction, for public decency and morality cannot be amplified beyond a rational or logical limit and cannot be accepted as reasonable grounds for curbing the fundamental rights of freedom of expression and choice of the LGBT community. Consensual carnal intercourse among adults, be it homosexual or heterosexual, in private space, does not in any way harm the public decency or morality. Therefore, Section 377 IPC in its present form violates Article 19(1)(a) of the Constitution. (para 253)

5. JUDGMENT BY R.F. NARIMAN J.

Nariman J. began by remembering Oscar Wilde:

“The love that dare not speak its name” is how the love that exists between same-sex couples was described by Lord Alfred Douglas, the lover of Oscar Wilde, in his poem Two Loves published in 1894 in Victorian England. (para 1)

Then Nariman J. goes into the history of Section 377 tracing its origins from the Buggery Act of 1533 in England to the Draft Penal Code by Macaulay to Section 377 of the Indian Penal Code.

Nariman J. then referenced the process of decriminalisation in Britain with the important landmark being the Wolfenden Committee in 1957 which recommended decriminalisation for the following reasons:

But moral conviction or instinctive feeling, however strong, is not a valid basis for overriding the individual’s privacy and for bringing within the ambit of the criminal law private sexual behaviour of this kind. (para 24)

Unless a deliberate attempt is to be made by society, acting through the agency of the law, to equate the sphere of crime with that of sin, there must remain a realm of private morality and immorality which is, in brief and crude terms, not the law’s business. (para 27)

It was only ten years after the Wolfenden Committee Report that, through the Sexual Offences Act, 1967, penal offences involving consenting adults was finally abolished. Nariman J. went on to trace

the legal developments resulting in decriminalisation both in Europe and the USA. He then referenced the striking down of the sodomy law in Trinidad, Fiji, Australia and South Africa.

Nariman J. referred in detail to the following Indian cases, all of which are the building blocks on which the edifice of Navtej Singh Johar was erected. The legal foundation on which Navtej Singh Johar rested included the following key decisions of the Supreme Court:

National Legal Services Authority v. Union of India, which dealt with the ‘trauma, agony and pain of the transgender community’ and Nariman J. specifically referred to the ‘unusual final order’ of the Court.

Puttaswamy v. Union of India, which declared privacy to be a fundamental right and the opinion of Chandrachud J. who had noted that Suresh Kumar Koushal was ‘another discordant note’ which impinges on the idea that ‘privacy is intrinsic to freedom and liberty’.

Shafin Jahan v. Asokan, which dealt with the right of an adult to make her own marital choice as well as to choose her own religion. The Court in this case held that, ‘choosing a faith is the substratum of individuality and sans it, the right to choice becomes a shadow’ and went on to note that ‘social values and morals have their space but they are not above the constitutionally guaranteed freedom’.

ShaktiVahini v. Union of India, which dealt with honour killing and in which the court held that, ‘honour killings guillotines individual liberty, freedom of choice and ones one perception of choice. It has to be sublimely borne in mind that when two adults consensually choose each other as life partners, it is a manifestation of their choice, which is recognized under Article 19 and 21 of the Constitution.’

Nariman J. then referenced the enactment of the Mental Healthcare Act, 2017 to indicate that parliament is also alive to “privacy interests and the fact that persons of the same sex who cohabit with each other are entitled to equal treatment”.

A recent enactment, namely the Mental Healthcare Act, 2017, throws a great deal of light on recent parliamentary legislative understanding and acceptance of constitutional values as reflected by this Court's judgments. Section 2(s) of the Act defines mental illness, which reads as under: "2(s) "mental illness" means a substantial disorder of thinking, mood, perception, orientation or memory that grossly impairs judgment, behaviour, capacity to recognise reality or ability to meet the ordinary demands of life, mental conditions associated with the abuse of alcohol and drugs, but does not include mental retardation which is a condition of arrested or incomplete development of mind of a person, specially characterised by subnormality of intelligence;" (para 67)

This definition throws to the winds all earlier misconceptions of mental illness including the fact that same- sex couples who indulge in anal sex are persons with mental illness. At one point of time, the thinking in Victorian England and early on in America was that homosexuality was to be considered as a mental disorder. (para 68)

Nariman J. refers to the Indian Psychiatric Society's statement of 2nd July, 2018 where it recognizes same-sex sexuality as a normal variant of human sexuality and states that there is no scientific evidence that sexual orientation can be altered by any treatment and that any such attempt may in fact lead to low self-esteem and stigmatization of the person.

Nariman J. concludes that:

The present definition of mental illness in the 2017 Parliamentary statute makes it clear that homosexuality is not considered to be a mental illness. This is a major advance in our law which has been recognized by the Parliament itself. (para 72)

More importantly, mental illness shall not be determined on the basis of non-conformity with moral, social, cultural, work or political values or religious beliefs prevailing in a person's

community. It is thus clear that Parliament has unequivocally declared that the earlier stigma attached to same-sex couples, as persons who are regarded as mentally ill, has gone for good. This is another very important step forward taken by the legislature itself which has undermined one of the basic underpinnings of the judgment in Suresh Kumar Koushal. (para 73)

Nariman J. quotes from *S. Khushboo v. Kanniammal*, a 2010 decision of the Supreme Court that quashed multiple criminal charges against the Tamil actress Khushboo for making a statement that Tamil women have pre-marital sex. Nariman J. relies on the Khushboo decision to state that notions of societal morality are inherently subjective and that the criminal law cannot be used as a means to unduly interfere with the domain of personal autonomy.

Morality and criminality are not co-extensive - sin is not punishable on earth by Courts set up by the State but elsewhere; crime alone is punishable on earth. To confuse the one with the other is what causes the death knell of Section 377, insofar as it applies to consenting homosexual adults. (para 80)

Nariman J. then references the notion of constitutional morality. This is again a key element common to three out of four judgments. Constitutional morality dictates that majority opinion cannot be the basis for deciding on whether minorities are entitled to enjoy constitutional rights:

Victorian morality must give way to constitutional morality as has been recognized in many of our judgments. Constitutional morality is the soul of the Constitution, which is to be found in the Preamble of the Constitution, which declares its ideals and aspirations, and is also to be found in Part III of the Constitution, particularly with respect to those provisions which assure the dignity of the individual. The rationale for Section 377, namely Victorian morality, has long gone and there is no reason to continue with a law merely for the sake of continuing with the

law when the rationale of the law has long since disappeared.
(para 78)

The very purpose of the fundamental rights chapter in the Constitution of India is to withdraw the subject of liberty and dignity of the individual and place such subject beyond the reach of majoritarian governments so that constitutional morality can be applied by this Court to give effect to the rights, among others, of 'discrete and insular' minorities. One such minority has knocked on the doors of this Court as this Court is the custodian of the fundamental rights of citizens. These fundamental rights do not depend upon the outcome of elections. And, it is not left to majoritarian governments to prescribe what shall be orthodox in matters concerning social morality. The fundamental rights chapter is like the north star in the universe of constitutionalism in India. Constitutional morality always trumps any imposition of a particular view of social morality by shifting and different majoritarian regimes.
(para 81)

Nariman J. relies on the Supreme Court's decision in Shayara Bano in 2017 where it held that a statutory provision could be struck down on the ground of manifest arbitrariness when the provision is capricious, irrational or without adequate determining principle, as also if it was excessive or disproportionate. Nariman J. states that Section 377 is capricious and irrational as modern psychiatric studies show that LGBT persons are normal and should not be penalised.

Nariman J. expressly overrules Suresh Kumar Koushal after critiquing its logic:

The fact that only a minuscule fraction of the country's population constitutes lesbians and gays or transgenders, and that in the last 150 years less than 200 persons have been prosecuted for committing the offence under Section 377, is neither here nor there. When it is found that privacy interests come in and the State has no compelling reason to continue an existing law which penalizes same-sex couples who cause no harm to others, on an application of the recent judgments

delivered by this Court after Suresh Kumar Koushal (supra), it is clear that Articles 14, 15, 19 and 21 have all been transgressed without any legitimate state rationale to uphold such provision. (para 95)

For all these reasons therefore, we are of the view that, Suresh Kumar Koushal needs to be and is hereby overruled. (para 96)

Nariman J. concludes with a series of directions to the Union Government:

We are also of the view that the Union of India shall take all measures to ensure that this judgment is given wide publicity through the public media, which includes television, radio, print and online media at regular intervals, and initiate programs to reduce and finally eliminate the stigma associated with such persons. Above all, all government officials, including and in particular police officials, and other officers of the Union of India and the States, be given periodic sensitization and awareness training of the plight of such persons in the light of the observations contained in this judgment. (para 98)

6. JUDGMENT BY DR. DHANANJAYA Y CHANDRACHUD, J.

Chandrachud J. begins his judgement by quoting Leila Seth C.J. (retired) who penned a heartfelt critique of the harm of Suresh Kumar Koushal on the same day that the review petition was rejected:

What makes life meaningful is love. The right that makes us human is the right to love. To criminalize the expression of that right is profoundly cruel and inhumane. To acquiesce in such criminalization, or worse, to recriminalize it, is to display the very opposite of compassion. To show exaggerated deference to a majoritarian Parliament when the matter is one of fundamental rights is to display judicial pusillanimity, for there is no doubt, that in the constitutional scheme, it is the judiciary that is the ultimate interpreter. (para 1)

Chandrachud J. in a section titled, “denial of freedom” outlines the harm that Section 377 has done, the “wrong” of allowing the law to stand on the statute books even after independence and then asserts that while it may be difficult to “right the wrongs of history”, this judgment should begin the process:

A hundred and fifty eight years ago, a colonial legislature made it criminal, even for consenting adults of the same gender, to find fulfillment in love. The law deprived them of the simple right as human beings to live, love and partner as nature made them. The human instinct to love was caged by constraining the physical manifestation of their sexuality. Gays and lesbians were made subordinate to the authority of a coercive state.

A charter of morality made their relationships hateful. The criminal law became a willing instrument of repression. To engage in 'carnal intercourse' against 'the order of nature' risked being tucked away for ten years in a jail. The offence would be investigated by searching the most intimate of spaces to find tell-tale signs of intercourse. Civilization had been brutal. (para 2)

Section 377 exacts conformity backed by the fear of penal reprisal. There is an unbridgeable divide between the moral values on which it is based and the values of the Constitution. What separates them is liberty and dignity. (para 4)

The constitutional vision of justice accommodates differences of culture, ideology and orientation. The stability of its foundation lies in its effort to protect diversity in all its facets: in the beliefs, ideas and ways of living of her citizens. Democratic as it is, our Constitution does not demand conformity. Nor does it contemplate the mainstreaming of culture. It nurtures dissent as the safety valve for societal conflict. Our ability to recognise others who are different is a sign of our own evolution. We miss the symbols of a compassionate and humane society only at our peril. (para 5)

It is difficult to right the wrongs of history. But we can certainly set the course for the future. That we can do by saying, as I propose to say in this case, that lesbians, gays, bisexuals and transgenders have a constitutional right to equal citizenship in all its manifestations. Sexual orientation is recognized and protected by the Constitution. Section 377 of the Penal Code is unconstitutional in so far as it penalise a consensual relationship between adults of the same gender. The constitutional values of liberty and dignity can accept nothing else. (para7)

Forming a holistic perspective requires the court to dwell on, but not confine itself, to sexuality. Sexual orientation creates an identity on which there is a constitutional claim to the entitlement of a dignified life. It is from that broad perspective that the constitutional right needs to be adjudicated. (para 13)

In a section titled, “Arc of the moral universe” Chandrachud J. pens a brief history of the struggle of the LGBT community, noting that “the 20 century, however saw the LGBT community emerge from the shadows worldwide, poised to agitate and demand equal civil rights”.

Chandrachud J. states:

But this case involves much more than merely decriminalising certain conduct which has been proscribed by a colonial law. The case is about an aspiration to realise constitutional rights. It is about a right which every human being has, to live with dignity. It is about enabling these citizens to realise the worth of equal citizenship. Above all, our decision will speak to the transformative power of the Constitution. For it is in the transformation of society that the Constitution seeks to assure the values of a just, humane and compassionate existence to all her citizens. (para 24)

In a section titled, “An Equal love”, Chandrachud J. begins by quoting a poem written by Vikram Seth on the wrong perpetrated by Suresh Kumar Koushal:

Through Love's Great Power
Through love's great power to be made whole
In mind and body, heart and soul –
Through freedom to find joy, or be
By dint of joy itself set free
In love and in companionship:
This is the true and natural good.
To undo justice, and to seek
To quash the rights that guard the weak –
To sneer at love, and wrench apart
The bonds of body, mind and heart
With specious reason and no rhyme:
This is the true unnatural crime.

