International Journal for Multidisciplinary Research (IJFMR)
E-ISSN: 2582-2160 ● Website: www.ijfmr.com ● Email: editor@ijfmr.com

A Comparative Analysis of Transgender Identity Laws in Sweden, Norway, Denmark, and Lessons for India

Linto Antony[1], Dr Basavaraja G[2]

[1]Research Scholar, Department of Studies and Research in Political Science, Tumkur University, Tumakuru, India & Assistant Professor, Department of Political Science, School of Humanities and Social Sciences, St Joseph's University, Bengaluru.
[2]Professor, Dept. of Studies and Research in Political Science Tumkur University, Tumakuru.

Abstract

The global human rights paradigms are shifting towards demedicalizing transgender identity, and legal gender recognition frameworks continue to be very varied. In this study, we offer a comparative legal analysis of transgender identity laws in three Nordic jurisdictions (Denmark, Norway and Sweden) to examine the extent to which the 'self-determination' model outperforms traditional medical gatekeeping. Denmark (2014) and Norway (2016) are pioneering examples, having divorced legal gender recognition from medical, psychiatric and surgical requirements, and based it purely on self-identification. By contrast, Sweden, the first country to legislate in favour of gender recognition in 1972, and which recently implemented further legal revisions in 2025, still requires medical approval, showing the persistence of the difficulties of pathologisation.

This study compares different Nordic approaches and provides important insights for the legal framework in India, and this contradiction is mirrored in the legal trajectory in India: the 2014 Supreme Court judgment of NALSA v. Union of India, which established self-identification as a fundamental constitutional right (National Legal Services Authority (NALSA) v. Union of India, , 2014). The Transgender Persons (Protection of Rights) Act, 2019, regressed into a bureaucratic and medicalised model of gatekeeping and according to the 2019 Act, the issuance of a new legal gender certificate requires proof of gender-affirming surgery, and basic identity recognition requires approval from the District Magistrate.

The paper contends that the existing Indian statutory framework structurally reflects the constraints of the Swedish model and so dilutes the constitutional protections of bodily autonomy and dignity. Drawing on the successful experiences of absolute self-determination in Denmark and Norway, the article further proposes concrete policy recommendations for India. It requires the abolition of the two-tiered system of magistrate certification, the elimination of all medical and surgical requirements and the establishment of a strictly rights-based administrative procedure that fully respects self-perceived gender identity in accordance with international human rights norms.

Keywords: Transgender, Rights, Identity, Norway, Denmark, Sweden, India, Policy, Act.

Introduction to the Legal Landscape of Gender Identity

One of the most dynamic, hotly contested and fast developing areas of modern human rights jurisprudence and state administrative law is legal recognition of gender identity. Historically, state mechanisms for legal gender recognition (LGR) have been embedded within medicalized paradigms. Governments often required people to submit to invasive psychiatric examinations, permanent sterilization, and structural surgical modifications as absolute preconditions for administrative legibility. Over the past decade we have seen a huge paradigm shift towards self-determination – the basic tenet that an individual's legal sex or gender should be determined by their self-perceived gender identity alone, and not subject to medical, judicial or bureaucratic gatekeeping.

As of early 2026, progressive international human rights standards – such as the mandates of the United Nations Independent Expert on sexual orientation and gender identity and the universally accepted Yogyakarta Principles – had long established that the right to self-determination of one's gender is a fundamental aspect of personal liberty, bodily integrity and intrinsic human dignity. Therefore, 23 countries across the globe have adopted different self-identification schemes that do not pathologize trans identities. The Nordic countries (Denmark, Norway, and to a lesser and more complicated degree, Sweden) provide compelling case studies of the breakdown of medicalized legal systems.

The legislative track of the Republic of India is at present regressive, non-linear and very complicated. The Indian Supreme Court's landmark judgment of 2014, which was celebrated around the world, recognized the constitutional right to self-identification without medical conditions, but has been systematically eroded by subsequent legislative enactments. The erosion culminated in the highly controversial Transgender Persons (Protection of Rights) Amendment Act, 2026 which has regressed Indian law by re-imposing stringent medical scrutiny, exclusionary definitions and draconian penal provisions.

The analysis aims to draw useful constitutional, administrative and socio-legal lessons by placing these Nordic models against the regressive and evolving legislative landscape in India. The first aim to expose the dangers of bureaucratic gatekeeping, interrogate the paradox of expanding welfare but contracting identity, and to lay out a clear path for convergence of state identification architectures with core human rights.

