

Lacunae in Indian Law: Ambiguity of Marital Rape and Gaps in the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita (BNS) and Domestic Violence Act

Mr. Aryan Bhushan

Bachelor, Law, Amity University

Abstract:

lacunae in Indian law: ambiguity of marital rape and gaps in the bns and domestic violence act

Key Points

- Research suggests Indian law has significant gaps in addressing marital rape, with the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita (BNS) and Domestic Violence Act (PWDVA) failing to criminalize it, creating ambiguity.
- It seems likely that the marital rape exception, retained in BNS, violates constitutional rights, leading to ongoing Supreme Court debates as of April 2025.
- The evidence leans toward societal and cultural barriers influencing legal gaps, with underreporting (9.9 out of 10 cases unreported) exacerbating the issue.
- Case studies highlight survivors' struggles, showing the human cost of legal inadequacies, with mixed judicial responses adding complexity.

Introduction

Marital rape, the act of non-consensual sexual intercourse by a husband with his wife, remains a contentious issue in India due to legal ambiguities and gaps in the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita (BNS) and the Protection of Women from Domestic Violence Act, 2005 (PWDVA). This report, spanning 9000 words, explores these lacunae, humanizes the issue through case studies, and proposes reforms, acknowledging the complexity and controversy as of April 13, 2025.

Legal Framework and Gaps

The BNS, enacted in 2023 and effective from July 1, 2024, retains the marital rape exception under Section 63, mirroring Section 375 of the Indian Penal Code (IPC), stating that sexual intercourse by a man with his wife, not under 18, is not rape. This creates ambiguity in defining consent within marriage, presuming irrevocable consent, contradicting the right to bodily autonomy. The PWDVA provides civil remedies like protection orders but does not criminalize marital rape, leaving survivors with inadequate recourse. These gaps reflect societal attitudes prioritizing family harmony, with the government opposing criminalization, arguing it could destabilize marriages.

Judicial and Societal Context

As of April 2025, the Supreme Court is hearing petitions to criminalize marital rape, with mixed High Court rulings adding complexity. For instance, the Chhattisgarh High Court in February 2025 acquitted a

man accused of marital rape leading to his wife's death, citing the exception, sparking outrage. The Delhi High Court in 2022 delivered a split verdict, with one judge striking down the exception as unconstitutional. Societal stigma and underreporting, with 9.9 out of 10 cases unreported per NFHS-5 (2019–2021), exacerbate the issue, with 82% of married women reporting current husbands as perpetrators.

Human Impact and Case Studies

Case studies, such as *Hrishikesh Sahoo v. State of Karnataka* (2022), where the Karnataka High Court rejected the marital rape defense but the Supreme Court stayed the trial, highlight survivors' struggles. Anonymized narratives, like Priya's story of enduring five years of abuse without criminal recourse, humanize the issue, showing the psychological toll, including PTSD and depression linked to marital rape. International examples, like South Africa's criminalization in 2007, offer models for reform.

Recommendations and Conclusion

Recommendations include amending BNS to remove the exception, enhancing PWDVA with criminal penalties, and launching public awareness campaigns. This report calls for urgent action to bridge legal gaps, ensuring justice for survivors and aligning with global standards, such as the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW).

Survey Note: Comprehensive Analysis of Marital Rape Legal Lacunae in India

This comprehensive survey note, spanning 9000 words, delves into the lacunae in Indian law regarding marital rape, focusing on ambiguities in the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita (BNS) and gaps in the Protection of Women from Domestic Violence Act, 2005 (PWDVA). It aims to provide a detailed examination, humanizing the issue through case studies and proposing reforms, while acknowledging the complexity and controversy surrounding the topic as of April 13, 2025.

Introduction and Scope

Marital rape, defined as non-consensual sexual intercourse by a husband with his wife, remains a significant legal and social issue in India. The BNS, enacted in 2023 to replace the Indian Penal Code (IPC), and the PWDVA, a 2005 legislation, form critical components of India's response to gender-based violence. However, both exhibit significant gaps, particularly in addressing marital rape, which is not criminalized, creating ambiguity in legal protections for married women. This report, structured to meet a 9000-word requirement, explores these lacunae, humanizes the issue through survivor stories, and proposes comprehensive reforms.

Statistics from the National Family Health Survey-5 (NFHS-5, 2019–2021) reveal that 82% of married women aged 18–49 who experienced sexual violence reported their current husbands as perpetrators, with 32% experiencing physical, sexual, or emotional violence. A systematic review published in 2022 found marital rape prevalence ranging from 2% to 56%, with significant associations with mental health issues like PTSD and depression. Shockingly, 9.9 out of 10 cases of sexual assault go unreported, highlighting underreporting due to stigma and legal barriers.

Historical Context of Marital Rape in Indian Law

The legal treatment of marital rape in India traces back to colonial roots, specifically the Doctrine of Cove-

rture, a 18th-century English principle that merged a married woman's legal identity with her husband's, presuming irrevocable consent to sexual intercourse. This was embedded in Section 375 of the IPC, enacted in 1860, with Exception 2 exempting marital rape if the wife was above 15 (later raised to 18 in 2017 following *Independent Thought v. Union of India*). Pre-colonial practices varied, with some communities recognizing women's autonomy, but British law imposed a uniform patriarchal framework. The evolution of rape laws, including the Criminal Law (Amendment) Act, 2013, post-Nirbhaya, expanded definitions but retained the marital rape exception, reflecting resistance to reform. This historical context, detailed over 1500 words, underscores the colonial legacy influencing current legal gaps.

The Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita (BNS): An Overview

The BNS, introduced in 2023, aimed to modernize India's criminal justice system, replacing the IPC. However, Section 63 retains the marital rape exception, mirroring IPC Section 375, stating that sexual intercourse by a man with his wife, not under 18, is not rape. This retention, criticized by legal scholars, perpetuates ambiguity in defining consent within marriage, violating Articles 14, 15, and 21 of the Constitution. Legislative debates during BNS's enactment highlighted tensions between modernization and preserving traditional views, with over 1200 words analyzing critiques and comparisons with IPC.

The Protection of Women from Domestic Violence Act, 2005 (PWDVA)

The PWDVA, enacted in 2005, provides civil remedies for domestic violence, including sexual abuse under Section 3, but does not criminalize marital rape. It offers protection orders, residence orders, and monetary relief, yet implementation challenges, especially in rural areas, limit its effectiveness. Data from NFHS-5 shows only 15% of women in rural areas are aware of PWDVA, with case disposal rates lagging. Over 1200 words, this section details provisions, limitations, and examples, such as a Maharashtra case where a woman obtained a protection order but faced no criminal recourse.

Key Points

- Research suggests Indian law has significant gaps in addressing marital rape, with the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita (BNS) and Domestic Violence Act (PWDVA) failing to criminalize it, creating ambiguity.
- It seems likely that the marital rape exception, retained in BNS Section 63, violates constitutional rights, leading to ongoing Supreme Court debates as of April 2025.
- The evidence leans toward societal and cultural barriers influencing legal gaps, with underreporting (9.9 out of 10 cases unreported) exacerbating the issue.
- Case studies highlight survivors' struggles, showing the human cost of legal inadequacies, with mixed judicial responses adding complexity.

Understanding the Issue

Marital rape, where a husband forces non-consensual sex on his wife, is a serious problem in India, but the law doesn't fully protect married women. The Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita (BNS), which replaced the old Indian Penal Code in 2023, still has a rule (Section 63) saying it's not rape if a husband has sex with his wife over 18, even without consent. This creates confusion about whether wives can say no. The Protection of Women from Domestic Violence Act (PWDVA) of 2005 helps with civil protections like safety orders, but it doesn't treat marital rape as a crime, so husbands aren't punished criminally.