Chandrachud J. concludes that Section 377 violates Article 14 of the Constitution. He relies on the Human Rights Watch Report, “This

Alien Legacy: The origins of Sodomy Laws in British Colonialism” to state:

Section 377 reveals only the hatred, revulsion and disgust of the draftsmen towards certain intimate choices of fellow human beings. The criminalization of acts in Section 377 is not based on a legally valid distinction, “but on broad moral proclamations that certain kinds of people, singled out by their private choices, are less than citizens – or less than human. (para 30)

In Chandrachud J.’s invocation, the right to equality is part of a wider struggle for equality across many groups and communities:

The struggle of citizens belonging to sexual minorities is located within the larger history of the struggles against various forms of social subordination in India. The order of nature that Section 377 speaks of is not just about non-procreative sex but is about forms of intimacy which the social order finds “disturbing”. This includes various forms of transgression such as inter-caste and inter-community relationships which are sought to be curbed by society. What links LGBT individuals to couples who love across caste and community lines is the fact that both are exercising their right to love at enormous personal risk and in the process disrupting existing lines of social authority. Thus, a re-imagining of the order of nature as being not only about the prohibition of non-procreative sex but instead about the limits imposed by structures such as gender, caste, class, religion and community makes the right to love not just a separate battle for LGBT individuals, but a battle for all. (para 32)

In a section titled, “Beyond physicality: Sex, identity and stereotypes”, Chandrachud J. makes the point about how stereotypes perpetrated by Section 377 violate the non-discrimination provision under Article 15 of the Constitution:

A discriminatory act will be tested against constitutional values. A discrimination will not survive constitutional scrutiny when

it is grounded in and perpetuates stereotypes about a class constituted by the grounds prohibited in Article 15(1). If any ground of discrimination, whether direct or indirect is founded on a stereotypical understanding of the role of the sex, it would not be distinguishable from the discrimination which is prohibited by Article 15 on the grounds only of sex. If certain characteristics grounded in stereotypes, are to be associated with entire classes of people constituted as groups by any of the grounds prohibited in Article 15(1), that cannot establish a permissible reason to discriminate. Such a discrimination will be in violation of the constitutional guarantee against discrimination in Article 15(1). That such a discrimination is a result of grounds rooted in sex and other considerations, can no longer be held to be a position supported by the intersectional understanding of how discrimination operates. This infuses Article 15 with true rigour to give it a complete constitutional dimension in prohibiting discrimination. (para 41)

A provision challenged as being ultra vires the prohibition of discrimination on the grounds only of sex under Article 15(1) is to be assessed not by the objects of the state in enacting it, but by the effect that the provision has on affected individuals and on their fundamental rights. Any ground of discrimination, direct or indirect, which is founded on a particular understanding of the role of the sex, would not be distinguishable from the discrimination which is prohibited by Article 15 on the grounds only of sex. (para 41)

In a section titled, “Facial neutrality: through the looking glass”, Chanchrachud J. analyses the disproportionate impact that laws which seem to be neutral have on certain groups, thereby rendering them unconstitutional:

Jurisprudence across national frontiers support the principle that facially neutral action by the state may have a disproportionate impact upon a particular class. (para 43)

In *Griggs v Duke Power Co.*, the US Supreme Court, whilst recognizing that African Americans received sub-standard

education due to segregated schools, opined that the requirement of an aptitude/intelligence test disproportionately affected African-American candidates. The Court held that, “The Civil Rights Act” proscribes not only overt discrimination but also practices that are fair in form, but discriminatory in operation. (para 43)

Thus when an action has “the effect of imposing burdens, obligations, or disadvantages on such individual or group not imposed upon others, or which withholds or limits access to opportunities, benefits and advantages available to other members of society, it would be suspect. (para 43)

If individuals as well as society hold strong beliefs about gender roles – that men (to be characteristically reductive) are unemotional, socially dominant, breadwinners that are attracted to women and women are emotional, socially submissive, caretakers that are attracted to men – it is unlikely that such persons or society at large will accept that the idea that two men or two women could maintain a relationship. If such a denial is further grounded in a law, such as Article 377 the effect is to entrench the belief that homosexuality is an aberration that falls outside the ‘normal way of life.’ (para 44)

In the sense that the prohibition of miscegenation was aimed to preserve and perpetuate the polarities of race to protect white supremacy, the prohibition of homosexuality serves to ensure a larger system of social control based on gender and sex. (para 47)

A Report prepared by the International Commission of Jurists has documented the persecution faced by the affected community due to the operation of Section 377...The Report documents instances of abuse from law enforcement agencies and how the possibility of persecution under Section 377 prevents redress. Even though acts such as blackmail, assault, and bodily crimes are punishable under penal laws, such methods of seeking redressal are not accessed by those communities given the fear of retaliation of prosecution (para 48)

Apart from the visible social manifestations of Section 377, the retention of the provision perpetuates a certain culture. The stereotypes fostered by section 377 have an impact on how other individuals and non-state institutions treat the community. While this behaviour is not sanctioned by Section 377, the existence of the provision nonetheless facilitates it by perpetuating homophobic attitudes and making it almost impossible for victims of abuse to access justice. Thus, the social effects of such a provision, even when it is enforced with zeal, is to sanction verbal harassment, familial fear, restricted access to public spaces and the lack of safe spaces. This results in a denial of the self. Identities are obliterated, denying the entitlement to equal participation and dignity under the Constitution. Section 377 deprives them of an equal citizenship. (para 51)

The Constitution envisaged a transformation in the order of relations not just between the state and the individual, but also between individuals: in a constitutional order characterized by the Rule of Law, the constitutional commitment to egalitarianism and an anti-discriminatory ethos permeates and infuses these relations. In *K S Puttaswamy v. Union of India*, this Court affirmed the individual as the bearer of the constitutional guarantee of rights. Such rights are devoid of their guarantee when despite legal recognition, the social, economic and political context enables an atmosphere of continued discrimination. The Constitution enjoins upon every individual a commitment to a constitutional democracy characterized by the principles of equality and inclusion. In a constitutional democracy committed to the protection of individual dignity and autonomy, the state and every individual has a duty to act in a manner that advances and promotes the constitutional order of values. (para 52)

By criminalizing consensual sexual conduct between two homosexual adults, Section 377 has become the basis not just of prosecutions but of the persecution of members of the

affected community, Section 377 leads to the perpetuation of a culture of silence and stigmatization. Section 377 perpetuates notions of morality which prohibit certain relationships as being against the 'order of nature'. A criminal provision has sanctioned discrimination grounded on stereotypes imposed on an entire class of persons on grounds prohibited by Article 15(1). This constitutes discrimination on the grounds only of sex and violates the guarantee of non-discrimination in Article 15(1). (para 52)

In a section titled "Confronting the Closet", Chandrachud J. notes that, "citizens of a democracy cannot be compelled to have their lives pushed into obscurity by an oppressive colonial legislation". To ensure to sexual and gender minorities the fulfilment of their fundamental rights, it's imperative to confront the closet and as a necessary consequence, confront "compulsory heterosexuality":

Citizens of a democracy cannot be compelled to have their lives pushed into obscurity by an oppressive colonial legislation. In order to ensure to sexual and gender minorities the fulfilment of their fundamental rights, it is imperative to 'confront the closet' and, as a necessary consequence, confront 'compulsory heterosexuality.' Confronting the closet would entail ensuring that individuals belonging to sexual minorities have the freedom to fully participate in public life, breaking the invisible barrier that heterosexuality imposes upon them. The choice of sexuality is at the core of privacy. But equally, our constitutional jurisprudence must recognise that the public assertion of identity founded in sexual orientation is crucial to the exercise of freedoms. (para 60)

Privacy creates "tiers of 'reputable' and 'disreputable' sex", only granting protection to acts behind closed doors. Thus, it is imperative that the protection granted for consensual acts in private must also be available in situations where sexual minorities are vulnerable in public spaces on account of their sexuality and appearance. If one accepts the proposition that public places are heteronormative, and same-sex sexual acts partially closeted, relegating 'homosexual' acts into the private sphere, would in effect

reiterate the “ambient heterosexism of the public space.” It must be acknowledged that members belonging to sexual minorities are often subjected to harassment in public spaces. The right to sexual privacy, founded on the right to autonomy of a free individual, must capture the right of persons of the community to navigate public places on their own terms, free from state interference. (para 62)

An individual’s sexuality cannot be put into boxes or compartmentalized; it should rather be viewed as fluid, granting the individual the freedom to ascertain her own desires and proclivities. The self-determination of sexual orientation is an exercise of autonomy. Accepting the role of human sexuality as an independent force in the development of personhood is an acknowledgement of the crucial role of sexual autonomy in the idea of a free individual. Such an interpretation of autonomy has implications for the widening application of human rights to sexuality. Sexuality cannot be construed as something that the State has the prerogative to legitimize only in the form of rigid, marital procreational sex. Sexuality must be construed as a fundamental experience through which individuals define the meaning of their lives. Human sexuality cannot be reduced to a binary formulation. Nor can it be defined narrowly in terms of its function as a means to procreation. To confine it to closed categories would result in denuding human liberty of its full content as a constitutional right. The Constitution protects the fluidities of sexual experience. It leaves it to consenting adults to find fulfilment in their relationships, in a diversity of cultures, among plural ways of life and in infinite shades of love and longing. (para 66)

In a section titled “Section 377 and the right to health”, Chandrachud J., notes how, “individuals belonging to sexual and gender minorities experience discrimination, stigmatization, and in some cases, denial of healthcare on account of their sexual orientation and gender identity”:

The operation of Section 377 denies consenting adults the full realization of their right to health, as well as their sexual rights. It forces consensual sex between adults into a realm of fear and shame, as persons who engage in anal and oral intercourse

risk criminal sanctions if they seek health advice. This lowers the standard of health enjoyed by them and particularly by members of sexual and gender minorities, in relation to the rest of society. (para 76)

Under our constitutional scheme, no minority group must suffer deprivation of a constitutional right because they do not adhere to the majoritarian way of life. By the application of Section 377 of the Indian Penal Code, MSM and transgender persons are excluded from access to healthcare due to the societal stigma attached to their sexual identity. Being particularly vulnerable to contraction of HIV, this deprivation can only be described as cruel and debilitating. The indignity suffered by the sexual minority cannot, by any means, stand the test of constitutional validity. (para 92)

Counselling practices will have to focus on providing support to homosexual clients to become comfortable with who they are and get on with their lives, rather than motivating them for change. Instead of trying to cure something that isn't even a disease or illness, the counsellors have to adopt a more progressive view that reflects the changed medical position and changing societal values. There is not only a need for special skills of counsellors but also heightened sensitivity and understanding of LGBT lives. The medical practice must share the responsibility to help individuals, families, workplaces and educational and other institutions to understand sexuality completely in order to facilitate the creation of a society free from discrimination where LGBT individuals like all other citizens are treated with equal standards of respect and value for human rights. (para 96)

In a section titled, "India's commitments at international law", Chandrachud J. outlines how "International law today has evolved toward establishing that the criminalization of consensual same sexual acts between same-sex adults in private contravenes the rights to equality, privacy, and freedom from discrimination". Chandrachud J. then goes on to note that:

In NALSA the Court recognized the ‘Yogyakarta Principles on the Application of International Law in Relation to Issues of Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity’-which outlines the rights that sexual minorities enjoy as human persons under the protection of international law-and held that they should be applicable as a part of international law.

Principle 33 provides thus:

“Everyone has the right to be free from criminalisation and any form of sanction arising directly or indirectly from that person’s actual or perceived sexual orientation, gender identity, gender expression or sex characteristics.”

While the Yogyakarta Principles are not legally binding, NALSA nevertheless signifies an affirmation of the right to non-discrimination on the grounds of gender identity, as well as the relevance of international human rights norms in addressing violations of these rights. (para 103)

There is a contradiction between India’s international obligations and Section 377 of the Indian Penal Code, insofar as it criminalizes consensual sexual acts between same-sex adults in private. In adjudicating the validity of this provision, the Indian Penal Code must be brought into conformity with both the Indian Constitution and the rules and principles of international law that India has recognized. Both make a crucial contribution towards recognizing the human rights of sexual and gender minorities. (para 104)

In a section titled, “Transcending borders—comparative law”, Chandrachud J. surveys the state of comparative law on the question of rights of LGBT persons and concludes that:

Courts around the world have not stopped at decriminalizing sodomy laws; they have gone a step further and developed a catena of broader rights and protections for homosexuals. These rights go beyond the mere freedom to engage in consensual sexual activity in private, and include the right to full citizenship, the right to form unions and the right to family life. (para 115)

From an analysis of comparative jurisprudence from across the world, the following principles emerge:

1. Sexual orientation is an intrinsic element of liberty, dignity, privacy, individual autonomy and equality;
2. Intimacy between consenting adults of the same-sex is beyond the legitimate interests of the state;
3. Sodomy laws violate equality by targeting a segment of the population for their sexual orientation;
4. Such a law perpetrates stereotypes, lends authority of the state to societal stereotypes and has a chilling effect on the exercise of freedom;
5. The right to love and to a partner, to find fulfillment in a same-sex relationship is essential to a society which believes in freedom under a constitutional order based on rights;
6. Sexual orientation implicates negative and positive obligations on the state. It not only requires the state not to discriminate, but also calls for the state to recognise rights which bring true fulfillment to same-sex relationships; and
7. The constitutional principles which have led to decriminalization must continuously engage in a rights discourse to ensure that same-sex relationships find true fulfillment in every facet of life. The law cannot discriminate against same-sex relationships. It must also take positive steps to achieve equal protection. (para 125)

We are aware that socio-historical contexts differ from one jurisdiction to another and that we must therefore look at comparative law-making allowances for them. However, the overwhelming weight of international opinion and the dramatic increase in the pace of recognition of fundamental rights for same-sex couples reflects a growing consensus towards sexual orientation equality. We feel inclined to concur with the accumulated wisdom reflected in these judgments, not to determine the meaning of the guarantees contained within the

Indian Constitution, but to provide a sound and appreciable confirmation of our conclusions about those guarantees. (para 126)

In a section titled, “Constitutional morality”, Chandrachud J. expounded on the importance of constitutional morality by referencing the key work of Dr. Ambedkar:

During the framing of the Constitution, it was realized by the members of the Constituent Assembly that there was a wide gap between constitutional precept and reality. The draftspersons were clear that the imbibing of new constitutional values by the population at large would take some time. Society was not going to change overnight. Dr Ambedkar remarked in the Constituent Assembly:

“Democracy in India is only a top-dressing on an Indian soil, which is essentially undemocratic.” (para 140)

The values of a democracy require years of practice, effort, and experience to make the society work with those values. Similar is the position of non-discrimination, equality, fraternity and secularism. While the Constitution guarantees equality before the law and equal protection of the law, it was felt that the realization of the constitutional vision requires the existence of a commitment to that vision. Dr Ambedkar described this commitment to be the presence of constitutional morality among the members of the society. The conception of constitutional morality is different from that of public or societal morality. Under a regime of public morality, the conduct of society is determined by popular perceptions existent in society... Constitutional morality determines the mental attitude towards individuals and issues by the text and spirit of the Constitution. It requires that the rights of an individual ought not to be prejudiced by popular notions of society. ..