Theoretical Framework: Self-Determination and Administrative Identity

The move from a pathologized model of gender identity to one of self-determination in gender is based on the recognition of bodily integrity and decisional autonomy. International human rights law is increasingly acknowledging the violation of the right to physical integrity and protections from cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment through mandatory medical interventions, such as forced sterilization, mandatory hormone therapy and forced psychiatric diagnoses. The self-determination model does not see gender identity as a contingent status conferred by medical or bureaucratic authorities, but rather as an internal, deeply felt reality that precedes recognition by the state.

Management of state identity is usually based on unique identifiers, often centralized in core registers such as the Civil Registration System (CPR) in Denmark or Personal Identification Numbers (PIN) in other Nordic countries.

State identity management is generally based on unique identifiers, often centralized in core registers like the Civil Registration System (CPR) in Denmark or Personal Identification Numbers (PIN) in other Nordic countries. They are unique identifiers at the national level, which constitute the basis for modern

governance. They link data from health, tax, social and other sectors to identify beneficiaries and deliver comprehensive services. Immediate, systemic barriers in employment, healthcare, banking and daily participation in society come up when a person's lived gender doesn't match their legal gender marker. These foundational numbers often have explicitly gendered markers. For example, in the Nordic systems odd or even digits determine legal male or female status.

Thus, the way a state allows an individual to alter this fundamental marker dictates the degree to which an individual can engage in the public sphere without forced exclusion, discrimination, or administrative violence. Legal scholars classify state approaches to gender registration as either "jurisdictions of civility" or "jurisdictions of conscience." A jurisdiction of civility is built upon an efficient organization of subjects into rigid, often binary, categories to make state administration easier. The well-being of subjects and their fundamental rights, on the whole, is the priority of a jurisdiction of conscience. This deeply rooted tension between the need to observe absolute human rights standards for their transgender and gender-diverse populations and the obligation to preserve the structural integrity of state administrative registers has been tackled by Denmark, Norway and Sweden. The comparative analysis below dissects this tension.

Denmark: A trailblazer in self-determination

Denmark became the first country in Europe to separate medical transition from legal gender recognition in June 2014. The Danish Parliament, i.e. Folketing, has passed a historic amendment to the statute on the National People's Register. The amendment was hotly contested and approved by a split vote of 59-52 on 1st September, 2014. It abolished the old requirements of a mental diagnosis of gender identity disorder, surgery and permanent sterilisation and substituted a purely administrative approach.

This radical method permits any legal resident 18 or older to apply for a new CPR number with a written statement of their experience of belonging to the other sex/gender. The Danish model does not fully abolish gatekeeping, but rather produces a particular form of temporal gatekeeping. They must wait a mandatory six-month "reflection period" before reconfirming their initial request, obtaining a new Social Security number, and updating other personal documents.

The 2014 law was hailed as a major breakthrough, but longitudinal socio-legal research has revealed substantial practical flaws, and the law does not officially recognise non-binary identities. It enforces a tight male/female binary. The legal age limit of 18 years during the transition created a constant administrative and social conflict for transgender youth, a lack of basic acknowledgement during developmental stages.

The Danish clinical findings indicate a need to identify youth. Between 2016 and 2022, there have been over 1,300 referrals to the national Gender Identity Service from young people, 70% of whom are transmasculine aged 11 to 17. All state databases continued to misgender these adolescents, many of whom were given gonadotropin-releasing hormone analogues (GnRHa) to suppress puberty to relieve severe distress.

This glaring gap has triggered intense advocacy by civil society, culminating in a policy directive issued by the Danish CPR Administration in August 2023. In line with Denmark's international obligations under the European Convention on Human Rights and in particular the child's right to privacy, the administration found that minors must be given the opportunity to change their legal gender in certain circumstances. Minors receiving gender-affirming treatment within the healthcare system can now skip the strict 18-year age limit, on a case-by-case basis, under the guidelines.

Conservative political factions have always been hostile to Denmark's self-determination framework. In early 2024 and throughout 2025, the Conservative Party and the Danish People's Party proposed to limit the scope of the LGR framework, to require the recognition of only two biological sexes, and to deny minors aged 15-17 independence in gender-affirming healthcare. In the Danish Parliament, these efforts to roll back were effectively voted down when put to the vote in their first reading, with almost two-thirds of MPs voting to reaffirm their support for the self-determination model. The Danish government, meanwhile, reaffirmed its commitment with an allocation of 24 million kroner for a comprehensive LGBTI action plan for 2026-2029.