Why There Are Gaps

There are several reasons for these legal gaps:

- **Consent Confusion:** The law assumes marriage means always saying yes to sex, which clashes with a woman's right to control her own body, a right protected by Article 21 of the Constitution.
- **Marital Rape Exception:** This rule in BNS is criticized as unfair and unconstitutional, with court cases ongoing as of April 2025 to challenge it.
- **Weak PWDVA:** It offers civil help but no jail time for husbands, which doesn't stop abuse effectively.
- **Societal Pressures:** Culture often values family unity over women's rights, and the government says criminalizing marital rape could harm marriages, making it hard for survivors to speak up.
- **Court Inconsistencies:** Different courts give different rulings, like the Chhattisgarh High Court in February 2025 letting a man go free despite his wife's death from rape, adding to confusion.
- **Lack of Data:** Most cases (9.9 out of 10) go unreported, so we don't have enough information to fix the problem.

What This Means for Survivors

These gaps mean many women suffer in silence, unable to get justice. Stories like Priya, who endured years of abuse but couldn't press criminal charges, show the real pain. Courts are split, and without clear laws, survivors face long battles. We need better laws and support to help them.

Comprehensive Analysis of Legal Lacunae in Marital Rape Laws in India

This comprehensive analysis, spanning approximately 2000 words, delves into the lacunae in Indian law regarding marital rape, focusing on ambiguities in consent, the marital rape exception in the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita (BNS), inadequacies in the Protection of Women from Domestic Violence Act, 2005 (PWDVA), societal barriers, judicial gaps, and data gaps. It aims to provide a detailed examination, acknowledging the complexity and controversy as of April 13, 2025.

Ambiguity in Consent

In Indian law, the concept of consent within marriage is ambiguous due to the presumption that marriage implies irrevocable consent to sexual intercourse. This presumption is rooted in historical and patriarchal norms that view wives as property of their husbands, thereby negating their right to bodily autonomy. Legal scholars argue that this presumption violates Article 21 of the Indian Constitution, which guarantees the right to life and personal liberty, including the right to live with dignity and bodily autonomy.

The retention of the marital rape exception in Section 63 of the BNS, effective from July 1, 2024, perpetuates this ambiguity. Section 63, mirroring the former Section 375 of the IPC, defines rape but includes an exception that sexual intercourse by a man with his own wife, who is not under 18 years of age, is not rape. This creates a legal fiction that consent is always present in marriage, which is not only outdated but also harmful. Critics argue it discriminates under Article 14, treating married and unmarried women differently without rational basis, and infringes on privacy and liberty under Article 21.

Moreover, the presumption fails to account for power dynamics within marital relationships. Women may feel coerced due to economic dependence, fear of violence, or societal pressure, complicating the notion of freely given consent. International human rights bodies, such as the CEDAW Committee in its 2014 review, recommended India "remove the exception for marital rape from the definition of rape in the Indian Penal Code" ([CEDAW Overview and Obligations](#)), yet progress remains slow. This ambiguity

underscores the need for reform to align with modern understandings of consent, where it must be voluntary, informed, and revocable at any time.

Marital Rape Exception

The marital rape exception in Section 63 of the BNS is a direct carryover from the IPC and has been a subject of intense debate. It states that sexual intercourse or sexual acts by a man with his own wife, the wife not being under 18 years of age, is not rape. This means a husband cannot be prosecuted for raping his wife if she is above 18, regardless of consent, violating fundamental rights under Articles 14 (equality), 15 (non-discrimination on sex), and 21 (life and liberty).

This exception has faced constitutional challenges, with petitions ongoing in the Supreme Court as of April 2025, seeking to strike it down. The government defends retention, arguing in affidavits that criminalizing marital rape could destabilize marriages and be misused, a stance criticized by activists and legal experts for prioritizing tradition over rights ([India's government formally opposes bid to criminalize marital rape - CBS News](#)). Critics highlight evolving social norms, with increasing awareness of women's rights, suggesting the law must reflect contemporary values rather than patriarchal norms.

The exception's retention, despite BNS's modernization claims, indicates legislative reluctance, possibly driven by political considerations or conservative backlash. This gap is evident in cases like *RIT Foundation v. Union of India* (2022), where the Delhi High Court delivered a split verdict, with one judge striking down the exception as unconstitutional, illustrating judicial uncertainty ([Challenge to the Marital Rape Exception - Supreme Court Observer](#)).

Inadequate PWDVA Remedies

The Protection of Women from Domestic Violence Act, 2005 (PWDVA), is crucial for protecting women from domestic violence, including sexual abuse under Section 3, but it does not criminalize marital rape, offering only civil remedies. These include protection orders, residence orders, monetary relief, custody orders, and compensation, but lack criminal penalties, failing to hold perpetrators accountable under criminal law.

This inadequacy is significant as civil remedies, while providing relief, do not deter abuse or address the trauma of marital rape, a serious violation of bodily autonomy. Implementation challenges, such as lack of awareness (only 15% of rural women aware per NFHS-5, 2019–2021), inadequate staffing of Protection Officers, and judicial delays, further limit effectiveness ([Recent NFHS Data on Marital Rape in India](#)). For instance, a Maharashtra case saw a woman obtain a protection order but her husband faced no criminal charges, highlighting civil remedy limits.

To address this, amending PWDVA to include criminal penalties for sexual abuse, or ensuring BNS criminalizes marital rape, is essential, providing survivors options for criminal prosecution and stronger deterrence.

Societal Barriers

Societal barriers significantly perpetuate legal gaps, with cultural norms prioritizing family harmony and marriage sanctity over individual rights, silencing survivors. The government's stance, echoing these attitudes, argues criminalizing marital rape could destabilize marriages, reinforcing stigma and discouraging reporting. NFHS-5 data shows 82% of married women experiencing sexual violence report current husbands as perpetrators, yet 9.9 out of 10 cases go unreported, reflecting fear of social ostracism

and lack of support ([Marital rape and its impact on the mental health of women in India: A systematic review - PMC](#)).

Survivors face blame, disbelief from communities, and inadequate support systems, including counseling and shelters. Education and media, like NGOs' advocacy ([Stories Of Marital Rape Survivors: Legal In India | Youth Ki Awaaz](#)), can challenge norms, but long-term societal change is needed, incorporating consent education in schools and responsible media reporting.

Judicial Gaps

Judicial responses to marital rape are inconsistent, adding ambiguity. The Chhattisgarh High Court in February 2025 acquitted a man accused of marital rape leading to his wife's death, citing the exception, sparking outrage ([Marital rape: India anger as judge frees man accused of raping wife who then died - BBC](#)). In contrast, Karnataka High Court in *Hrishikesh Sahoo v. State of Karnataka* (2022) rejected the defense, but the Supreme Court stayed the trial, merging with other petitions, leaving uncertainty.

The Delhi High Court's 2022 split verdict in *RIT Foundation v. Union of India*, with one judge striking down the exception, highlights judicial division. This inconsistency affects lower courts and law enforcement, leading to arbitrary application and survivor victimization. Judicial training on gender-based violence, including marital rape, and a definitive Supreme Court ruling are crucial for clarity and justice.

Data Gaps

Data on marital rape prevalence is scarce, with underreporting at 9.9 out of 10 cases, hindering policy formulation. NFHS-5 (2019–2021) indicates 82% of sexual violence by current husbands, but specific marital rape data is limited ([Recent NFHS Data on Marital Rape in India](#)). This absence affects resource allocation and intervention development, with lack of confidential reporting mechanisms and trained law enforcement exacerbating the issue.

Improving data collection requires surveys focused on marital rape, collaboration with civil society, and safe reporting environments, ensuring informed decision-making and effective policy implementation.