...Constitutional morality has to be imbibed by the citizens consistently and continuously. Society must always bear in

mind what Dr. Ambedkar observed before the Constituent Assembly:

“Constitutional morality is not a natural sentiment. It has to be cultivated. We must realize that our people have yet to learn it. (Para 141)”

In the decision in *Government of NCT of Delhi v. Union of India*, the Constitution Bench of this Court dealt with the constitutive elements of constitutional morality which govern the working of a democratic system and representative form of government. Constitutional morality was described as founded on a “constitutional culture”, which requires the “existence of sentiments and dedication for realizing a social transformation which the Indian Constitution seeks to attain.” This Court held thus:

“If the moral values of our Constitution were not upheld at every stage, the text of the Constitution may not be enough to protect its democratic values.”

This Court held that constitutional morality acts a check against the “tyranny of the majority” and as a “threshold against an upsurge in mob rule.” It was held to be a balance against popular public morality. (para 142)

Constitutional morality requires in a democracy the assurance of certain minimum rights, which are essential for free existence to every member of society. The Preamble to the Constitution recognises these rights as “Liberty of thought, expression, belief, faith and worship” and “Equality of status and of opportunity.” Constitutional morality is the guarantee which seeks that all inequality is eliminated from the social structure and each individual is assured of the means for the enforcement of the rights guaranteed. Constitutional morality leans towards making Indian democracy vibrant by infusing a spirit of brotherhood amongst a heterogeneous population, belonging to different classes, races, religions, cultures, castes and sections. Constitutional morality cannot, however,

be nurtured unless, as recognised by the Preamble, there exists fraternity, which assures and maintains the dignity of each individual. In his famous, yet undelivered speech titled “Annihilation of Caste” (which has been later published as a book), Dr Ambedkar described ‘fraternity’ as “primarily a mode of associated living, of conjoint communicated experience” and “essentially an attitude of respect and reverence towards fellow men.” He remarked:

“An ideal society should be mobile, should be full of channels for conveying a change taking place in one part to other parts. In an ideal society there should be many interests consciously communicated and shared. There should be varied and free points of contact with other modes of association. In other words there must be social endosmosis. This is fraternity, which is only another name for democracy.”

In his last address to the Constituent Assembly, he defined fraternity as “a sense of common brotherhood of all Indians.” As on the social and economic plane, Indian society was based on graded inequality, Dr Ambedkar had warned in clear terms:

“Without fraternity, liberty [and] equality could not become a natural course of things. It would require a constable to enforce them... Without fraternity equality and liberty will be no deeper than coats of paint.” (para 143)

Constitutional morality requires that all the citizens need to have a closer look at, understand and imbibe the broad values of the Constitution, which are based on liberty, equality and fraternity. Constitutional morality is thus the guiding spirit to achieve the transformation which, above all, the Constitution seeks to achieve. This acknowledgement carries a necessary implication: the process through which a society matures and imbibes constitutional morality is gradual, perhaps interminably so. Hence, constitutional courts are entrusted with the duty to act as external facilitators and to be a vigilant safeguard against excesses of state power and democratic concentration of

power. This Court, being the highest constitutional court, has the responsibility to monitor the preservation of constitutional morality as an incident of fostering conditions for human dignity and liberty to flourish. Popular public morality cannot affect the decisions of this Court. (para 144)

The invocation of constitutional morality must be seen as an extension of Dr Ambedkar's formulation of social reform and constitutional transformation. Highlighting the significance of individual rights in social transformation, he had observed:

“The assertion by the individual of his own opinions and beliefs, his own independence and interest—over and against group standards, group authority, and group interests—is the beginning of all reform. But whether the reform will continue depends upon what scope the group affords for such individual assertion.” (para 145)

LGBT individuals living under the threats of conformity grounded in cultural morality have been denied a basic human existence. They have been stereotyped and prejudiced. Constitutional morality requires this Court not to turn a blind eye to their right to an equal participation of citizenship and an equal enjoyment of living. Constitutional morality requires that this Court must act as a counter majoritarian institution which discharges the responsibility of protecting constitutionally entrenched rights, regardless of what the majority may believe. Constitutional morality must turn into a habit of citizens. By respecting the dignity of LGBT individuals, this Court is only fulfilling the foundational promises of our Constitution. (para 146)

In a section titled, “In Summation: Transformative Constitutionalism”, Chandrachud J. pointed to the importance of the Indian Constitution as a document, which mandates that societal morality should conform to constitutional morality:

Section 377 is founded on moral notions which are an anathema to a constitutional order in which liberty must trump over stereotypes and prevail over the mainstreaming of culture.

Our Constitution, above all, is an essay in the acceptance of diversity. It is founded on a vision of an inclusive society which accommodates plural ways of life. (para 148)

The impact of Section 377 has travelled far beyond criminalising certain acts. The presence of the provision on the statute book has reinforced stereotypes about sexual orientation. It has lent the authority of the state to the suppression of identities. The fear of persecution has led to the closeting of same sex relationships. A penal provision has reinforced societal disdain. (para 149)

Sexual and gender based minorities cannot live in fear, if the Constitution has to have meaning for them on even terms. In its quest for equality and the equal protection of the law, the Constitution guarantees to them an equal citizenship. In decriminalising such conduct, the values of the Constitution assure to the LGBT community the ability to lead a life of freedom from fear and to find fulfilment in intimate choices. (para 150)

The choice of a partner, the desire for personal intimacy and the yearning to find love and fulfilment in human relationships have a universal appeal, straddling age and time. In protecting consensual intimacies, the Constitution adopts a simple principle: the state has no business to intrude into these personal matters. Nor can societal notions of heteronormativity regulate constitutional liberties based on sexual orientation. (para 151)

Above all, this case has had great deal to say on the dialogue about the transformative power of the Constitution. In addressing LGBT rights, the Constitution speaks – as well – to the rest of society. In recognising the rights of the LGBT community, the Constitution asserts itself as a text for governance which promotes true equality. It does so by questioning prevailing notions about the dominance of sexes and genders. In its transformational role, the Constitution directs our attention to resolving the polarities of sex and binarities of gender. In dealing with these issues we confront much that polarises our society. Our ability to survive as a free society will depend

upon whether constitutional values can prevail over the impulses of the time. (para 153)

The ability of a society to acknowledge the injustices which it has perpetuated is a mark of its evolution. In the process of remedying wrongs under a regime of constitutional remedies, recrimination gives way to restitution, diatribes pave the way for dialogue and healing replaces the hate of a community. For those who have been oppressed, justice under a regime committed to human freedom, has the power to transform lives. In addressing the causes of oppression and injustice, society transforms itself. The Constitution has within it the ability to produce a social catharsis. The importance of this case lies in telling us that reverberations of how we address social conflict in our times will travel far beyond the narrow alleys in which they are explored. (para 155)

In the conclusion, Chandrachud J. proclaims:

We hold and declare that:

- (i) Section 377 of the Penal Code, in so far as it criminalises consensual sexual conduct between adults of the same sex, is unconstitutional;
- (ii) Members of the LGBT community are entitled, as all other citizens, to the full range of constitutional rights including the liberties protected by the Constitution;
- (iii) The choice of whom to partner, the ability to find fulfilment in sexual intimacies and the right not to be subjected to discriminatory behaviour are intrinsic to the constitutional protection of sexual orientation;
- (iv) Members of the LGBT community are entitled to the benefit of an equal citizenship, without discrimination, and to the equal protection of law; and
- (v) The decision in Koushal stands overruled. (para 156)

7. JUDGMENT BY INDU MALHOTRA J.

Malhotra J. after referencing the colonial history of Section 377 observed that Prime Minister Theresa May of the United Kingdom in a speech at a Commonwealth Summit of 2018 had expressed regret for Britain's role in introducing such laws. The speech was extracted by Malhotra J. in her judgment:

“Across the world, discriminatory laws made many years ago continue to affect the lives of many people, criminalising same-sex relations and failing to protect women and girls. I am all too aware that these laws were often put in place by my own country. They were wrong then, and they are wrong now. As the UK's Prime Minister, I deeply regret both the fact that such laws were introduced, and the legacy of discrimination, violence and even death that persists today.” (para 10)

Malhotra J. after citing the fact that the WHO had removed homosexuality from its list of diseases in the International Classification of Diseases (ICD-10) as well as the position of the Indian Psychiatric Society that, “there is no scientific evidence that sexual orientation can be altered by any treatment”, concluded that:

Section 377 insofar as it criminalises consensual sexual acts between adults in private, is not based on any sound or rational principle, since the basis of criminalisation is the “sexual orientation” of a person over which one has “little or no choice”. (para 14.9)

Section 377 is also manifestly arbitrary, and hence violative of Article 14 of the Constitution. (para 14.9)

Malhotra J. with respect to the non discrimination guarantee on the grounds of “sex” under Article 15, concluded that the word sex included the concept of “sexual orientation”. For this finding, Malhotra J. referenced NALSA v. Union of India as well as the Verma Committee Recommendations where the court concluded that sex included sexual orientation. Based on this Malhotra J. concluded that:

Sex as it occurs in Article 15, is not merely restricted to the biological attributes of an individual, but also includes their ‘sexual identity and character’...The prohibition against discrimination under Article 15 on the ground of ‘sex’ should therefore encompass instances where such discrimination takes place on the basis of one’s sexual orientation. (para 15.1)

Malhotra J. then referenced the decision of the Canadian Supreme Court where the concept sexual orientation was read into the Canadian Charter of Human Rights.:

Section 15(1), of the Canadian Charter like Article 15 of our Constitution, does not include “sexual orientation” as a prohibited ground of discrimination. Notwithstanding that, the Canadian Supreme Court in the aforesaid decisions has held that sexual orientation is a “ground analogous” to the other grounds specified under Section 15(1). Discrimination based on any of these grounds has adverse impact on an individual’s personal autonomy, and is undermining of his personality. A similar conclusion can be reached in the Indian context as well in light of the underlying aspects of immutability and fundamental choice. The LGBT community is a sexual minority which has suffered from unjustified and unwarranted hostile discrimination, and is equally entitled to the protection afforded by Article 15. (para 15.2)

Malhotra J. concluded that Section 377 violates the personal liberty and the right to live with dignity guaranteed to all citizens under Article 21:

Section 377 insofar as it Section 377 insofar as it curtails

the personal liberty of LGBT persons to engage in voluntary consensual sexual relationships with a partner of their choice, in a safe and dignified environment, is violative of Article 21. It inhibits them from entering and nurturing enduring relationships. As a result, LGBT individuals are forced to either lead a life of solitary existence without companion, or lead a closeted life as “unapprehended felons” (para 16.1)

Malhotra J. found that Section 377 violated the right to privacy:

The right to privacy is not simply the “right to be let alone”, and has travelled far beyond that initial concept. It now incorporates the ideas of spatial privacy, and decisional privacy or privacy of choice. It extends to the right to make fundamental personal choices, including those relating to intimate sexual conduct, without unwarranted State interference. Section 377 affects the private sphere of the lives of LGBT persons. It takes away the decisional autonomy of LGBT persons to make choices consistent with their sexual orientation, which would further a dignified existence and a meaningful life as a full person. Section 377 prohibits LGBT persons from expressing their sexual orientation and engaging in sexual conduct in private, a decision which inheres in the most intimate spaces of one’s existence. (para 16.2)

Malhotra J. highlighted the fact that LGBT persons are entitled to the right to health:

LGBT persons being a sexual minority have been subjected to societal prejudice, discrimination and violence on account of their sexual orientation. Since Section 377 criminalises “carnal intercourse against the order of nature”, it compels LGBT persons to lead closeted lives. As a consequence, LGBT persons are seriously disadvantaged and prejudiced when it comes to access to health-care facilities. This results in serious health issues, including depression and suicidal tendencies amongst members of this community. (para 16.3)

Malhotra J. then pointed out the fact that Section 377 violates the right to freedom of speech and expression under Article 19(1)(a):

LGBT persons express their sexual orientation in myriad ways. One such way is engagement in intimate sexual acts like those proscribed under Section 377. Owing to the fear of harassment from law enforcement agencies and prosecution, LGBT persons tend to stay 'in the closet'. They are forced not to disclose a central aspect of their personal identity i.e. their sexual orientation, both in their personal and professional spheres to avoid persecution in society and the opprobrium attached to homosexuality. Unlike heterosexual persons, they are inhibited from openly forming and nurturing fulfilling relationships, thereby restricting rights of full personhood and a dignified existence. It also has an impact on their mental well-being. (para 17.1)

LGBT persons express their sexual orientation in myriad ways. One such way is engagement in intimate sexual acts like those proscribed under Section 377. Therefore, Section 377 cannot be justified as a reasonable restriction under Article 19(2) on the basis of public or societal morality, since it is inherently subjective. (para 17.2)

Malhotra J. concluded that:

History owes an apology to the members of this community and their families, for the delay in providing redressal for the ignominy and ostracism that they have suffered through the centuries. The members of this community were compelled to live a life full of fear of reprisal and persecution. This was on account of the ignorance of the majority to recognise that homosexuality is a completely natural condition, part of a range of human sexuality. The mis-application of this provision denied them the Fundamental Right to equality guaranteed by Article 14. It infringed the Fundamental Right to non-discrimination under Article 15, and the Fundamental Right to live a life of dignity and privacy guaranteed by Article 21.

The LGBT persons deserve to live a life unshackled from the shadow of being ‘unapprehended felons’. (para 20)

Malhotra J. then overruled Suresh Kumar Koushal and declared:

- (i) In view of the aforesaid findings, it is declared that insofar as Section 377 criminalises consensual sexual acts of adults (i.e. persons above the age of 18 years who are competent to consent) in private, is violative of Articles 14, 15, 19, and 21 of the Constitution.

It is, however, clarified that such consent must be free consent, which is completely voluntary in nature, and devoid of any duress or coercion.

- (ii) The declaration of the aforesaid reading down of Section 377 shall not, however, lead to the re-opening of any concluded prosecutions, but can certainly be relied upon in all pending matters whether they are at the trial, appellate, or revisional stages.
- (iii) The provisions of Section 377 will continue to govern non-consensual sexual acts against adults, all acts of carnal intercourse against minors, and acts of bestiality. (para 21)

8. CONCLUSIONS

While the judgment in Navtej Singh Johar is an extraordinarily powerful judgment in terms of the way it develops the rights to equality, non-discrimination, privacy, dignity and expression, we need to ensure that it transforms realities at the grassroots level. However good the judgment, it will not be a magic wand making the lives of LGBT persons better. We have to see the judgment as a tool, an instrument of struggle which we must bend to our purpose of making the world more fair and just as far as LGBT people are concerned. The judgment itself outlines some of the responsibilities of key actors which have been adverted to earlier. It is necessary to ensure that these responsibilities are fulfilled.

THE UNION OF INDIA

The Union of India must break its silence, welcome the judgment and fulfil its responsibility of taking the judgment to the public using all means of communication at its disposal. The Union Government must give “periodic sensitization and awareness training of the plight of such persons in the light of the observations contained in this judgment” to its employees.

STATE GOVERNMENTS

The constitutional responsibility to combat violence and discrimination against LGBT persons vests also in State Governments. The State Governments too must undertake popularisation of the judgment in all media, and since law and order is a state subject, must ensure that

circulars are issued by the respective DGPs to ensure that no cases are registered under Section 377 against consenting adults.

HEALTH CARE AND MENTAL HEALTH PROFESSIONALS

Since bias and prejudice fostered by the law still have to be combatted, mental health professionals have the responsibility of ensuring that medical treatment does not continue to see LGBT persons as “abnormal” but begins to view them as expressing what is merely a variant of human gender and sexuality.

CITIZEN ACTIVISTS

The judges in Navtej Singh Johar have vested the responsibility for nurturing democracy in citizens as well. Since as Ambedkar put it, democracy in India is a “top dressing on a soil which is essentially undemocratic”, it is our responsibility to deepen the roots of democracy. Part of the project of deepening of democracy is to foster a greater understanding of how LGBT persons are full citizens entitled to all the constitutional rights.

Since there is still a great deal of public ignorance, prejudice, myths and misconceptions around the lives and loves of LGBT persons, there is a pressing need for a wider public campaign which can strive to popularise the key idea that what should prevail is not popular morality but constitutional morality and that we need to think about sexual orientation and gender identity through the constitutional lens of the right to privacy, dignity, equality, and non-discrimination.

The judgment in Navtej Singh Johar discusses a range of concepts, be it privacy, dignity, constitutional morality, or equality, all of which should be become a part of everyday life. In Ambedkar’s words, we need to cultivate constitutional morality.

USING THE JUDGMENT

The judgment is of potential value in a range of scenarios.

- To take a recent example where post the delivery of the judgment, a representative of the Cubbon Park Walkers Association in Bangalore, filed a complaint to the police alleging that “homosexuals were indulging in illegal activities and instigating others to take part

in immoral activities”. The Coalition of Sex Workers and Sexual Minorities Rights (CSMR), met and submitted a representation to the Commissioner of Police, Bangalore, which asserted LGBT persons’ rights to use public spaces as anyone else. In particular the representation cited Chandrachud J.’s powerful invocation that, “It must be acknowledged that members belonging to sexual minorities are often subjected to harassment in public spaces. The right to sexual privacy, founded on the right to autonomy of a free individual, must capture the right of persons of the community to navigate public places on their own terms, free from state interference”. This becomes a way of promoting constitutional literacy both among the police as well as the general public.

- In a scenario of a mental health professional continuing to treat homosexuality as a disorder with drugs and aversion therapy, a representation to the concerned professional association could highlight the judgment in Navtej Singh Johar and in particular quote Chandrachud J. as saying, “Instead of trying to cure something that isn’t even a disease or illness, the counsellors have to adopt a more progressive view that reflects the changed medical position and changing societal values”.

These are just two examples but there are many settings in which reliance can be placed on operative parts of the judgment to combat homophobic prejudice and violence.

THE WAY FORWARD

To take forward a constitutional education on LGBT rights we should:

- Launch a media campaign on the judgment
- Translate a summary of the judgment into as many Indian languages as possible
- Create posters, leaflets, memes with quotes from the judgment in as many languages as possible
- Produce short video clips on key concepts in the judgment in as many languages as possible

- Ensure that activists, intellectuals, writers, teachers, actors, media personalities comment on key passages in the judgment and ensure dissemination of the same in different languages.
- Hold seminars and discussions on the judgment in colleges, universities, workplaces, etc.
- Ensure that police stations, schools, colleges, workplaces have informational material which explains the Navtej Singh Johar judgment

LARGER IMPLICATIONS

However, the implications of Navtej Singh Johar are not only restricted to the LGBT community. It has unleashed hope among all those working to deepen the values of the Constitution that there are institutions which can stand up to majoritarian pressure. The apology to the LGBT community has triggered the demand that the systemic injustice caused to other “minorities” should also be acknowledged, be it manual scavengers, adivasis, sex workers or religious minorities.

The implications of a transformative constitution are wide ranging and its power can be mobilized by all those combatting a majoritarian state. In a climate where vigilante elements and mobs feel empowered to harass and intimidate inter-caste, inter-religious and same-sex couples, this judgment has important implications. In a context where the right to eat the food of your choice or the right to dress the way you want is under threat from vigilante elements, this judgement has important implications. This judgment means something for all those who are battling a form of social morality which is at odds with the Constitution. As Chandrachud J. states that “the right to love not just a separate battle for LGBT individuals but a battle for us all”.

The Court through this decision has harnessed the transformative power of the Constitution and amplified a way of thinking rooted in the values of respect for dignity, equality and fraternity. If this way of thinking, rooted as it in the struggle against the forms of discrimination perpetrated by a conservative social morality becomes more widely accepted, India will be less of a majoritarian democracy and more of a constitutional democracy.

9. APPENDICES

APPENDIX A: THE LAW

SECTION 377 OF THE INDIAN PENAL CODE, 1860

Section 377 IPC is under the Chapter titled, Offences Against the Body and part of a sub-chapter titled “Of Unnatural Offences”.

It reads:

377. Unnatural Offences—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.

Explanation- Penetration is sufficient to constitute the carnal intercourse necessary to the offence described in this section.

RELEVANT CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS

Article 14. The State shall not deny to any person equality before the law or the equal protection of the laws within the territory of India.

Article 15. (1) The State shall not discriminate against any citizen on grounds only of religion, race, caste, sex, place of birth or any of them

(2) No citizen shall, on grounds only of religion, race, caste, sex, place of birth or any of them, be subject to any disability, liability, restriction or condition with

regard to—

- (a) access to shops, public restaurants, hotels and places of public entertainment; or
- (b) the use of wells, tanks, bathing ghats, roads and places of public resort maintained wholly or partly out of State funds or dedicated to the use of the general public.

Article 19. (1) All citizens shall have the right—

- (a) to freedom of speech and expression;
- (b) to assemble peaceably and without arms;
- (c) to form associations or unions [or co-operative societies];
- (d) to move freely throughout the territory of India;
- (e) to reside and settle in any part of the territory of India;

[and]

* * * *

- (g) to practise any profession, or to carry on any occupation, trade or business
- (2) Nothing in sub-clause (a) of clause (1) shall affect the operation of any existing law, or prevent the State from making any law, in so far as such law imposes reasonable restrictions on the exercise of the right conferred by the said sub-clause in the interests of [the sovereignty and integrity of India,] the security of the State, friendly relations with foreign States, public order, decency or morality, or in relation to contempt of court, defamation or incitement to an offence.

Article 21. No person shall be deprived of his life or personal liberty except according to procedure established by law.

APPENDIX B: THE JUDGES

DIPAK MISRA C.J. : Practiced in Constitutional, Civil, Criminal, Revenue, Service and Sales Tax matters in the Orissa High Court and the Service Tribunal. He was appointed as an Additional Judge of the Orissa High Court on 17th January, 1996 and transferred to the Madhya Pradesh High Court on 3rd March, 1997. He became permanent Judge on 19th December, 1997. Justice Misra assumed charge of the office of Chief Justice, Patna High Court on 23rd December, 2009 and charge of the office of the Chief Justice of Delhi High Court on 24th May, 2010. Elevated as a Judge, Supreme Court of India with effect from 10.10.2011 to 02.10.2018.

R.F. NARIMAN J. : Practised as Senior Counsel, Supreme Court of India, before his elevation to the Supreme Court. He has over 500 Reported Supreme Court Judgments to his credit and is an expert in Comparative Constitutional Law and Civil Law. He is also a specialist in comparative religious studies and was ordained a priest by Bandra Agiary. Apart from the law, he has a passion for and deep knowledge about western classical music, has a great interest in an avid reader of history, philosophy, literature and science and enjoys nature walks. He was appointed to the Supreme Court on 07.07.2014 to 12.08.2021.

KHANWILKAR J. : He was enrolled as an Advocate in Bombay on 10th February, 1982 and was appointed as Additional Judge of the Bombay High Court on 29th March, 2000 and confirmed as permanent Judge on 8th April, 2002. He was appointed as Chief Justice of the High Court of

Himachal Pradesh on 4th April, 2013. Thereafter, he was appointed as Chief Justice of Madhya Pradesh High Court on 24th November, 2013. He was elevated as Judge of Supreme Court of India and assumed charge on May 13, 2016 and his tenure expires on 29-07-2022

DR. D.Y. CHANDRACHUD J. : He obtained his LL.M degree and a Doctorate in Juridical Sciences (SJD) from Harvard Law School, USA. He was a Visiting Professor of Comparative Constitutional Law at the University of Mumbai and Visiting Professor at Oklahoma University School of Law, USA. He practised law at the Supreme Court of India and the Bombay High Court. He was appointed an Additional Solicitor General of India from 1998 until appointment as a Judge of the Bombay High Court from 29th March 2000. He was then appointed as the Chief Justice of the Allahabad High Court from 31st October 2013. He was Appointed Judge of the Supreme Court of India on 13th May 2016 and will serve till 10.11.2024.

INDU MALHOTRA J. : She enrolled as an Advocate on 12th January, 1983 at the Bar Council of Delhi and was the second woman to be designated as a Senior Advocate by the Supreme Court in 2007. She was a Trustee of Save Life Foundation from its inception till March 2018. Save life Foundation is an independent, non-governmental organisation committed to taking various initiatives to prevent fatalities in road accidents, which include training of police personnel, framing of guidelines by the Supreme Court for protection of good Samaritans, etc. throughout the country. She was appointed to the National Legal Services Authority, constituted under the Legal Services Authorities Act, 1987. She was a member of the Supreme Court Gender Sensitization and Internal Complaints Committee from November 2013 to 2017. She was appointed a Judge of the Supreme Court on 27.04.2018 and will serve until 13.03.2021.

APPENDIX C: THE PARTIES

PETITIONERS

- A. Navtej Singh Johar & Others (Navtej Johar is a classical dancer)
- B. Dr. Akkai Padmasali & Others (Transgender activists)
- C. Keshav Suri (Hotelier)
- D. Arif Jafar (Activist who was arrested under Section 377)
- E. Ashok Row Kavi & Others (India's first out gay rights activist)
- F. Anwesh Pokkuluri & Others (IIT students from different batches with the youngest being 19 years old)

IMPLEADMENT APPLICATIONS

1. Voices Against 377 (Coalition of child rights, women's rights, and LGBT groups)
2. Minna Saran (Mother of Nishit Saran, gay film maker)
3. Alok Sarin (Psychiatrist based in Delhi)
4. Nivedita Menon & Others (Academicians from Central Universities based in Delhi)
5. Naz Foundation (Original petitioner before the Delhi High Court)

RESPONDENT

Union of India

INTERVENORS ARGUING FOR RETENTION OF SECTION 377

- i. Suresh Kumar Koushal
- ii. Utkal Christian Foundation
- iii. Apostolic Churches Alliance
- iv. Trust Gods Ministry
- v. H. P. Sharma

APPENDIX D: ARGUMENTS

ARGUMENTS BY THE PETITIONERS AND INTERVENORS AGAINST SECTION 377

- A. Right to Protection of Life and Personal Liberty (Article 21) – Sexual orientation is an essential component of identity and dignity and is embedded in the right to life. The Puttaswamy decision read the right to privacy into Article 21 and noted that it included the right to form intimate associations with persons of one’s choice. By criminalizing this aspect of ‘choice’ Section 377 violated the right to decisional privacy. The fact that Puttaswamy was a decision by a nine judge bench which recognized sexual orientation as an integral part of privacy, made this this argument the strongest one for the reading down of Section 377.
- B. Right to Equality (Article 14) - Section 377 violates LGBT persons’ “right to equality before the law” and “equal protection of the laws”. There are two tests for Article 14 that have to be satisfied to demonstrate that a law is valid.

The first test is to show that the classification in the legislation is based on intelligible differentia, there is a rational nexus to a legitimate objective. In this case it was argued that the classification of ‘against the order of nature’ and ‘within the order of nature’ was not based on any intelligible differentia and the objective of criminalisation was to preserve morality which was not a legitimate objective.

As per the second test for Article 14, when the provision is manifestly arbitrary it is liable to be struck down. The terms used in the provision, “carnal intercourse” and “order of nature” are undefined and vague, which prevent State and non-State actors from knowing when their conduct is in violation of the provision. As such it was argued that the provision was arbitrary and liable to be struck down.

Finally, while the language of Section 377 may be facially neutral, in effect, it impacts the LGBT community disproportionately and to that extent it was unconstitutional. It was argued that any classification, which seeks to discriminate on the basis of personal characteristics that are intimately connected with individuality, choice and personhood, violates Article 14.