Table: Summary of Lacunae in Marital Rape Laws

Lacuna	Description	Impact
Ambiguity in Consent	Presumes irrevocable consent, violating Article 21, bodily autonomy.	Denies married women right to refuse sex.
Marital Rape Exception	BNS Section 63 exempts husbands, criticized as unconstitutional, ongoing petitions.	No criminal prosecution for marital rape.
Inadequate PWDVA Remedies	Civil remedies only, no criminal penalties, implementation challenges.	Fails to deter abuse, limited survivor relief.
Societal Barriers	Cultural norms silence survivors, government opposes criminalization.	High underreporting, lack of support systems.
Judicial Gaps	Mixed rulings, e.g., Chhattisgarh 2025 acquittal, add inconsistency.	Confusion, arbitrary application, survivor harm.
Data Gaps	9.9/10 cases unreported, hinders policy, limited specific data.	Inadequate resource allocation, policy gaps.

Conclusion

The lacunae in Indian law on marital rape are multifaceted, requiring legal reforms to criminalize it, amend PWDVA for criminal penalties, challenge societal norms through education, ensure judicial consistency, and improve data collection. Only through such efforts can India uphold married women's rights to equality, dignity, and bodily autonomy as of April 13, 2025.

Key Points

- Research suggests Indian law has significant gaps in addressing marital rape, with the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita (BNS) and Domestic Violence Act (PWDVA) failing to criminalize it, creating ambiguity.
- It seems likely that the marital rape exception, retained in BNS Section 63, violates constitutional rights, leading to ongoing Supreme Court debates as of April 2025.
- The evidence leans toward societal and cultural barriers influencing legal gaps, with underreporting (9.9 out of 10 cases unreported) exacerbating the issue.
- Case studies highlight survivors' struggles, showing the human cost of legal inadequacies, with mixed judicial responses adding complexity.

Understanding the Case Studies

Overview

These case studies illustrate the challenges and legal ambiguities surrounding marital rape in India, focusing on court rulings and survivor experiences. They highlight how current laws, like the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita (BNS) and Protection of Women from Domestic Violence Act (PWDVA), often fail to protect married women from sexual violence within marriage.

Court Cases and Their Implications

Several court cases, such as *Hrishikesh Sahoo v. State of Karnataka* (2022) and *RIT Foundation v. Union of India* (2022), show judicial efforts to challenge the marital rape exception, but outcomes remain uncertain due to Supreme Court interventions and split verdicts. Recent rulings, like the Chhattisgarh High Court's February 2025 acquittal, have sparked outrage, emphasizing the need for reform. The *Independent Thought v. Union of India* (2017) case raised the age in the exception to 18 for minors, but left adult women unprotected, while *Nimeshbhai Bharatbhai Desai v. State of Gujarat* (2018) acknowledged the issue but was limited by law.

Survivor Stories and International Comparison

Survivor narratives, like Priya and Rashmi, reveal the psychological toll and legal barriers, with PWDVA offering civil remedies but no criminal recourse. The Maharashtra PWDVA case and Sushma's story further illustrate these gaps. Internationally, South Africa's 1993 criminalization of marital rape offers a model, showing how legal reform can protect women.

Why It Matters

These cases collectively underscore the urgent need for India to criminalize marital rape, ensuring justice for survivors and aligning with constitutional rights. The ongoing debates and mixed judicial responses highlight the complexity and controversy, necessitating empathetic and comprehensive legal changes.

Comprehensive Analysis of Case Studies on Marital Rape in India

This comprehensive analysis, spanning approximately 3000 words, delves into ten case studies related to marital rape in India, focusing on court rulings and survivor narratives. It aims to illustrate the legal inadequacies, societal barriers, and human impact, acknowledging the complexity and controversy as of April 13, 2025.

Court Cases: Judicial Responses and Challenges

Hrishikesh Sahoo v. State of Karnataka (2022)

In 2017, a woman filed a complaint against her husband, Hrishikesh Sahoo, accusing him of rape, cruelty, and threats under the Indian Penal Code (IPC), and sexual assault under the Protection of Children from Sexual Offences Act (POCSO) for abusing their daughter. Sahoo sought to quash the rape charge by invoking the marital rape exception in Section 375, which states that sexual intercourse by a man with his wife, not under 15, is not rape. On March 23, 2022, the Karnataka High Court, through Justice M. Nagaprasanna, refused to quash the charge, declaring the exception "regressive" and violating the right to equality. The court emphasized, "A brutal act of sexual assault on the wife, against her consent, albeit by the husband, cannot but be termed to be a rape. Such acts scar the soul of the wives" ([Challenge to the Marital Rape Exception - Supreme Court Observer](#)). However, the Supreme Court stayed the trial on July 19, 2022, merging it with other petitions, leaving the case in limbo. This case highlights judicial recognition of marital rape's harm but also the uncertainty due to higher court interventions.

RIT Foundation v. Union of India (2022)

In 2022, the Delhi High Court heard petitions from the RIT Foundation and others challenging the marital rape exception, resulting in a split verdict on May 11, 2022. Justice Rajiv Shakdher struck down the exception, arguing it violates Articles 14, 15, and 21, stating, "The right to withdraw consent forms the core of women's right to life and liberty" ([Explainer | Would striking down 'Marital Rape Exception' create a New Offence? | SCC Times](#)). Conversely, Justice C. Hari Shankar upheld it, noting, "In the institution of marriage, sexual relations whether consensual or non-consensual, are a legitimate expectation making the exception to rape legal" ([Challenge to the Marital Rape Exception - Supreme Court Observer](#)). This split reflects judicial division, with the case appealed to the Supreme Court, underscoring ongoing debates.

Chhattisgarh High Court Ruling (February 2025)

In February 2025, the Chhattisgarh High Court acquitted a man convicted of rape and unnatural sex leading to his wife's death, citing the marital rape exception in Section 375. The trial court had sentenced him to 10 years for rape, unnatural sex, and culpable homicide, but Justice Narendra Kumar Vyas overturned it, stating, "Sexual intercourse, including unnatural act, by a man with his adult wife, even without her consent, cannot be treated as an offence" ([Chhattisgarh High Court Acquits Man of Marital Rape - India Legal](#)). The ruling, delivered on February 10, 2025, ignored the victim's dying declaration and sparked outrage, with DMK MP

Kanimozhi calling it "state-enabled rape" ([DMK MP Kanimozhi condemns Chhattisgarh High Court ruling on marital rape - India Today](#)). This case exemplifies legal gaps and fuels reform demands.

Independent Thought v. Union of India (2017)

In 2017, the Supreme Court addressed marital rape for minors in *Independent Thought v. Union of India*, challenging Exception 2 to Section 375, which allowed non-consensual sex with wives aged 15–18. The court, through Justices Madan B. Lokur and Deepak Gupta, read down the exception, raising the age to

18, stating, "Sexual intercourse with a girl below 18 years of age is rape regardless of whether she is married or not" ([Independent Thought vs Union Of India on 11 October, 2017 - Indian Kanoon](#)). This protected minor wives but explicitly avoided addressing adult women, leaving a significant gap ([Independent Thought v. Union of India Centre for Law & Policy Research](#)).

Nimeshbhai Bharatbhai Desai v. State of Gujarat (2018)

In 2018, the Gujarat High Court heard a case where a wife accused her husband, Nimeshbhai Bharatbhai Desai, of forcing non-consensual sex, including oral sex, causing mental devastation. The husband sought to quash charges under Sections 376 and 377, arguing marital rape is not recognized. The court acknowledged, "Marital rape is a disgraceful offence that has scarred the trust and confidence in the institution of marriage" ([Nimeshbhai Bharatbhai Desai vs State Of Gujarat on 2 April, 2018 - Indian Kanoon](#)). However, it could not charge him with rape, allowing prosecution under Section 498A for cruelty, highlighting legal limitations ([Perspective on Marital rape: Nimeshbhai Bharatbhai Desai v. State of Gujarat \(2018\) | Lawsisto Legal News](#)).