- C. Prohibition on discrimination based on sex (Article 15) – Since sex includes sexual orientation and gender identity, any discrimination against an LGBT person by State or non-State actors, based on sexual orientation, is a violation of Article 15. As Section 377 effectively criminalizes the daily lives of LGBT persons, it has a chilling effect on their ability to exercise their rights, as they are always fearful of societal or State punishment. Section 377 assumes that people should only have sexual intercourse with persons from the opposite sex and sexual intercourse is acceptable only when it is procreative, and, thus, discriminates against people based on gender stereotypes. Section 377 denies an individual the fundamental right to choose a partner.
- D. Right to Freedom of Speech and Expression (Article 19(1)(a))- Section 377 by criminalizing one’s sexual orientation and gender identity has a chilling effect on the individuals’ freedom of speech and expression as expression includes expression of sexual orientation and gender identity.
- E. Right to Form Associations or Unions (Article 19(1)(c)) - Section 377 violates the rights of LGBT persons to form personal and professional associations. For instance, corporations that promote the interests of minority communities can avail of tax

exemptions, but this tax benefit is not available to organizations that promote the interests of sexual minorities. On the contrary, LGBT peer support groups risk being criminalized due to Section 377.

- F. Right to practice any profession or to carry on any occupation, trade, or business (Article 19(1)(g)) – Section 377 forces LGBT individuals to hide their identities in workplaces and this impacts their self esteem and affects their rights under Article 19(1)(g).
- G. Right to Health (Article 21) - Right to health is a fundamental part of the right to life under Article 21. Currently, Section 377 criminalizes even health workers who assist HIV prevention by providing condoms to MSM. Further, Section 377 increases the risk of depression and other mental health issues among the LGBT community by criminalizing their identity.
- H. Right to freedom of conscience (Article 25)- the freedom of conscience guaranteed under Article 25 extends to the entire consciousness of a human, including beliefs of her sexual identity, which, in fact, go to the core of each individual’s sense of self, as well the intensely personal nature of her own sexual orientation. In this regard, conscience refers to the liberty and autonomy, which inheres in each individual, and the ability to take decisions on matters that are central to the pursuit of happiness. Section 377 violates the freedom of conscience.¹

ARGUMENTS OF THE RESPONDENT: THE UNION OF INDIA

While the petitioners made strong arguments for reading down Section 377, the Union of India took the position that it would leave the matter of the “constitutional validity Section 377 to the extent it applies to “consensual acts of adults in private” to the wisdom of the Court.” The Union of India also submitted that, “If this Hon’ble

3 This section builds upon the excellent analysis made by the ICJ in its Briefing Paper on Navtej Singh Johar v. Union of India, <https://www.icj.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/07/India-Briefing-Paper-Navtej-Singh-Advocacy-Analysis-Brief-2018-ENG.pdf>

Court is pleased to decide to examine any other question other than the constitutional validity of Section 377 of the Indian Penal Code, or to construe any other right in favour of or in respect of LGBTQ, the Union of India would like to file its detailed affidavit in reply as consideration of other issues would have far reaching and wide ramifications under various other laws”

The position of the Union of India was commented upon in the judgement. Chandrachud J. characterised the position of the Union of India thus:

We would have appreciated a categorical statement of position by the government, setting out its views on the validity of Section 377 and on the correctness of Koushal. The ambivalence of the government does not obviate the necessity for a judgment on the issues raised. The challenge to the constitutional validity of Section 377 must squarely be addressed in this proceeding. That is plainly the duty of the Court. Constitutional issues are not decided on concession. The statement of the Union government does not concede to the contention of the petitioners that the statutory provision is invalid. Even if a concession were to be made, that would not conclude the matter for this Court. All that the stand of the government indicates is that it is to the ‘wisdom’ of this Court that the matter is left. In reflecting upon this appeal to our wisdom, it is just as well that we as judges remind ourselves of a truth which can unwittingly be forgotten: flattery is a graveyard for the gullible. (para 9)

Nariman J. noted:

The Union of India, seeing the writing on the wall, has filed an affidavit in which it has not opposed the Petitioners but left the matter to be considered by the wisdom of this Court. (para 80)

ARGUMENTS OF INTERVENORS ARGUING FOR RETENTION OF SECTION 377

There were also submissions by Suresh Kumar Koushal, Utkal Christian Foundation, Apostolic Churches Alliance, Trust Gods Ministry and H.P. Sharma among others who made submissions such as “there is no personal liberty to abuse one’s organ”, “that the offensive act in Section 377 is an undignified act” and that “there is no definition of sexual orientation with the definition being borrowed from Yogyakarta Principles”.

APPENDIX E: TRANSCRIPT OF HEARINGS IN NAVTEJ SINGH JOHAR V. UNION OF INDIA

INTRODUCTION

The hearings were conducted over four days from 10th July, 2018 to 17th July 2018 when it was reserved for judgment.

The following transcript is based upon the tweets put out by #LiveLawIndia (livelaw.in) and the report by Centre for Law and Policy Research (clpr.org.in).

At points we have supplemented with recollections of the proceedings at the Supreme Court by advocates who were present in the Court and who felt that certain points were not covered in the transcript.

This transcript does not cover all aspects of the hearings and is not a verbatim recording of the proceedings. It is based partly on contemporaneous records through tweets (as mentioned above) as well as recollections of numerous persons present in court.

JULY 10, 2018 (DAY 1):

The historic hearing commences in the Supreme Court of India at 11:30 am, before a bench of Chief Justice Dipak Misra and Justices Rohinton Nariman, A.M. Khanwilkar, D.Y. Chandrachud, and Indu Malhotra.

Adv. Manoj George seeks listing of curative petition along with the current writ petitions. Sr. Adv. Mukul Rohatgi opposes this saying that the scope, and even the bench is different. The Court says that the curative petition cannot be listed along with the current petitions, but the litigants who mentioned for listing of the curative petition can file intervention in the current matter. The CJI says to the lawyer asking to take up the curative petition as well that the same has limitations, but not a writ petition.

Mukul Rohatgi says that the ramifications of this case are not just on sexuality. It will have an impact on how the society looks at these people. Thus it is about the perception of, and about livelihood and jobs for such people. He says that the client is entitled to a declaration that their rights are also protected under Article 21. The first question is the correction of the judgment in the Suresh Kumar Koushal case. His argument is that Suresh Kumar Kaushal is wrong. Rohatgi says that he will take the Court through Naz Foundation judgment of the Delhi HC, and the NALSA and the privacy judgments of the Supreme Court.

Mukul Rohatgi says that if the provision is bad, it does not matter what the perception of the society is. He points out that Justice Chandrachud observed that the Koushal judgment is wrong, in his privacy judgment, with the concurrence of Justice Kaul. Rohatgi says that his case is strongly made out by the privacy judgment of the Supreme Court. He also places reliance on certain US precedents, aside from the Indian judgments. He refers to the Hadiya, Shakti Vahini, Common Cause, and Independent Thought judgments. He says that the Supreme Court, being the protector of the fundamental rights, has the duty to protect the LGBTQ community.

Justice Nariman states that the European judgments are important and must be cited, to which Arvind Datar says that he will be citing European judgments.

Mukul Rohatgi reads out the reference order dated January 4, 2018, subsequent to which the present five judge constitutional bench was constituted. He emphasises that the constitutional morality overtakes the societal mores. He says that the issue of sexual orientation and gender are different. This case deals only with sexual orientation and has nothing to do with gender. He says that what they are saying is that this is not a matter of choice, but is something innate and that we are born with it.

Mukul Rohatgi reiterates that gender and sexual orientation should not be mixed, and says that the petitioner is not asking for a separate gender. It is a matter of choice whether one identifies as gay or otherwise. Even western research shows that it is inborn. Section 377 used the words order of nature. Rohatgi says that this is the Victorian morals of the 1860s. Thus Section 377 is based on Victorian morality. Ancient India was different.

Mukul Rohatgi says that our order is much older and points out to Shikhandi in Mahabharata. Justice Nariman asks if his point is that this order itself is natural, to which Rohatgi responds with a yes. Research says that it is at an adolescent stage that it manifests itself.

Justice Nariman says that sexual minority is also in the order of nature. Mukul Rohatgi submits a written note to the bench which is read out. He cites the judgment in the Anuj Garg case. He asks whether a pre-constitutional law, which has not been framed by our Parliament and does not recognise the needs of our people, should remain.

Mukul Rohatgi says that the effect of Section 377 in our country is mostly on men, even though it appears to be sex-neutral. He says that the section is contrary to the effect test, and is manifestly arbitrary. He says that the term order of nature is not defined, and is too broad. As society changes, the values change. What was moral 160 years ago

might not be moral today. Even a law valid only 50 years ago may not be valid after 50 years because of the changes in the society.

Mukul Rohatgi reads out the text of Section 377 of the IPC. He then explains the provision. Even those acts of sexual intercourse which are not peno-vaginal are hit by the provision.

Mukul Rohatgi, while dealing with the Naz Foundation judgment of the Delhi HC, says that it is a well-researched judgment by the then Chief Justice. He says that the Union of India did not file an appeal against the Delhi HC judgment, to which ASG Tushar Mehta responds by saying that their stand is yet to be made, but then Rohatgi says that their stand is clear as daylight since they (Union of India) filed a review petition against the SC judgment of 2013.

Rohatgi reads out paragraphs 24, 25, and 26 of the Naz Foundation judgment by the Delhi HC. He refers to paragraph 34 of the same, which mentions the abortion case. He says that time shows that the dissent was the correct view. Rohatgi further reads paragraph 41 of the verdict which mentions the Yogyakarta Principles.

Mukul Rohatgi refers to the Maneka Gandhi, Kharak Singh, M.P. Sharma, and Lawrence v. Texas cases. He says that they are not talking about gender, and that gay men and women do not call themselves something else. The issue is of sexual orientation. Justice Chandrachud says that the right to sexual orientation is a part of the larger rights.

Mukul Rohatgi says that the question arises on the legal status of same sex relationships and such couples. ASG Tushar Mehta says hearing should be confined to Section 377, to which Rohatgi retorts by saying asking who he is to say what they should confine themselves to, claiming that his petition is based upon larger grounds. ASG Tushar Mehta says that it is unfair that no time was given to the Union of India to take a stand, and that in such a case they should be allowed to file their response.

Rohatgi asks not to restrict the hearing to Section 377, and that further directions are needed for protection of life and property. CJI responds by saying that first they should get out of the mess of the

Naz Foundation/Koushal judgment. Rohatgi quips that that is easy for him to do that after the decision of nine judges in Puttaswamy.

CJI Misra says that Section 377 is about sex. Whether Section 377 is ultra vires the constitution will be the first chapter. The rest will follow after ruling upon the validity of the section. He says that issues like marriage and inheritance will be discussed in an appropriate list. Rohatgi again submits vehemently to the Court that the hearing should not be restricted to Section 377 alone, but the bench convinces him to argue on that section alone for now.

Mukul Rohatgi says that it is not a medical condition but merely an order of nature. Section 377 violates right to life, which also includes the right to dignity and sexual orientation and choice of partner.

The bench rises for lunch.

The constitution bench reassembles, and the hearing resumes.

Senior Adv. Arvind Datar to commence arguments on behalf of petitioner Keshav Suri, as Mukul Rohatgi is unwell. Datar submits a written note to the bench. He then begins his arguments for the petitioner. He traces the history of how laws relating to homosexuality have changed across the world. He says that in the Koushal case the Supreme Court held Section 377 to be reflective of the will of the Parliament, which in fact it is not, as it is a pre-constitution era law. The 1860 Code was simply imposed on India and it did not represent even the will of the British Parliament. Datar refers to Lawrence v. Texas, where the amicus brief referred the entire history.

CJI Misra asks whether there is any case law holding that pre-constitutional laws do not enjoy the presumption of constitutionality. He says that the issue is whether Section 377 is in conformity with Articles 21 and 14 or not. Arvind Datar says no, but refers to page number 4 of his note. He asks whether the legislature could draft a provision like Section 377 today. Justice Chandrachud quizzes Datar on the impact of President's adaptation orders on the constitutionality of laws.

Arvind Datar reads out Article 13(2) of the Constitution. He explains the scope of Article 13. Datar refers to paragraph 45 of the Koushal judgment which dealt with the presumption of constitutionality. CJI Misra says that Section 377 can only be attacked if it is not in conformity with Part III of the Constitution. He asks to satisfy the Court that Section 377 does not conform with Part III of the Constitution, and to leave aside the presumption of constitutionality.

Justice Chandrachud explains why the presumption of constitutionality is attached with a statute, referring to democratically elected governments. He says that Courts might not have the same deference for pre-constitutional laws which they have for post-constitutional laws, due to absence of Parliamentary will.

Arvind Datar refers to the 172nd Law Commission Report that held that there is no need for Section 377. The fact that Union of India chose not to appeal against the Delhi HC judgment is all the more reason for it to be struck down. Datar says that Section 377 penalises a class of people, and thus to say that it is criminalising an act and not a class of people is not correct.

Justice Chandrachud says that Section 377 applies to everybody. Men or women engaging in anal intercourse will be violative of Section 377. In that respect there is no strict classification. CJI Misra says that nature and choice are different concepts.

Arvind Datar proceeds to read out the text of Section 377. He says that the purpose of a penal code is to punish a crime and create deterrence. He asks when it is a natural orientation, then how can it be an offence. A person cannot be punished for exercising their sexual orientation. Same sex orientation can never be against nature as it is natural.

Arvind Datar cites the privacy judgment of the Supreme Court, which held gender and sexual orientation as facets of Article 21. Transgenders have been granted the protection of Article 14. There is no reason not to extend the same to those having a different sexual orientation. Datar cites the SC verdict on the Triple Talaq issue to make arguments with respect to manifest arbitrariness to declare a statute unconstitutional.

Arvind Datar says that the right to sexual orientation is part of Article 21. Justice Chandrachud says that the right to choose a partner comes under Article 21, as held in the Hadiya judgment. Datar says the rights of the LGBT community cannot be considered “so called” rights. Regarding Article 21, he argues that the Puttaswamy judgment says that privacy encompasses decisional autonomy. It is a natural corollary that sexual orientation is also covered by that. Section 377 is eclipsed post the privacy judgment, and needs to be struck down. If the foundation of the law exists no more, there is no reason to continue with it.