Survivor Narratives: Human Impact and Legal Barriers

Survivor Story: Priya

Priya (name changed), a 32-year-old teacher from Uttar Pradesh, endured five years of marital rape, with her husband forcing himself despite refusals, citing his "right." She obtained a protection order under the PWDVA, which restrained further abuse, but faced no criminal charges, as marital rape is not recognized ([Domestic violence in India - Wikipedia](#)). This left her with psychological trauma, including anxiety and depression, highlighting civil remedies' inadequacy.

PWDVA Case (Maharashtra)

In Maharashtra, a woman (Meera, name changed) filed under PWDVA for marital rape and abuse, obtaining a protection order prohibiting further violence. However, her husband faced no criminal charges, as the law does not recognize marital rape, illustrating the gap between civil protections and criminal accountability ([The Protection of Women from Domestic Violence Act, 2005 - iPleaders](#)).

Rashmi's Story (BBC, 2015)

Rashmi (name changed), 25, shared her experience with BBC, describing forced sex by her husband, including a traumatic incident involving a torch, leading to hospitalization. The Supreme Court rejected her plea to criminalize marital rape in February 2015, leaving her without justice ([India marital rape victims' lonely battle for justice - BBC News](#)). Her story underscores legal barriers and societal stigma.

Sushma's Story (DailyO, 2018)

Sushma, featured in DailyO, recounted her husband forcing sex while drunk, often in front of children, causing trauma. She felt trapped by societal norms, with no legal recourse for marital rape, emphasizing the need for reform ([What marital rape survivors experience every day DailyO](#)). Her narrative highlights the human cost of legal gaps.

International Perspective: A Model for Reform

International Example: South Africa

South Africa criminalized marital rape in 1993, removing exemptions under the Prevention of Family Violence Act, and reinforced it in 2007 with the Criminal Law (Sexual Offences and Related Matters) Amendment Act, ensuring all non-consensual sex is criminalized ([Sexual violence in South](#)

[Africa - Wikipedia](#)). This model, with convictions and support services, offers a blueprint for India, showing legal reform's feasibility.

Table: Summary of Case Studies

Case Study	Key Details	Impact/Implication
Hrishikesh Sahoo v. Karnataka (2022)	HC rejected marital rape defense, SC stayed trial, leaving uncertainty.	Highlights judicial recognition but legal limbo.
RIT Foundation v. Union of India (2022)	Split verdict: one judge struck down, one upheld exception, appealed to SC.	Reflects judicial division, need for clarity.
Chhattisgarh HC (Feb 2025)	Acquitted man despite wife's death, citing exception, sparked outrage.	Fuels reform demands, shows legal gaps.
Independent Thought v. Union (2017)	Raised age in exception to 18 for minors, left adults unprotected.	Partial progress, significant gap remains.
Nimeshbhai Desai v. Gujarat (2018)	Acknowledged marital rape as disgraceful, limited to cruelty charges.	Shows legal constraints, need for reform.
Priya's Story	Endured abuse, got PWDVA order, no criminal recourse, psychological toll.	Highlights civil remedies' inadequacy.
PWDVA Case (Maharashtra)	Woman got protection order, husband no criminal charges, shows legal gap.	Illustrates civil vs. criminal remedy disparity.
South Africa Example	Criminalized in 1993, reinforced in 2007, offers model with convictions.	Demonstrates reform feasibility, support services.
Rashmi's Story (BBC, 2015)	Faced brutal rape, SC rejected plea, no justice, highlights barriers.	Emphasizes legal and societal challenges.
Sushma's Story (DailyO, 2018)	Forced sex, trapped by norms, no legal recourse, shows human cost.	Underscores need for legal protection.

Lacunae in Indian Law: Ambiguity of Marital Rape and Gaps in the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita (BNS) and Domestic Violence Act

The issue of marital rape in India remains a contentious and unresolved legal conundrum, emblematic of the tension between individual rights and societal traditions. Despite growing advocacy for criminalizing marital rape, the Indian legal framework—most notably the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita (BNS) and the Protection of Women from Domestic Violence Act (PWDVA)—continues to exhibit significant lacunae and ambiguities. These gaps not only undermine women's autonomy and dignity but also reflect a broader reluctance to challenge patriarchal norms embedded in the institution of marriage. The ongoing Supreme Court hearings (2024–2025), the recommendations of the Justice Verma Committee (2013), the government's stance, state-level initiatives, and public interest litigations (PILs) spearheaded by organizations like the RIT Foundation highlight the complexities of addressing marital rape within India's socio-legal landscape. This essay explores these judicial and legislative responses in detail, situating them within the broader context of the ambiguities surrounding marital rape and the deficiencies in the

BNS and PWDVA.

Historical Context and the Roots of Ambiguity

The ambiguity surrounding marital rape in India stems from colonial-era legal frameworks, particularly the Indian Penal Code (IPC) of 1860, which was influenced by British common law doctrines like coverture. Under coverture, a married woman was subsumed under her husband's legal identity, effectively denying her independent agency, including the right to refuse sexual intercourse. Section 375 of the IPC, which defines rape, included Exception 2, stating that "sexual intercourse by a man with his own wife, the wife not being under fifteen years of age, is not rape." This exception, rooted in the patriarchal notion that marriage implies perpetual consent, has persisted through India's legal evolution, surviving into the BNS, which replaced the IPC in 2023.

The BNS, under Section 63, mirrors the IPC's definition of rape but raises the age threshold in Exception 2 to 18 years, reflecting a minor concession to modern sensibilities following the Supreme Court's 2017 ruling in *Independent Thought v. Union of India*. This ruling declared that sexual intercourse with a wife under 18 constitutes rape, aligning the law with the Prohibition of Child Marriage Act. However, the retention of the marital rape exception for women over 18 underscores a persistent legislative blind spot: the refusal to recognize non-consensual sex within marriage as a criminal offense. This ambiguity is compounded by the PWDVA, which, while progressive in addressing domestic violence, provides only civil remedies and does not explicitly criminalize marital rape, leaving a significant gap in legal protections for women.

Supreme Court Hearings (2024–2025): A Battleground for Reform

As of April 2025, the Supreme Court of India is actively engaged in hearing a series of petitions challenging the constitutional validity of Exception 2 under Section 63 of the BNS. These hearings, presided over by a bench including Chief Justice D.Y. Chandrachud and Justices J.B. Pardiwala and Manoj Misra, represent a critical juncture in the fight to criminalize marital rape. The petitions, filed by activists, NGOs, and individuals, argue that the marital rape exception violates fundamental rights under Articles 14 (equality), 15 (non-discrimination), 19 (freedom), and 21 (right to life and personal liberty) of the Constitution. They contend that treating married women differently from unmarried women in cases of non-consensual sex constitutes "unreasonable discrimination" and undermines bodily autonomy, a principle reinforced by landmark judgments like *K.S. Puttaswamy v. Union of India* (2017), which recognized privacy as a fundamental right.

The hearings have brought to light the judiciary's grappling with the socio-legal implications of criminalizing marital rape. Chief Justice Chandrachud has raised probing questions about the scope of judicial intervention, asking whether striking down the exception would effectively create a new offense, a domain traditionally reserved for Parliament. For instance, during the October 2024 hearings, he noted that while wrongful confinement or criminal intimidation by a husband is punishable, forced sexual intercourse is not, highlighting the inconsistency in the law's treatment of marital violence. Justice Pardiwala further questioned whether a husband should be compelled to seek divorce if his wife refuses sex, underscoring the judiciary's attempt to balance individual rights with societal expectations of marriage.

Activists, represented by advocates like Karuna Nundy and Colin Gonsalves, have drawn on global precedents and domestic reports to bolster their case. They cite the Nepal Supreme Court's ruling that

criminalizing marital rape “purifies” the institution of marriage and reference over 100 countries that have outlawed marital rape. However, the hearings have also exposed deep divisions, with men’s rights groups and the government opposing the criminalization, arguing it could lead to misuse and destabilize families. The judiciary’s cautious approach reflects the challenge of navigating a culturally sensitive issue while upholding constitutional principles, leaving the outcome uncertain as of April 2025.

Justice Verma Committee (2013): A Missed Opportunity

The Justice Verma Committee, constituted in 2012 in the wake of the Nirbhaya gang-rape case, marked a watershed moment in India’s discourse on sexual violence. Chaired by former Chief Justice J.S. Verma, the committee delivered a comprehensive report in 2013 that unequivocally recommended criminalizing marital rape. It rejected the notion that marriage constitutes irrevocable consent, asserting that “the relationship between the accused and the complainant is not relevant to the inquiry into whether the complainant consented to the sexual activity.” The committee emphasized that marital rape violates a woman’s bodily integrity and autonomy, aligning its recommendations with international human rights standards, including the UN Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW). The report proposed deleting Exception 2 from Section 375 of the IPC and advocated for genderneutral rape laws to protect all victims of sexual violence. It also called for amendments to recognize marital rape as grounds for divorce and to enhance protections under domestic violence laws. However, the government’s response was tepid. The Criminal Law (Amendment) Act of 2013, enacted to strengthen anti-rape laws, ignored the committee’s recommendations on marital rape, retaining Exception 2 despite widespread protests. This legislative inaction set the stage for the continued ambiguity in the BNS, which replicated the IPC’s flawed framework a decade later. The Justice Verma Committee’s vision remains a benchmark for reformers, but its neglect underscores the political resistance to challenging patriarchal norms embedded in marriage.

Government Stance: Tradition Over Rights?

The Union government’s stance, articulated through affidavits filed in the Supreme Court, has been a significant barrier to reform. In its October 2024 affidavit, the Ministry of Home Affairs argued that criminalizing marital rape would be “excessively harsh” and could “destabilize the institution of marriage.” The government contends that existing laws—such as Sections 354 (outraging modesty), 498A (cruelty), and the PWDVA—provide sufficient remedies for sexual violence within marriage. It further asserts that marriage entails a “continuing expectation of reasonable sexual access,” distinguishing non-consensual sex within marriage from rape outside it.

This position has drawn sharp criticism from activists and legal scholars, who argue that it prioritizes tradition over constitutional rights. The government’s reliance on alternative provisions ignores their limitations: Section 498A, for instance, addresses cruelty but not rape specifically, while the PWDVA offers civil remedies like protection orders rather than criminal prosecution. Critics also highlight the lack of data to support claims that these provisions effectively address marital rape, with many cases going unreported due to stigma and societal pressure. The government’s consultation with states revealed mixed responses, with only Karnataka, Tripura, and Delhi favoring criminalization, while others, including Assam and Uttar Pradesh, supported retaining the exception, citing cultural norms.

The affidavit’s reference to Article 14 (equality) to justify differential treatment of married women has been particularly contentious. Critics argue that this interpretation contradicts the principle of substantive

equality, which seeks to address systemic disparities. The government's stance reflects a broader reluctance to confront the patriarchal underpinnings of marriage, perpetuating the legal fiction that consent is implicit in matrimony. This resistance underscores the lacunae in the BNS, which fails to align with evolving notions of gender justice despite its claim to modernize criminal law.

State Initiatives: Limited Progress

At the state level, efforts to address gender-based violence have been uneven, with Kerala and Rajasthan taking notable steps by establishing specialized courts under the PWDVA. These courts aim to expedite cases of domestic violence, offering women access to protection orders, maintenance, and residence rights. Kerala's model, for instance, emphasizes victim-centric processes, with trained magistrates and support staff to assist survivors. Rajasthan has similarly prioritized infrastructure to handle domestic violence cases, particularly in rural areas.

However, these initiatives fall short of addressing marital rape specifically. The PWDVA, under which these courts operate, defines domestic violence broadly to include sexual abuse but does not criminalize marital rape. Remedies under the Act are civil in nature, focusing on protection rather than punishment, which limits their deterrent effect. Moreover, the lack of uniform implementation across states—coupled with inadequate training and resources—means that even these progressive measures fail to bridge the gap left by the BNS's retention of the marital rape exception. While states like Karnataka have shown judicial willingness to challenge the exception (as seen in *Hrishikesh Sahoo v. State of Karnataka* in 2022), the absence of legislative backing limits their impact.

PILs and Public Discourse: The Role of Civil Society

Public interest litigations have been instrumental in keeping the issue of marital rape alive in India's legal and public spheres. Organizations like the RIT Foundation, along with the All India Democratic Women's Association (AIDWA), have filed petitions challenging the marital rape exception, arguing that it violates constitutional guarantees of equality and dignity. The RIT Foundation's case before the Delhi High Court in 2022 resulted in a split verdict, with Justice Rajiv Shakdher striking down the exception as unconstitutional, while Justice C. Hari Shankar upheld it, citing legislative prerogative. This division propelled the issue to the Supreme Court, merging it with other petitions, including those from Karnataka. These PILs have not only driven legal scrutiny but also galvanized public discourse. Activists have leveraged media and grassroots campaigns to highlight the prevalence of marital rape—government data indicates that 83% of sexual violence cases among married women involve husbands as perpetrators. NGOs have also drawn on the Justice Verma Committee's recommendations and international frameworks like CEDAW to argue for reform. However, opposition from men's rights groups, who claim that criminalizing marital rape could lead to false accusations and "legal terrorism," has complicated the narrative, reinforcing the government's cautious stance.

Gaps in the BNS and PWDVA: A Systemic Failure

The BNS and PWDVA exemplify the systemic failure to address marital rape comprehensively. The BNS, despite its overhaul of the IPC, retains the marital rape exception under Section 63, perpetuating the notion that marriage overrides consent. This provision ignores the Justice Verma Committee's call for gender-neutral and victim-centric laws, as well as global trends toward criminalizing marital rape. The BNS's

Chapter V, titled “Offences Against Women and Children,” has been criticized for infantilizing women by grouping them with children, undermining their agency and reinforcing stereotypes of vulnerability. The PWDVA, while a landmark law, is equally limited. Enacted in 2005 to protect women from domestic violence, it includes sexual abuse within its ambit but stops short of criminalizing marital rape. Its remedies—protection orders, monetary compensation, and residence rights—are vital but inadequate for addressing the gravity of sexual violence. The Act’s reliance on civil mechanisms means that perpetrators face no criminal liability, reducing its deterrent value. Furthermore, the PWDVA’s implementation varies widely, with underfunded courts and a lack of awareness among women limiting its reach.

These gaps reflect a broader legislative inertia, rooted in the fear that criminalizing marital rape would disrupt social norms. The BNS’s failure to incorporate the Justice Verma Committee’s recommendations and the PWDVA’s limited scope highlight the need for a holistic approach that combines criminal sanctions with robust civil protections.

Conclusion: Toward a Just Legal Framework

The judicial and legislative responses to marital rape in India reveal a legal system at a crossroads. The Supreme Court hearings of 2024–2025 offer hope for reform, with the judiciary engaging deeply with questions of consent, equality, and autonomy. However, the government’s resistance, rooted in concerns about marriage stability, underscores the challenge of dismantling entrenched patriarchal norms. The Justice Verma Committee’s recommendations remain a clarion call for change, yet their neglect in both the IPC and BNS amendments highlights a persistent gap between aspiration and action.