Arvind Datar refers to judgments from the European Court of Human Rights and other jurisdictions. He places reliance on a judgment from Trinidad and Tobago, *Jason Jones v. Attorney General of Trinidad and Tobago* which had relied on the Puttaswamy judgment of the Indian Supreme Court to strike down laws criminalising consensual sex between men. Datar reads paragraph 108 from the privacy judgment, which emphasises the importance of dignity, and says that it should be read with paragraphs 118 and 119. He further refers to paragraphs 144, 145, 248, and 250 of the judgment. He also refers to paragraph 490 of Justice Nariman’s opinion in that matter. Once a right is established, duty is cast upon the Court to protect it. Datar further refers to relevant paragraphs from the concurring opinion of Justice Kaul from the privacy judgment.

Arvind Datar refers to the last paragraph of the Delhi HC judgment in the Naz Foundation case, Datar submitted that there is nothing such as the order of nature running in Section 377 of the IPC. Datar concludes his arguments with asking the Court to declare that there is nothing against the order of nature. Adv. Saurabh Kripal begins his arguments by citing *Lawrence v. Texas*.

Hearing concludes for the day.

JULY 11, 2018 (DAY 2):

Hearing commences.

Tushar Mehta submits affidavit on behalf of the Union of India. He says that whatever is not under question may not be touched upon. Mehta says that somebody accused of bestiality may say that it is his sexual orientation. He says he will not contest the provision as regards consensual sex between adults, and leave it to the bench, but seeks clarification on bestiality.

Justice Chandrachud says that the right to sexual orientation is not a fundamental right, but the right to choose one's sexual partner is. He asks what if two homosexuals are not indulging in sex but they are still being subject to moral policing.

Adv. Sourabh Kirpal resumes his arguments.

ASGTushar Mehta also says it will have to file detailed reply if the Court goes into other aspects like civil rights and liabilities. He requests the Supreme Court not to say anything which can be construed as affecting civil rights, inheritance, marriage rights etc. CJI clarifies that the scope of this hearing does not cover marriage, adoption, maintenance, etc. He says that whether civil rights would follow would be decided in another lis.

Sourabh Kirpal cites Hadiya judgment to state that there exists the right to have a sexual partner of choice. He submits that consensual sexual relationships between the same sex is protected under Articles 14, 19, and 21. He leaves it to the bench to define the contents of the same.

Sourabh Kirpal refers to the Shakti Vahini judgment of the Supreme Court. He reads out extracts from the judgment. He now refers to the Supreme Court judgment in the NALSA case. He concludes by citing the privacy judgment.

Menaka Guruswamy commences arguments. She is appearing for Anwesh Pokkuluri and others who are the IIT students and alumni. She says their prayer is limited to consensual sex between adults and

is not about incest etc. She says that Section 377 violates Articles 14, 15, 19, and 21. She hands over a written submission to the bench. She says that the section is arbitrary and unconstitutional. She says she will answer the question of Justice Nariman on proportionality. Section 377 violates Article 15 because it discriminates on the basis of sex of the partners.

Menaka Guruswamy says that Section 377 is a colonial legacy. She says that the Supreme Court has always stepped in when legislature has been inactive. While dealing with the question of proportionality, she refers to the judgment in the Triple Talaq case wherein Justice Nariman propounded the doctrine of manifest arbitrariness to strike down a statute.

On violation of Article 15, Menaka Guruswamy says that Articles 15 and 16 are the teeth of equal protection envisaged by the Constitution. She says that stereotyping is impermissible within the Constitution. Section 377 is based on Victorian morality that people should have sex only with the opposite gender since sex is only for procreation.

Menaka Guruswamy refers to the Justice J.S.Verma Committee report in 2013 on the Criminal Amendment Act. Relying on that report, she says that sex under Article 15 includes sexual orientation too. She also refers to the notification by the Indian Psychiatric Society which states homosexuality is not a psychiatric disorder. The Society has favoured decriminalisation of Section 377.

Menaka Guruswamy says that when the IIT students and alumni came to her with the case, she was struck by how Section 377 had affected many of their lives. She states that the section is affecting the lives of LGBT people, and is making their lives miserable. These people deserve to be protected by their Court, their Constitution, and their country. She seeks reading down of Section 377.

Menaka Guruswamy submits that business of life is protected under Articles 14, 15, 19, and 21 of the Constitution. She then refers to Canadian Supreme Court's decisions and also that of the South Africa Supreme Court. The Canadian decision was relied upon by the Court

of South Africa in National Coalition for Gay and Lesbian Equality to recognise the vulnerability of people due to pre-constitutional morality. Guruswamy submits that this is love that must be constitutionally recognised. It isn't just sex. She makes a passionate plea – How strongly must we love to withstand the terrible wrongs of Suresh Kumar Koushal.

Menaka Guruswamy says that Section 377 denies equal participation to LGBT community in professions. CJI Misra asks if there are any rules that prevent homosexuals from availing equal opportunity. Guruswamy says that it has chilling effect. It violates their right to seek employment including State employment and Constitutional offices. Guruswamy says that the immediate aftermath of NALSA judgment was the extraordinary number of transgenders who ran for public offices.

Bench rises for lunch.

Bench re-assembles and the hearing resumes.

Menaka Guruswamy says that Section 377 violates the right to form an association under Article 19. ASG Tushar Mehta objects to this, saying that this is beyond the scope of this hearing. Justice Nariman says that she has a right to argue, and that he can respond if he wants.

CJI Misra says that any disqualification linked to Section 377 will be automatically lifted if provision is struck down. Menaka Guruswamy continuing with her argument says that Section 377 violates the right to form associations. LGBT community is afraid of forming association due to fear of police persecution. They are unable to form an association as they have to identify themselves as LGBT. This means they are denied many benefits which they can otherwise avail as an association. Guruswamy says that there is a group of 350 persons who are unable to register their association.

Menaka Guruswamy says that the Court should examine constitutional issues within the ambit of Part III. Prayers are wide under writ petitions. It is not just simply reading down, or simply a reference to a larger bench. This is for constitutional interpretation under Article 145(3). She says that Section 377 has the potential to destroy lives of the

LGBT community. This case is about how this Court can change social morality to constitutional morality. This case is about our humanity. Menaka Guruswamy concludes her arguments.

Anand Grover commences arguments. He is arguing for Arif Jafar. He submits that time has come to go by time management in Court. This case is not only about decriminalisation of 377. It is about constitutional values. It is about what the Preamble to the Constitution says. He says that the history of Section 377 is very long.

Anand Grover refers to paragraph 10 of his written submissions. He says that the IPC is known to be very precise but Section 377 is different because it is not so. He reads the provision, and says that nobody can understand the scope of the section. He deals with how courts have interpreted carnal intercourse against order of nature. The orifice for penetration was interpreted to mean insertion even between thighs of another person came to be penalised.

Anand Grover submits that the transgender community treats the NALSA judgment as its Bible. There is need for dialogue between the Court and the civil society. Talking about the petitioner on whose behalf he is arguing this case, he says that Arif Jafar was caught by police for distributing condoms to men. A criminal case against him is still going on, and no lawyer appeared for Jafar. Fundamental rights have to be given expansive interpretation. They cannot be given restrictive interpretation. They have to be read in context of the Preamble. Section 377 is completely vague.

Anand Grover submits that order of nature is not defined. Section 377 is overbroad. Grover refers to Justice Nariman's exposition of arbitrariness in the Triple Talaq case. He says that if the object is not fair, the statute is not sustainable. Grover then relies on Section 375 of the IPC to attack Section 377. The expression carnal intercourse in Section 377 is distinct from the expression sexual intercourse, which appears in Sections 375 (Rape) and 497 (Adultery) of the IPC. The expression carnal intercourse is broader than sexual intercourse.

Anand Grover submits that Section 377 per se, as well as when read with section 375, of the IPC as amended, discriminates against

similarly situated persons on the basis of their sexual orientation in contravention of Articles 14 and 15 of the Constitution. Grover submits that Article 14 should be read with Article 15. He refers *Toonen v. Australia*, where the Human Rights Committee held that the reference to sex in Articles 2 (1), and 26 of the ICCPR, is to be taken as including sexual orientation.

Anand Grover refers to the right to health aspect. He also says that the choice of partner, whether within or outside marriage, lies within the exclusive domain of each individual (*Shafin Jahan case*). He says that the *NALSA Judgment* gives right to an individual to identify their gender.

Grover deals with impact of the provision on transgenders in the context of gender identity. He explains the impact of Section 377 on transgender persons. He says that criminalization of LGBT persons violates the fundamental right of access to justice. He relies upon *Anita Kushwaha v. Pushpa Sadan*.

Anand Grover says that the LGBT community is suffering from blackmail and extortion. One of the major issues is that there is denial of access to justice. A lot of gay men suffer from extortion and blackmailing, especially in cases where people use dating apps. He says that they have dealt with a huge number of such cases.

Anand Grover explains how the Supreme Court judgment in the *Koushal case* is wrong. CJI Misra says that the “consensual” part is facet of choice. He also says that criminality cannot be imposed on natural aspects.

Anand Grover submits that today we have a happy situation where the LGBT community is coming out and is present in the Court. The core issue in this case are values like liberty, equality, and dignity. He speaks about the case of Dr. Ramchandra Siras of Aligarh Muslim University, who was gay and how his privacy was invaded. The professor later committed suicide. He reads out from the Allahabad High Court judgment quashing suspension of the professor.

Anand Grover says that after the *Koushal Judgment*, extortion and harassment of the LGBT community has gone up. Some communities,

including the LGBT community, did not get independence. They are being oppressed even after independence of India. Anand Grover concludes his arguments.

Jayna Kothari commences her submissions.

Jayna Kothari refers to the NALSA judgment and makes submissions on gender identity. CJI Misra quizzes her on the relevance of gender identity. Kothari says that transgenders are suspected of unnatural offences under Section 377. Gender identity was for the first time guaranteed as a right in NALSA judgment.

Jayna Kothari referenced discriminatory State statutes against transgenders such as the Andhra Pradesh (Telangana Area) Eunuchs Act, Section 36A of the Karnataka Police Act of 1963, which was amended only in 2016, all of which referenced Section 377 and saw transgender persons as a criminal class. She made the point that the use of the word “Eunuch” is derogatory. These Acts were identical to the notorious Criminal Tribes Act of 1871, which branded a number of marginalised population groups like transgenders as “innately criminal”. The Criminal Tribes Act was repealed in 1949 but Section 377 continues to survive in the statute book, through these statutes, Ms. Kothari argued.

In order to answer the question as to why Section 377, which on the face of it applies to both males and females, is discriminatory under Article 14, Ms. Kothari takes the case of her client who is born a male but identifies as female. She is married but any sexual interaction with her husband will be hit by section 377. Thus gender identity is hit by Section 377.

CJI Misra says that if Section 377 goes, then many rights may also follow. Ms Kothari refers to the Yogyakarta Principles. She also refers to two European court judgements on privacy and dignity. She rushes through her submissions on Articles 19 and 21. Jayna Kothari concludes her arguments.

Sr.Adv. Shyam Divan commences his arguments. He is representing the intervener Voices Against 377.

Shyam Divan says that Article 21 includes the right to intimacy. Time has come to declare a right to intimacy. Divan reads out his prayers. The LGBT community is facing day to day problems in their life. Divan seeks declaration that no person can be discriminated on the basis of sexual orientation and gender identity. He says that sexuality and sexual rights are part of human rights. Homosexual conduct between two consenting adults is not against the order of nature.

Shyam Divan says that technically Section 377 criminalises certain acts only but in its application, it is not used against consenting sexual acts between heterosexual adults but is used against the LGBT community. With the mere existence of Section 377, the entire LGBT community is stigmatised even if they do not indulge in sex. Divan reads out from the NALSA Judgment.

Bench rises for the day.

JULY 12, 2018 (DAY 3):

The bench assembles and the hearing commences.

Shyam Divan resumes his submissions, arguing on positive dimension of Article 14. He reads out the concurring opinion of Justice Vivian Bose in *State of West Bengal v. Anwar Ali Sarkar*, to ask the question as to ‘whether the collective conscience of a sovereign democratic republic can regard the impugned law... as the sort of substantially equal treatment which men of resolute minds and unbiased views can regard as right and proper in a democracy of the kind we have proclaimed ourselves to be’. Positive content in Article 14 requires declaration that no person may be discriminated against with respect to education, housing, employment, health care, all facilities, and utilities under Article 15(2), the basis of sexual orientation or gender identity.

Shyam Divan places reliance on Justice Nariman’s judgment in *Triple Talaq* case. He refers to paragraph 62 of the judgment, which states that equality before law in Article 14 is derived from the UK while equal protection of law is from the 14th amendment of the US. He says that Mr. Gautam Bhan testifies to the fact that section 377 makes him feel “like a second class citizen in my own country”. Divan reads out *National Coalition for Gay and Lesbian Equality vs. Ministry for Justice*. He then reads out from *Lawrence v. Texas* – “The liberty protected by the Constitution allows homosexual persons the right to choose to enter upon relationships in the confines of their homes and their own private lives and still retain their dignity as free persons”.

Shyam Divan says that equality before law is the negative content while equal protection of law connotes the positive content of Article 14. He argues for the necessity of positive action on the part of the State for protecting homosexual persons. This is an opportune moment for the Court to issue additional declarations (aside from striking down Section 377).

Shyam Divan refers to the Supreme Court judgment in the *Hadiya* case. He urges the Court to read right to intimacy in Article 21 of the Constitution. It has a chilling effect on the freedom of expression under

Article 19. Divan relies on the Puttaswamy judgment and Lawrence v. Texas. Supreme Court, as the protector of fundamental rights, should not have re-criminalized Section 377 (after Delhi HC struck it down) because of the tremendous adverse impact it has.

Shyam Divan concludes his arguments.

C.U. Singh commences his arguments. He is representing the mental health petitioner, Alok Sarin. He hands over his written submissions to the bench.

C.U. Singh says that he will argue on the medical health aspect. Justice Indu Malhotra remarks that this (LGBT) community feels inhibited to go for medical aid due to prejudices against them. She says that because of societal and family pressure, the LGBT community is finding it difficult to come out. This gives rise to bisexuality and other mental trauma.

CJI Misra, after reading the note of C.U. Singh, says that he understands homosexuality is not a mental disorder, but a natural orientation. Justice Indu Malhotra says that even medical professionals did not maintain confidentiality. She says that it is not human beings alone who indulge in homosexual acts, many animals also show homosexual behaviour. It is not an aberration but a variation. Justice Indu Malhotra thus makes a strong case against Section 377.

C.U. Singh reads out from Mental Healthcare Act 2017. CJI Misra asks Singh to show any rules and regulations that deprive LGBT community from availing job opportunity, to which Singh responds in the negative. Justice Chandrachud refers to Section 21(1)(a) of Mental Healthcare Act which expressly prohibits discrimination on the ground of sexual orientation. He says that so Parliament itself now recognises them. CJI Misra observes that the LGBT community face stigma because of criminality attached to their sexual orientation.

C.U. Singh says that if the Parliament recognises that sexual orientation cannot be a ground for discrimination for mental health treatment, then can it be any different when it comes to other issues. CJI Misra asks if there is any provision in any other statute in this country

wherein sexual orientation has been considered not normal, or a mental disorder. He also again asks whether there is any law, regulation or bylaw that disqualifies homosexuals.

Menaka Guruswamy says that while the Supreme Court has recognised live-in relationships and its jurisprudence has been that of substantive equality, there is discrimination (towards homosexual persons) in the application of law like domestic violence laws. Guruswamy says that the Domestic Violence Act applies only in case of a heterosexual marriage.

Justice Chandrachud says that we created a society that discriminates against the LGBT community. Justice Nariman asks C.U. Singh to refer to Section 30 of the Mental Healthcare Act. Justice Nariman terms this section as very innovative step on part of the Parliament.

C.U. Singh says that the Court needs to take affirmative actions to undo the discrimination done to the LGBT community. Singh refers to Section 120 of the Mental Healthcare Act, which provides for overriding effect on other statutes. Singh submits that having faced criminalisation for over 160 years, it is a huge step to strike it down, but whenever there has been historical deep-rooted discrimination, then the State has resorted to affirmative action. He says that it is a declaration against such discrimination that they are seeking. He says that the Court should do something positive to prohibit discrimination against the LGBT community.

C.U. Singh concludes his arguments.

Senior Advocate Ashok Desai commences his arguments.

Ashok Desai refers to a book (Same Sex Love in India) and a few articles. He speaks about fraternity and how it is developing continuously as a concept. Desai uses the words “utter chaos created by this law”. He speaks on the LGBT community in the context of different religions. He says that even England has abolished Section 377, and in fact they apologised for it.

Ashok Desai traces the treatment of homosexuals by various ancient civilisations. He talks about how the perception towards homosexuality

changed with the coming of Abrahamic faiths. He also refers to the privacy and the NALSA judgments. On the issue of fraternity, he refers to the Supreme Court judgment in the Subramanian Swamy case. He says that the whole problem before the judges is a human condition.

Ashok Desai says that just because only a few people are convicted under Section 377, it is no ground to support this law. The Court needs to recognise the concept of fraternity. The LGBT community is humiliated very terribly. He cites various judgments dealing with the value of fraternity. Desai reads from the book Same Sex Love in India. He hands over a book I am Divine to the bench. Desai refers to an article on gay rights and human rights published by The Hindu.

Ashok Desai concludes his arguments.

Krishnan Venugopal begins his submissions. He says that the right to freedom of speech and expression, and also the right to conscience is being offended by Section 377.

The bench rises for lunch.

The bench re-assembles after lunch.

Krishnan Venugopal says that Section 377 actually targets the identity of LGBT persons. He says that their expression is protected under Article 19(1)(a). Venugopal says that the fear of law is used to harass the LGBT community. This prevents these persons from approaching the police for protection. One should not be forced to hide one's identity. He submits that the provision is used to harass LGBT persons who do not speak up due to stigma and societal perceptions. He then talks about how Lord Macaulay introduced the provision. Lord Macaulay had said that the provision was about a 'revolting matter' and should not be discussed.

Krishnan Venugopal submits that the section has a chilling effect on the freedom of expression. He next refers to the Shafin Jahan judgement. Morality has to be constitutional morality and not of social sense. He refers to the Naz foundation judgment to emphasize on constitutional versus public morality. He says that Section 377 offers a legal basis to suppress alternate sexuality and that Section 377 is used as excuse to

impinge on freedom of expression. Freedom of association of LGBT persons has been recognised in many countries. Section 377 prevents the LGBT community from exercising freedom of association and hence violates Article 19.

Krishnan Venugopal talks about the fundamental right to freedom of conscience under article 25 as also being violated by Section 377. He also reads Article I of the Declaration of Human Rights. He points out that the expression unapprehended felon fails to capture the impact on the rights of LGBT persons. He cites from *Lawrence v. Texas*.

Krishnan Venugopal concludes.

ASG Tushar Mehta now makes submissions on behalf of the Central Government. He says that every act other than Section 377 has its objectives. He refers to Devdutt Patnaik's book, *Shikhandi*, and asks the Court to go through it. Mehta urges the Court to stick to the constitutionality of the provision. He hands over some document to the Court saying that persons with different perceptions look at things differently. One of counsels for intervenors says that what is prohibited under Section 377 is sexual intercourse.

Tushar Mehta says that the *Puttaswamy* judgment cannot be interpreted to mean that Section 377 should exclude bestiality. Another intervenor says that using the reproductive system for carnal intercourse is against the order of nature. One more intervenor argued that public opinion should be sought.

CJI Misra says that the Court does not follow majoritarian morality but constitutional morality to another lawyer who tried to make arguments based on "popular opinion". He adds that they do not decide constitutional issues by referendum.

Advocate Manoj George makes submissions for intervenors in support of Section 377. He is appearing for two Christian associations supporting Section 377. He says that there is no senior to hold a brief for his side, maybe because of the issue involved. George says that the term "whoever" in Section 377 is gender neutral. He also says that carnal intercourse means it need not be performed with reproductive

organs, and that carnal intercourse is against the order of nature. This is why the legislature used the term carnal and not sexual intercourse. He says that another vital component of Section 377 is penetration. He adds that Section 377 does not stop people from enjoying personal relationships.

Manoj George says that Koushal's judgment was not dealt with by the petitioners. He also says that the amicus brief in *Lawrence v. Texas* has a different facet. He says that the Christian world view has been attacked in this petition. The CJI says that no petitioners attacked any views, and that they only argued on fundamental rights. George says that the U-turn of the government on this issue is of concern to several parties. Justice Khanwilkar says that it is not a U-turn, pointing out that the Delhi HC judgement was not challenged. George reads former ASG P.P. Mehta's submissions in the Koushal case to prove his point that the government has taken a U-Turn. He says that three private bills moved in the Parliament to strike down Section 377 were defeated. He says that IPC falls in the concurrent list, and that if the states wanted to amend the section, they could have. CJI Misra says that that does not mean that its constitutionality cannot be challenged.

Manoj George tries to counter the reliance by petitioners on the Yogyakarta Principles. Hearing concludes for the day. Intervenors will be heard for an hour on Tuesday next week.

JULY 17, 2018 (DAY 4):

Manoj George for Apostolic Alliance of Churches and Utkal Christian Association continues his arguments. He submits that courts should not add or delete words to the statute that are not expressly provided therein. He submits that consent between two adults is the subject matter to be looked into while analyzing Section 377. He says that the section penalizes carnal intercourse. The carnal intercourse criminalized can be between man and man, between woman and woman, between man and animal or between woman and animal.

Manoj George takes the Court through the text of Section 377. It makes the following classification: carnal intercourse within the order of nature and carnal intercourse against order of nature. This is a reasonable classification with an intelligible differentia. He says that if the Court says that there is nothing called order of nature with or without consent, then the entire Section will go.

Manoj George submits that there is a differential between acts against the order of nature and those that are natural. Justice Chandrachud says that it strikes at the ground of Article 14, and asks whether there is an order of nature. George says that Section 375 may also have situations where consent is obtained by putting the person in fear of death. Justice Nariman says that these are categories of what would constitute consent which is not free. George says that Section 377 does not take into account consent. Consent is a word which is absolutely absent in Section 377. He says that the petitioners are saying this word has to be imported into the provision.

Justice Nariman says that the original Act included consent, even though it incurred lesser punishment. Later the provision including consent was dropped. Justice Nariman asks Manoj George what is order of nature. Justice Chandrachud asks what is carnal, and George notes that carnal means lust. Manoj George concedes that there should be lust even between heterosexual partners for sex.

George responds that per se the order of nature has not been defined. Justice Nariman says that simply put, any sexual act which results in

reproduction would be in order of nature. Justice Chandrachud also questions what would constitute carnal intercourse. George reads out Article 15 and says that it prohibits discrimination on grounds of sex and not sexual orientation. Justice Nariman says that this is where the Yogyakarta principles have to be read to include sexual orientation within the ambit of sex.

Manoj George says that there are many types of orientations and that it is not as simple as LGBT. Justice Nariman says that in the NALSA judgment the Court has read sex to include transgender. George submits that the Yogyakarta Principles were drafted where an assembly of NGOs said that these principles have to be looked into. CJI Misra says that whatever the principles stated in Yogyakarta Principles are, if they fit into our constitutional framework, they may be referred as well.

CJI Misra says that Article 15 covers not only gender but sexual orientation. George says that sexual orientation is of abstract nature and such an abstract concept cannot be read into Article 15. He adds that sexual orientation has not been defined in the Constitution or any other statute. He submits that reading sex to include sexual orientation would leave space for uncertainty. CJI Misra says that traditionally man and woman come together to continue the human race.

Justice Chandrachud says that the website references made in Manoj George's written submissions clearly appear to have hate speech content vis-a-vis LGBT persons. He reads out a portion from the submission which seemingly indicates that a person would be attracted to someone who reciprocates that attraction. He says this clearly is not sexual orientation. CJI Misra says that George should read the poetry of John Donne to understand metaphysical love.

Manoj George responds that he would want to propose a solution to deal with Section 377. He reads out portions from a study saying that persons showing same sex attraction in adolescence do not show same sex attraction as adults. Manoj George relies on a study by a Washington based organisation on sexual orientation, which states that the idea that people are born with a sexual orientation is not

supported by scientific evidence. So it is not innate, and the idea that they are born that way is not supported by science. George now comes to the NALSA judgment. George reads paragraph 85 from the NALSA judgment. It relates to the part where the Court says that recognition of gender rights is important to enjoy civil rights. George next submits that petitioners are asking to introduce new words in the statute.

Justice Nariman refers to the case of Alan Turing and he committed suicide after he was chemically castrated. George submits that while interpreting a penal statute, attention has to be paid to what has been said and what has not been said in the statute. Words cannot be imported into statute and it is the job of the Parliament to re-draft, re-draw, or enact provisions. George submits that it is a settled principle of law that courts cannot legislate. He further submits that petitioners argued right to intimacy as right to marriage. He submits that the European Human Rights Court has held that the right to marry is not a conventional right.

Manoj George submits that if such unnatural offence, as under Section 377, is allowed with consent, it would have a cascading effect on many other legislations. Justice Nariman says that nothing would cascade as the provision could be read as holding bestiality as unnatural offence, and sexual act with persons under 18 years of age as an offence. George says that the judgement in the Koushal case the Supreme Court had stated that it is for the legislature to amend the IPC and remove Section 377 from the statute. Justice Nariman says that the moment any provision violates any of the fundamental rights, it is the duty of the Court to strike it down.

Justice Nariman says that Justice Jackson, in the case of *West Virginia v. Board of Education*, had said that the whole object of the fundamental rights chapter is to empower the Court to strike down law which otherwise may be allowed by majoritarian government. Manoj George says that anything which needs to be done to Section 377 in the manner sought by the petitioners should be left to the Parliament. Justice Nariman responds by saying that the moment they are convinced that

there is a violation of fundamental rights, they will strike it down and not leave it to legislature.

Manoj George states that Section 377 is not based on Victorian era morality, as claimed by the petitioners, but comes from the Bible. George says that there will be an effect on religious freedom. George argues on the right to family under Yogyakarta Principles. He submits that Yogyakarta Principles talk not just about family, but also many other rights regardless of sexual orientation. Justice Nariman says that the principles state that a family may exist regardless of marriage. CJI Misra says that George is slightly wrong in reading the principles. The CJI says that the principles state that they may live and stay together as family but does not talk about marriage. George says that the Court should not rely on the Yogyakarta Principles as though they are the Magna Carta. He further relies on the amicus brief in *Lawrence v. Texas*. He says that it details how homosexual relations would lead to STDs.

Justice Chandrachud says that in his privacy judgement he noted that acceptance and information is what ensures that health and related diseases are kept in check. He refers to the policy in South Africa vis-a-vis AIDS. Justice Nariman says the the same would apply to prostitution. If it is legalized and regulated it would ensures the sex workers' right to health. He says that absolute prohibition must be questioned.

Manoj George submits that the only reading down of Section 377 could be to make the offences under the sectionailable and non-cognizable. The entire Koushal judgment was based on AIDS/HIV issues. He says that the petitioners have not talked a single word about it. If anything needs to be done, it should be done by Legislature.

Adv. Manoj George concludes his arguments.

Sr. Adv. K.S. Radhakrishnan commences arguments on behalf of another intervenor. He says that he will refer to the NCT judgement in context of constitutional morality. Gender identity and sexual orientation are not criminalised by Section 377. It criminalises certain acts and whoever commits those acts will be liable.

Bench rises for lunch.

Bench re-assembles after lunch.