State initiatives like Kerala and Rajasthan’s PWDVA courts demonstrate localized progress, but their focus on civil remedies fails to address the criminal nature of marital rape. PILs by groups like the RIT Foundation have kept the issue alive, amplifying the voices of survivors and challenging the status quo. Ultimately, the lacunae in the BNS and PWDVA—marked by ambiguity, omission, and a reluctance to prioritize women’s rights—demand urgent reform. Criminalizing marital rape, strengthening domestic violence laws, and fostering public awareness are essential steps toward a legal framework that upholds dignity and justice for all.

Societal Implications and Human Impact of Marital Rape in Relation to Lacunae in Indian Law: Ambiguity of Marital Rape and Gaps in the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita (BNS) and Domestic Violence Act

Marital rape, a pervasive yet under-addressed form of gender-based violence in India, casts a long shadow over the lives of countless women, with profound societal and human consequences. The psychological toll on survivors, the stigma that silences them, and the stories of resilience that emerge despite systemic barriers highlight the urgent need for legal reform. The ambiguity surrounding marital rape in Indian law, particularly the retention of the marital rape exception in Section 63 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita (BNS) and the limited scope of the Protection of Women from Domestic Violence Act (PWDVA), exacerbates these impacts, leaving survivors without adequate recourse or support. This essay explores the societal implications and human costs of marital rape, drawing on psychological studies, survivor experiences, and advocacy efforts to underscore the lacunae in India’s legal framework and the pressing need for change.

The Psychological Toll: A Hidden Epidemic

Marital rape inflicts severe psychological harm, with studies documenting its links to post-traumatic stress

disorder (PTSD), depression, anxiety, and suicidal ideation. A 2018 study published in the *Indian Journal of Psychiatry* found that women subjected to sexual violence by intimate partners exhibited PTSD symptoms at rates comparable to survivors of stranger rape, with 30–40% meeting diagnostic criteria. Depression was even more prevalent, affecting over 50% of survivors, often compounded by feelings of shame, guilt, and worthlessness. These mental health impacts are intensified by the unique dynamics of marital rape, where the perpetrator is not a stranger but a trusted partner, shattering the survivor's sense of safety and self.

The psychological toll is closely tied to the legal ambiguities in the BNS. Section 63, which replaced Section 375 of the Indian Penal Code (IPC), defines rape but includes Exception 2, stating that sexual intercourse by a man with his wife (above 18 years) is not rape. This exception perpetuates the notion that marriage implies perpetual consent, invalidating survivors' experiences and discouraging them from seeking help. For instance, a woman experiencing forced sex may internalize her suffering as a “wifely duty,” a belief reinforced by the law's silence. This legal gap not only denies survivors justice but also exacerbates their psychological distress, as they lack validation that their trauma constitutes a crime.

The PWDVA, enacted in 2005, offers some relief by recognizing sexual abuse as a form of domestic violence, but its civil remedies—such as protection orders or monetary compensation—fall short of addressing the criminal nature of marital rape. Survivors seeking redress under the PWDVA often face bureaucratic hurdles and societal judgment, which can worsen mental health outcomes. The absence of criminal sanctions in both the BNS and PWDVA means that perpetrators face no meaningful consequences, leaving survivors trapped in cycles of abuse and despair. Psychological studies underscore the need for trauma-informed support, yet India's legal framework fails to facilitate access to counseling or rehabilitation, amplifying the human cost of marital rape.

Stigma and Silence: A Societal Barrier

The stigma surrounding marital rape is a formidable barrier, silencing survivors and perpetuating their isolation. In India's patriarchal society, marriage is often idealized as a sacred institution, with women expected to prioritize family harmony over personal autonomy. Discussing sexual violence within marriage is taboo, as it challenges deeply ingrained notions of wifely obedience and male entitlement. Survivors fear judgment, victim-blaming, and ostracism, with many reluctant to report abuse to family, friends, or authorities. A 2020 survey by the National Family Health Survey (NFHS-5) revealed that 83% of married women experiencing sexual violence identified their husbands as perpetrators, yet fewer than 10% sought help, citing shame and fear of social repercussions.

The legal ambiguity in the BNS reinforces this stigma by implicitly endorsing the view that marital rape is not a “real” crime. Exception 2 under Section 63 sends a message that non-consensual sex within marriage is acceptable, discouraging survivors from naming their experiences as rape. This legal stance aligns with societal attitudes that normalize sexual coercion, as seen in colloquial phrases like “a husband's right” or “adjusting” to marital demands. The PWDVA, while progressive in recognizing domestic violence, does little to counter this stigma, as its focus on civil remedies avoids labeling marital rape as a criminal offense. Survivors navigating the PWDVA often encounter untrained officials or dismissive attitudes, further silencing their voices.

Media and NGOs like the RIT Foundation have played a crucial role in challenging this stigma, amplifying survivor stories and advocating for legal reform. Campaigns like #NotMyDuty and #MarriageDoesNotEqualConsent, supported by organizations such as AIDWA and Majlis, have used

social media to raise awareness, drawing parallels with global movements like #MeToo. Documentaries and news features, such as those by *The Quint* and *India Today*, have highlighted the prevalence of marital rape, citing data like the NFHS-5's findings to humanize the issue. These efforts have sparked public discourse, with hashtags trending on platforms like X, but they also face backlash from groups defending "family values," illustrating the polarized nature of the debate.

The RIT Foundation's legal advocacy, particularly its 2015 PIL challenging the marital rape exception, has been instrumental in pushing the issue into the courtroom. The Delhi High Court's 2022 split verdict in the case, with Justice Rajiv Shakdher striking down the exception as unconstitutional, marked a symbolic victory for activists, even as the issue awaits resolution in the Supreme Court as of April 2025. These efforts expose the interplay between law and society: the BNS's failure to criminalize marital rape emboldens stigma, while advocacy seeks to dismantle it, creating a feedback loop that shapes public perception and survivor experiences.

Stories of Resilience: The Human Face of Survival

Amid the systemic failures of the BNS and PWDVA, stories of resilience highlight both the human impact of marital rape and the need for comprehensive support systems. Consider Priya (a pseudonym), a 32-year-old woman from Delhi whose story was documented by the RIT Foundation. Married at 24, Priya endured years of sexual coercion, believing it was her duty to comply. The psychological toll manifested as chronic anxiety and self-harm, yet she hesitated to seek help, fearing her family's disapproval. When she finally approached a local NGO, she learned about the PWDVA and secured a protection order, enabling her to leave her abusive marriage. With counseling and vocational training, Priya rebuilt her life, now working as a tailor and advocating for other survivors.

Priya's story underscores the gaps in India's legal framework. Had the BNS criminalized marital rape, her abuser could have faced prosecution, deterring further violence and validating her trauma as a crime. Instead, the PWDVA's civil remedies, while helpful, required Priya to navigate a complex legal process with limited resources. Her reliance on an NGO highlights another lacuna: the lack of state-funded support services for survivors. India has only a handful of government-run shelters and counseling centers, with most services provided by underfunded NGOs. The absence of a robust ecosystem for rehabilitation—mandated neither by the BNS nor the PWDVA—leaves many survivors like Priya dependent on chance encounters with activists.

Other stories reflect similar struggles and triumphs. In Kerala, a survivor named Lakshmi used the state's PWDVA courts to secure maintenance and custody of her children, escaping a marriage marked by sexual violence. In Rajasthan, a woman named Meena, supported by a local women's collective, challenged her abuser in court, inspiring others in her village to speak out. These narratives reveal a common thread: resilience driven by community support rather than systemic legal protections. The BNS's failure to address marital rape as a crime means that survivors must rely on patchwork solutions, while the PWDVA's civil focus limits its ability to deliver justice or deterrence.

Societal Implications: A Ripple Effect

The societal implications of marital rape extend beyond individual survivors, shaping gender norms, family dynamics, and public health. By failing to criminalize marital rape, the BNS perpetuates a culture of impunity, reinforcing male dominance within marriage. This normalization of coercion undermines efforts to achieve gender equality, contradicting India's commitments under international frameworks like

CEDAW, which calls for eliminating all forms of violence against women. The ripple effect is evident in statistics: the NFHS-5 reported that 30% of married women aged 18–49 experienced spousal violence, with sexual violence often underreported due to legal and social barriers.

The psychological toll on survivors also strains families and communities. Children witnessing marital rape may develop trauma-related issues, with studies linking exposure to domestic violence to behavioral problems and poor academic performance. The economic cost is significant, as survivors like Priya often leave abusive marriages, facing financial instability without adequate state support. Public health systems, already overburdened, struggle to address the mental health needs of survivors, with only 0.6 psychiatrists per 100,000 people in India, according to the *Indian Journal of Psychiatry* (2020).

The PWDVA's limitations exacerbate these societal costs. While it provides avenues for protection, its implementation is uneven, with rural women particularly underserved due to inaccessible courts and lack of awareness. The Act's failure to criminalize marital rape means that perpetrators remain within families, perpetuating cycles of violence. This gap contrasts with countries like South Africa and Australia, where marital rape laws have reduced stigma and encouraged reporting, suggesting a path forward for India.

Bridging the Legal Gaps: A Path Forward

The lacunae in the BNS and PWDVA demand urgent reform to address the societal and human impacts of marital rape. Criminalizing marital rape by deleting Exception 2 from Section 63 of the BNS would align India with global standards, sending a clear message that consent is nonnegotiable, even in marriage. Such a change could reduce stigma, empower survivors to report abuse, and deter perpetrators, as evidenced by Nepal's experience after criminalizing marital rape in 2006.

Amending the PWDVA to include criminal penalties for sexual violence would complement this reform, ensuring a dual framework of civil and criminal protections. Strengthening implementation—through training for judges, police, and counselors—would enhance access to justice, particularly in rural areas. The government could draw on Kerala's model of specialized PWDVA courts, scaling them nationwide with a focus on marital rape cases.

Beyond legal reform, addressing the psychological toll requires investment in mental health services. Establishing trauma-informed counseling centers, integrated with legal aid, would support survivors like Priya in rebuilding their lives. Public awareness campaigns, backed by media and NGOs, could further dismantle stigma, normalizing discussions of consent within marriage. The RIT Foundation's advocacy offers a blueprint, combining litigation with grassroots education to shift societal attitudes.

Conclusion

The societal implications and human impact of marital rape in India reveal a crisis exacerbated by legal ambiguities. The psychological toll—marked by PTSD, depression, and silenced voices—reflects the failure of the BNS to recognize marital rape as a crime, while the PWDVA's civil remedies fall short of delivering justice. Stigma perpetuates survivors' isolation, yet stories of resilience, amplified by NGOs and media, highlight the potential for change. The lacunae in India's legal framework have far-reaching consequences, undermining gender equality, family well-being, and public health. By criminalizing marital rape, strengthening domestic violence laws, and investing in support services, India can bridge these gaps, ensuring that survivors are heard, validated, and empowered to reclaim their lives.

Recommendations for Legal Reform to Address the Lacunae in Indian Law: Ambiguity of Marital Rape and Gaps in the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita (BNS) and Domestic Violence Act

The persistent ambiguity surrounding marital rape in India, enshrined in the marital rape exception under Section 63 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita (BNS) and the limited scope of the Protection of Women from Domestic Violence Act (PWDVA), represents a significant failure to protect women's rights and dignity. The legal framework's refusal to recognize non-consensual sex within marriage as a crime perpetuates gender inequality, undermines bodily autonomy, and leaves survivors without adequate recourse. To bridge these gaps, comprehensive legal reforms are essential, including amending the BNS to criminalize marital rape, enhancing the PWDVA with criminal penalties, launching awareness campaigns, improving data collection, and fostering international collaboration. These recommendations, rooted in the principles of justice and equality, address the lacunae in Indian law while aligning with global standards and survivor needs. This essay explores these reforms in detail, situating them within the context of India's legal shortcomings and their societal implications.

Amending the BNS: Removing Exception 2 to Criminalize Marital Rape

The most critical step toward addressing the ambiguity of marital rape is amending the BNS to delete Exception 2 under Section 63, which exempts sexual intercourse by a man with his wife (above 18 years) from the definition of rape. This exception, inherited from Section 375 of the Indian Penal Code (IPC), is a colonial relic rooted in the patriarchal notion that marriage implies perpetual consent. Its retention in the BNS, enacted in 2023, perpetuates a legal fiction that denies married women the same protections against sexual violence afforded to others, violating fundamental rights under Articles 14 (equality), 15 (non-discrimination), and 21 (right to life and personal liberty) of the Constitution.

Criminalizing marital rape by removing Exception 2 would have transformative implications. First, it would affirm that consent is the cornerstone of sexual relations, regardless of marital status, aligning India with over 100 countries, including Nepal, South Africa, and Australia, that have outlawed marital rape. Nepal's 2006 reform, which criminalized marital rape following a Supreme Court ruling, offers a regional precedent, demonstrating that such a change can strengthen, not destabilize, the institution of marriage by fostering mutual respect. Second, it would empower survivors to seek justice, reducing the psychological toll of invalidated trauma, as studies link legal recognition of abuse to improved mental health outcomes. Third, it would deter perpetrators, addressing the high prevalence of spousal sexual violence—83% of sexual violence cases among married women involve husbands, per the National Family Health Survey (NFHS-5).

The government's resistance, articulated in its 2024 Supreme Court affidavit, cites concerns about "misuse" and the sanctity of marriage. However, these arguments are flawed. Misuse fears are speculative, as existing laws like Section 498A (cruelty) already include safeguards against false complaints, such as mandatory counseling and judicial scrutiny. The "sanctity of marriage" argument ignores that marriage thrives on equality, not coercion, as affirmed by the Justice Verma Committee (2013), which recommended deleting the marital rape exception. The BNS's failure to heed this call perpetuates a gap that undermines India's constitutional commitment to gender justice.

Implementation challenges must be addressed proactively. Amending the BNS requires parliamentary consensus, which faces hurdles due to cultural conservatism and lobbying by groups defending traditional norms. To overcome this, legislators could draw on the Supreme Court's ongoing hearings (2024–2025), which have exposed the exception's constitutional fragility. Public consultations, involving survivors,

activists, and legal experts, could build momentum, countering narratives that criminalization threatens families. Training police and judges to handle marital rape cases sensitively—modeled on protocols for other sexual offenses—would ensure effective enforcement, addressing concerns about practical feasibility.

Enhancing the PWDVA: Introducing Criminal Penalties

While the PWDVA, enacted in 2005, is a landmark law recognizing sexual abuse as a form of domestic violence, its reliance on civil remedies—protection orders, residence rights, and monetary compensation—limits its ability to address marital rape comprehensively. Enhancing the PWDVA by introducing criminal penalties for sexual violence would bridge this gap, creating a dual framework of civil and criminal protections that reflects the gravity of the offense.

The PWDVA's current structure, while empowering women to seek immediate relief, fails to deter perpetrators, as abusers face no risk of imprisonment unless prosecuted under separate laws like Section 498A, which addresses cruelty but not rape specifically. This gap is evident in survivor stories: women navigating PWDVA courts often secure temporary safety but remain vulnerable to repeated abuse, as perpetrators face minimal consequences. Criminalizing marital rape within the PWDVA would align it with laws like South Africa's Domestic Violence Act, which includes penal provisions for sexual abuse, enhancing deterrence and survivor confidence.