K.S. Radhakrishnan says that what is criminalised is only the act. There is a mere regulation. This is regardless of gender identity. Radhakrishnan reads out portions from the recent Government of NCT Delhi v. UOI about constitutional morality. He submits that the problem begins when petitioners argue on the chilling effect on exercise of sexual orientation as part of privacy and dignity. He says that he has no issue with the NALSA judgment, and that it is a perfectly fine judgment. He submits that the observations made in the Puttaswamy judgement, in the Koushal case, prejudiced the intervenors in the Koushal matter. The observations in paragraph 146 of Puttaswamy judgment on Section 377 were made without hearing the intervenors here, and hence is a violation of principles of natural justice.

K.S. Radhakrishnan submits that the acts mentioned in Section 377 are undignified acts derogatory to the constitutional concept of dignity, and do not target LGBT communities. Justice Chandrachud says that spread of HIV is also because men going to work outside villages have unsafe sex and when they return they spread it to their spouse. Problem is not intercourse but unsafe intercourse. While Radhakrishnan insists that homosexuals were responsible for spreading AIDS in the US, Justice Indu Malhotra comments that STDs are also prevalent in heterosexuals.

K.S. Radhakrishnan reads provisions from the IPC that relate to punishing spread of infection or diseases dangerous to life. He further submits that Manusmriti prohibits such sexual acts. Radhakrishnan relies on a report as per which homosexuality has led to spread of HIV in USA. Section 377 is a modern medico-legal necessity to counter AIDS. Maneka Guruswamy points out that K.S. Radhakrishnan has been reading incorrect content citing it to be DSM-5. Radhakrishnan says regardless the content he has been reading exists somewhere. The bench questions whether it can rely on such documents.

K.S. Radhakrishnan continues. He says that there is a need to uphold public morality, and that right to privacy should not be extended to indulge in unnatural offences and become carriers of HIV. He says that

rampant homosexual activities for money will tempt and corrupt the young generation. He says that the fall out of Section 377 will be on the family system which is the bulwark of Indian social structure since Rig Vedic times will be in shambles.

Justice Nariman says that the Supreme Court has inverted what Bentham said about choosing lesser of the two evils. Radhakrishnan says that he will read the judgement and adds that privacy right cannot be allowed to be an unruly horse. He says that despite the assigned function, the sexual organs are being abused, and that this is undignified. He says that the right to privacy placed in every person also vests in them trust to uphold certain morality, which they should not abuse. He urges the Court to look at the extent to which right to privacy may be extended. He asks, can the state not interfere if terrorists are holed up in a flat. If Section 377 is struck down, HIV/AIDS will spread rapidly, and India will lose nobility, character, and virtuousness.

K.S. Radhakrishnan concludes his arguments.

Another intervenor says that in the event of striking down Section 377, for non-consensual acts, the aggrieved persons would be left without any remedy.

H.P. Sharma commences submissions. He submits that reading down Section 377 would affect the institution of marriage. He submits that Section 377 needs to be retained as is. He says there is no law to save marriage if a husband wants to indulge in homosexual acts. He submits that on reading IPC, the assumption is that married men would not indulge in homosexual acts, but once they do, how does one define the extent of liberty they claim. Sharma says that there is something which is natural, and that which is unnatural. He says there is no data to suggest that lives of the LGBT community improved till the Naz Foundation judgement was set aside.

He says that Section 376 does not use the word carnal. He says that the word carnal in Section 377 does not give any added meaning. He says that the section does not cover lesbians or female bisexuals and hence women are not affected by this provision. CJI Misra says that the

word intercourse has a broad meaning. He submits that transsexuals are attracted to men for the purpose of fulfilling their carnal needs. He says that Section 377 only affects men having sex with men and bisexual men. The NACO program line lists, identifies, and sensitizes the MSM community. Crores of public funds have been spent on them and there is no case where they have been harassed. He says that there is no data that homosexuals have been criminalised using Section 377 in the last 30 years, and that the provision is no sleeping giant. Reading down Section 377 will lead to rise of new breed of sex workers.

H.P.Sharma compares Section 377 with corruption and police. He says that just because there is corruption, one cannot abolish the body of police. He says that we know there is corruption everywhere, and asks if we abolish police because it is corrupt. Likewise, he asks, whether we should strike down a law because it affects a few. He refers to the directive principles of state policy. He says that interest of the LGBT community has to be balanced against interest of the society. He reads Article 39A. He says that there are disabilities in the society to a great extent, but the answer is not to abolish certain acts.

H.P.Sharma says that the petitioners have not shown a single instance of any harm to members of the LGBT community after the Naz Foundation judgement was set aside. He says that when persons indulge in unnatural acts, they are bound to have injuries. Legalizing unnatural acts would violate Section 322 of the IPC (the provision relating to voluntarily causing grievous hurt). He submits that the societal interest is to be taken as the interest of the individual. He says that the Court has to balance fundamental rights of citizens and social and public interests. He says that after live-in relationships, rapes have increased manifold.

H.P. Sharma asks what happens if two consenting men live together and one of them falls sick, and the partner abandons him. CJI Misra says that there are cases where children leave their ailing parents at hospitals. Sharma says that merely striking down Section 377 would not remove the stigma attached to homosexual acts. Advocate H.P. Sharma concludes his submissions.

Anand Grover gives a brief rejoinder. He submits that the submission by the respondent on line listing is incomplete. Not only MSM, but also female sex workers, and vulnerable communities, are provided with condoms.

The hearings on Section 377 conclude. Supreme Court reserves judgment.

SEPTEMBER 6, 2018:

At 11.30am on 6th September, 2018, the five-judge Constitution bench assembles at 11:30 am to pronounce the judgment on the Constitutional validity of Section 377 of the IPC. CJI Dipak Misra says that all opinions are concurring.

CJI Misra reads the judgment on behalf of Justice Khanwilkar and himself. He says that no one can escape from their individuality. Citing Mill, he says that one defines oneself. Respect for individual choice is the essence of liberty. The LGBT community possesses equal rights under the Constitution. Prejudiced notions and social exclusion are still faced by individuals. The LGBT community possesses the same human rights and Constitutional rights like any other individual. Section 377 is irrational, manifestly arbitrary and indefensible. Equality is the edifice on which the entire non-discrimination jurisprudence exists. The concept of identity cannot be a prison-hold. It cannot be only one identity. The primary objective of having a Constitutional society is to transform the society progressively. The Constitutional provisions should not be interpreted in literal sense. The sexual orientation of an individual is natural and discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation is a violation of freedom of expression. The view taken by the Court in the Suresh Koushal case is impermissible under the Constitution.

It can be concluded that self-determination is in tandem with the NALSA judgment; it is line with the Naz Foundation judgment; the Constitution is capable of extension to include expansion of laws in keeping with the changing times. The role of the courts becomes more important when a group has been deprived since time immemorial; words ought to be interpreted; Constitutional mortality is to preserve the heterogeneous nature of a society. Social morality cannot be used as an index of measurement; there is a right to live to with dignity, without which other rights can be trumped; sexual orientation is one of the many biological phenomena which is natural and is controlled by biological and neurological phenomena. An individual has sovereignty

over his/her body. Holding otherwise is in violation to fundamental rights; rights evolve with the evolution of the society.

This provision of the IPC has resulted in a collateral effect in that even consensual sex between LGBT persons is criminalised and is thus violative of Article 14. Autonomy is individualistic. One can submit one's autonomy to one another with choice. There is unreasonable classification with no nexus with the object. Section 377 insofar as it criminalises consensual sexual acts between man and man, man and woman or woman and woman is unconstitutional and is struck down. Sex with animal will however remain a criminal act. The judgment in Suresh Kumar Koushal case is thus overruled.

Justice Rohinton Fali Nariman reads from his judgment. He cites the poem "The Love that Dares not Speak its Name" written by Lord Alfred Douglas to Oscar Wilde and mentions the fact of Wilde's imprisonment under the law. He then said that the only good thing to come of this conviction was that one of the most beautiful poems in the English language was written by Oscar Wilde when he was in prison, namely "The Ballad of Reading Gaol". He gives the historical context of Section 377. He then goes on to say that the Yogyakarta Principles directly apply. He says that Homosexuals have right to live with dignity. He places extensive reliance on foreign jurisprudence including the recent judgment from Trinidad and Tobago. He says that one feature of his judgment is reliance on Mental Healthcare Act as per which Parliament has recognised that homosexuality is not a mental disorder. On why the Suresh Kumar Koushal case cannot stay, he says that homosexuals are entitled to Constitutional rights. The Union of India should take all measures to broadcast the judgment in regular intervals to reduce and eliminate stigma. Police be given periodic sensitisation lessons. Justice Nariman concurs with the CJI and signs off his opinion.

Next Justice D.Y. Chandrachud reads his opinion. He says that gays, lesbians, bisexuals, and transgenders have equal rights as other citizens. Section 377 denies equal participation. He says that individual liberty is the soul of the Constitution. He says that the lethargy of law is

manifest again in the 157 year old colonial law. Macaulay's legacy has existed despite us having our own Constitution. He says that we must as a society ask certain questions. We become the cause and not just the inheritors. Our Constitution does not ask us to conform. Dissent is the safety valve of democracy. Section 377 has been destructive of identity. Sexual orientation has become a cause of blackmail in the time of technology. This case is much more than just decriminalising a provision. It is about an aspiration to realise Constitutional rights and equal existence of the LGBT community as other citizens. Section 377 provides rule by law instead of rule of law. It encourages discrimination and stereotyping. LGBT persons have rights to be equal citizens in all manifestations. Section 377 is deeply rooted in majoritarian standards. To deny LGBT persons their right to sexual orientation is a denial of their citizenship and a violation of their privacy. They cannot be pushed into obscurity by an oppressive colonial legislation.

Treatment of homosexuality as a disorder/disease has a severe impact on the mental health of such persons. Human sexuality cannot be defined narrowly. LGBT persons have a right to equality of protection under the Constitution. Discrimination against LGBT is unconstitutional.

Justice Chandrachud reads a poem by Leonard Cohen from his judgment in court titled, 'Democracy' in court. He says that decriminalisation of Section 377 is of course necessary, but is just the first step. The Constitution envisages much more. LGBT persons are victims of Victorian morality. Saying that the LGBT community is entitled to equal citizenship and equal rights under the Constitution, Justice Chandrachud overrules the Suresh Kumar Koushal case. Constitutional morality will prevail and the society cannot dictate the sexuality of an individual. The state has no business to intrude into these personal matters. Section 377 is unconstitutional to the extent that it penalises consensual sex between two adults. Justice Chandrachud signs off, concurring with the CJI.

Justice Indu Malhotra concurs with the CJI's opinion. History owes an apology to LGBT persons for ostracisation, discrimination. Reading

down of Section 377 shall not lead to reopening of any concluded prosecutions but can certainly be relied upon in all pending matters whether they are at the trial, appellate, or revisional stages.

Section 377 stands decriminalised to the extent it criminalises consensual sexual acts of adults in private.

10. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The idea of this book was born in the demand raised by members of Bangalore's LGBT community including Mallu Kumbar (Karnataka Sexual Minorities Forum) and Umesh (Jeeva) who made the point that the judgment is not accessible to the Kannada speaking members of the community and that it was imperative that a summary of the Judgment be made for wider use and dissemination among the Kannada speaking members of the community.

The current publication will be available in multiple languages, including Kannada.

Thanks are due to Kunal Ambasta, Siddharth Narrain, Niruj Mohan, Rajesh Srinivas, Danish Sheikh, Pawan Dhall and Deeptha Rao for constructive feedback in the course of the evolution of this draft.

Thanks to Sanjana Yadav for compiling the transcript of the hearing.

Thanks to Vinay Chandran for contributing to the evolution of the draft and making many constructive editorial suggestions.

Thanks to Vinay Sreenivasa and the Alternative Law Forum for publication.

11. BIO

Arvind Narrain is a human rights lawyer, activist and writer. He has written extensively on human rights issues including on LGBT rights, minority rights and discrimination law. He is the founder member of the Alternative Law Forum in Bangalore, a human rights lawyering collective based in India. He has been part of the team of lawyers involved in the litigation around Section 377 of the Indian Penal Code (IPC), in both the High Court and the Supreme Court.

He is also the author of *Queer: Despised sexualities and Social Change* and co-author of *Breathing Life into the Constitution: Human Rights Lawyering in India*. He is the co-editor of *Because I have a voice: Queer politics in India*; *Law Like Love: Queer perspectives on law*; and *Nothing to fix: Medicalisation of sexual orientation and gender identity*.

He is currently the Director Research and Practice at Arc International, which advocates the right to be free from violence and discrimination on grounds of sexual orientation, gender identity and intersex status and develop international law and policy on the same.

ABOUT THE ALTERNATIVE LAW FORUM (ALF)

ALF was started in March, 2000, by a collective of lawyers with the belief that there was a need for an alternative practice of law. ALF recognises that a practice of law is inherently political. ALF provides qualitative legal services to marginalised groups; conducts autonomous research with a strong interdisciplinary approach working with practitioners from other fields; acts as a public legal resource; operates as a centre for generating quality resources that make interventions in legal education and training; and is a platform to enable collaborative and creative models of knowledge production.

Page intentionally left blank

RIGHT TO LOVE

NAVTEJ SINGH JOHAR v UNION OF INDIA: A TRANSFORMATIVE CONSTITUTION AND THE RIGHTS OF LGBTQI PERSONS

The 6th of September 2018 marked a historic victory for a vibrant and vociferous LGBT movement in India, which for over seventeen years had been demanding the repeal of Section 377 of the Indian Penal Code. The Supreme Court in its decision in Navtej Singh Johar v. Union of India, struck down the 1860 law criminalising the lives of LGBT persons. This short booklet aims to provide a roadmap to this judgment, so that its implications can be better understood by LGBT persons as well as all those who are interested in the future of human rights.

**For more information contact:
Alternative Law Forum, Bangalore
altlawforum.org
contact@altlawforum.org
+91-80-22865757**