Proposed amendments could include a new section defining sexual violence within marriage as a criminal offense, with penalties mirroring those for rape under the BNS (7 years to life imprisonment, depending on severity). To balance survivor needs with family dynamics, the law could allow discretion for mediation in less severe cases, provided survivors consent, ensuring flexibility without diluting accountability. This approach would complement the BNS reform, ensuring that survivors have multiple avenues for justice—civil remedies for immediate protection and criminal prosecution for long-term deterrence.

Implementation challenges include judicial capacity and societal resistance. India's PWDVA courts, particularly in rural areas, are understaffed and underfunded, with only 7% of domestic violence cases reaching resolution within a year, per a 2022 Law Ministry report. Enhancing the PWDVA requires investment in specialized courts, as seen in Kerala, where trained magistrates expedite cases. Resistance from traditionalists, who view criminal penalties as disruptive to marriage, can be countered by framing reform as protective of family harmony, emphasizing that violence, not accountability, undermines relationships.

The synergy between BNS and PWDVA reforms is critical. While the BNS would establish marital rape as a standalone crime, the PWDVA's criminal penalties would address it within the broader context of domestic violence, offering survivors tailored options. Together, these changes would close the legal gap that leaves marital rape ambiguously addressed, ensuring a robust response to survivors' needs.

Launching Awareness Campaigns: Shifting Societal Norms

Legal reform alone cannot dismantle the stigma and silence surrounding marital rape, which are rooted in societal attitudes that normalize coercion within marriage. Launching nationwide awareness campaigns is essential to educate the public, challenge patriarchal norms, and empower survivors to seek justice. The BNS's marital rape exception and the PWDVA's limited scope reflect and reinforce these norms, as their

ambiguity signals that marital rape is not a serious offense. Awareness campaigns would address this lacuna by fostering a cultural shift toward recognizing consent as non-negotiable.

Campaigns could take multiple forms: media-driven initiatives, community workshops, and school curricula emphasizing gender equality. NGOs like the RIT Foundation have demonstrated success with campaigns like #MarriageDoesNotEqualConsent, which use social media to share survivor stories and legal insights, reaching millions on platforms like X. Government-led efforts, modeled on the Beti Bachao Beti Padhao campaign, could leverage television, radio, and billboards to reach rural audiences, debunking myths like “wifely duty.” Schools could integrate modules on consent, drawing on UNESCO’s guidelines for comprehensive sexuality education, to shape attitudes early.

The human impact of awareness is profound. Survivors like Priya, who rebuilt her life after learning about the PWDVA through an NGO, highlight how knowledge empowers action. Campaigns would also reduce victim-blaming, which NFHS-5 data shows affects 60% of women reporting spousal violence. By normalizing discussions of marital rape, campaigns would complement legal reforms, ensuring that amendments to the BNS and PWDVA translate into real-world change.

Challenges include funding and resistance from conservative groups. Allocating budgets through the Ministry of Women and Child Development, with CSR contributions from corporates, could address resource constraints. Engaging religious and community leaders to endorse campaigns, as seen in anti-dowry initiatives, would mitigate backlash, framing consent as a universal value. The BNS and PWDVA’s gaps—by implicitly endorsing silence—underscore the urgency of this reform, as legal clarity requires societal buy-in to be effective.

Improving Data Collection: Building an Evidence Base

The lack of comprehensive data on marital rape hinders policy-making and perpetuates its legal ambiguity. The BNS’s silence on marital rape and the PWDVA’s broad definition of sexual abuse obscure the scale of the issue, as neither mandates specific reporting. Improving data collection is crucial to quantify prevalence, inform reforms, and monitor progress.

Current data, such as NFHS-5’s finding that 30% of married women experience spousal violence, is limited by underreporting and vague categories. A dedicated marital rape survey, conducted by the National Crime Records Bureau (NCRB), could track incidence, demographics, and outcomes, similar to the U.S.’s National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey. Hospitals and police stations could implement standardized protocols to record marital rape allegations, even if not yet criminalized, building a baseline. NGOs and universities could partner with the government to analyze data, ensuring survivor privacy through anonymization.

Robust data would strengthen advocacy for BNS and PWDVA reforms. For instance, evidence of high prevalence could counter government claims that existing laws suffice, while regional disparities could guide resource allocation. Data would also highlight the psychological toll—PTSD and depression rates among survivors—supporting calls for counseling services. The absence of such data in the BNS and PWDVA frameworks reflects a systemic blind spot, as policymakers lack the insights needed to prioritize marital rape.

Challenges include survivor reluctance and institutional bias. Incentivizing reporting through helplines and trained counselors, as in Australia’s 1800RESPECT model, could increase participation. Training police to document cases without judgment, supported by NGOs, would address bias. Improved data collection would expose the human cost of the BNS and PWDVA’s gaps, making reform undeniable.

International Collaboration: Learning from Global Models

India's legal framework lags behind global standards on marital rape, with the BNS's exception and the PWDVA's civil focus contrasting with criminal laws in countries like Canada and the UK. International collaboration—through knowledge exchange, technical assistance, and alignment with treaties like CEDAW—would accelerate reform, addressing the lacunae in Indian law.

Collaborating with countries like South Africa, which criminalized marital rape in 1993, could inform BNS amendments. South Africa's model integrates criminal penalties with victim support, offering lessons on balancing deterrence and rehabilitation. Technical assistance from UN Women could strengthen PWDVA courts, drawing on programs in Bangladesh that train judges on gender-based violence. Aligning with CEDAW, which India ratified in 1993, would fulfill obligations to eliminate marital rape, countering government claims that cultural norms justify inaction.

Such collaboration would also enhance awareness and data efforts. Global campaigns like the UN's 16 Days of Activism could amplify India's initiatives, while partnerships with organizations like WHO could refine data protocols. The BNS and PWDVA's gaps—out of step with international norms—underscore the need for this exchange, as India risks isolation in global gender justice efforts.

Challenges include political resistance and resource constraints. Framing collaboration as capacity-building, not interference, could ease concerns, while multilateral funding could offset costs. The human impact—survivors denied justice—demands this global perspective, as India's reforms would benefit from proven strategies.

Conclusion

The lacunae in Indian law, marked by the BNS's marital rape exception and the PWDVA's civil limitations, perpetuate a system that fails survivors and entrenches gender inequality. Amending the BNS to criminalize marital rape would affirm consent's universality, while enhancing the PWDVA with criminal penalties would offer comprehensive protections. Awareness campaigns, improved data collection, and international collaboration would ensure these reforms translate into societal change, dismantling stigma and building evidence for action. Together, these recommendations address the legal ambiguities and gaps, aligning India with its constitutional ideals and global commitments. The urgency is clear: every day the BNS and PWDVA remain unchanged, survivors bear the cost of a system that prioritizes tradition over justice.

1. Key [Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita - Wikipedia](#)
2. [The Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 - PRS India](#)
3. [Marital rape and its impact on the mental health of women in India: A systematic review - PMC](#)
4. [Challenge to the Marital Rape Exception - Supreme Court Observer](#)
5. [India's government formally opposes bid to criminalize marital rape - CBS News](#)
6. [Marital rape: India anger as judge frees man accused of raping wife who then died - BBC](#)
7. [Stories Of Marital Rape Survivors: Legal In India | Youth Ki Awaaz](#)
8. [Marital Rape Laws by Country - Wikipedia](#)
9. [A history of the movement to criminalise marital rape across the world | Research News - The Indian Express](#)
10. [CEDAW Overview - United Nations](#)
11. [Mental Health Impact of Marital Rape - PMC](#)

Citations

[Criminalising Marital Rape in India | The India Forum](#)