Norway The Example of Unlimited Administrative Self-Identification

In June 2016, Norway passed the Gender Recognition Act, building on Denmark's law while addressing its flaws. This legislation arguably created one of the most progressive, accessible and human rights compliant LGR frameworks in the world. The Norwegian model, proposed by the Conservative-led government of Erna Solberg and adopted with overwhelming multi-partisan support (more than 85% of voting MPs) separated the medical and the legal tracks completely. The Norwegian law explicitly states that it is legally irrelevant to distinguish between legal gender and biological sex.

The Norwegian process is noted for its extreme administrative simplicity and lack of time or medical gatekeeping. Citizens can change their legal gender by simply notifying the National Population Register electronically, which will instantly issue a new national identification number reflecting the gender they have declared. Once the notification is processed, the State will not record or link the individual's former gender identification in active official documents, protecting the individual from forced outing.

Note that Norway's legislation on minors was much more comprehensive than the initial Danish legislation from 2014. The 2016 Act gives people 16 years or older (the age of consent in medical matters in Norway) the right to self-determine their gender without parental consent. Children aged between 6 and 16 can legally change their gender, provided that their legal guardians consent. The County Governor may approve the application, if there is a dispute between the parents, if he/she finds that the approval is in the best interest of the child. Children under six years of age can only undergo legal gender change if they are intersex and have "uncertain somatic sex development."

The need for this sweeping reform was driven by decades of systemic abuse. This remained the case until 2016. Transgender persons in Norway had to undergo burdensome and discriminatory measures, including a required psychiatric diagnosis and permanent sterilisation, which constituted a grave breach of the right to bodily integrity and family life and heritage extending back to the 1970's. A noteworthy example was the case of 65-year-old transsexual woman John Jeanette Solstad Remo, who refused to be forcibly sterilised. The campaigns of Amnesty International and the Norwegian Organisation for Sexual and Gender Diversity were very important in the public and legislative agreement.

The Norwegian system has proven procedurally efficient but not without strong academic and socio-legal critique. Legal academic note that the law still operates within a tight male/female gender binary. According to survey data from the European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights, up to seventy-five per cent of transgender respondents do not identify strictly within the binary. Instead of creating a definitive law acts mainly as a jurisdiction of civility in that it maintains this binary that systematically classifies subjects to control them by the state. Scholars claim that this causes a definitional dilemma for non-binary persons who are compelled to select an inaccurate legal marker so that they can perform their

duty in the state's administrative architecture. This reproduces that heterosexual matrix and quietly disempowers non-binary individuals, although it appears to empower the greater transgender community. Norway has embraced gender identification in all its anti-discrimination legislation. Norwegian law criminalises discrimination and hate speech on the grounds of gender identity or expression with a maximum penalty of three years imprisonment. These rights are for everyone, whether a person has altered their legal gender in the official records or not.

Sweden: The Weight of Residual Medicalisation and Incremental Modernisation

Sweden was the first country in the world to provide a formal legal path to change one's legal gender in 1972. This pioneering status has its attendant harsh state sanctioned human rights crime. The 1972 bill included a mandatory sterilisation mandate based on eugenics ideas. This was only removed from the law in 2013 after major protests at home and abroad.

Sweden has created a solid framework of LGBTQI+ safeguards over the past few decades, and the anti-discrimination laws were changed in 2009 to encompass transgender identification, and in 2019, the Freedom of the Press laws were expanded to include legal protections against hate crimes. But the legal procedure of gender recognition was painfully lengthy, cumbersome and overly medicalised. The National Board of Health and Welfare's Legal Advisory Council would take 5-8 years to approve an application for legal gender transition, and mental evaluations would have to be done across several years.

After almost 17 years of public investigations and heated political debate, the Swedish Parliament (Riksdagen) passed the "Determination of Legal Gender in Certain Cases" Act in April 2024 to address these systemic delays. The legislation, which entered into force on 1 July 2025, is a step towards the modernization of Swedish gender law. But it rejects the pure self-determination model that has been adopted by Norway, Denmark and 21 other progressive countries.

The 2025 Act separates the administrative procedure for changing legal gender markers in the population register from the medical regulations for gender-affirming bottom surgeries. It lowers the age of legal gender recognition from 18 to 16, but requires parental consent for those under 18. It is noteworthy that the National Board of Health and Welfare no longer issues any permit for bottom surgery. The decisions are now made directly by the gender-affirming care providers based on clinical criteria.

The 2025 Act still requires a medical certificate for the purely administrative change of the legal gender marker, which determines the penultimate digit of the Swedish social security number. The applicant cannot self-declare, but must provide a formal statement from a licensed medical professional – doctor, psychologist, psychotherapist or specialised healthcare counsellor – confirming that the individual's gender identity is not in accordance with the resident register and is expected to remain so for the foreseeable future. The National Board of Health and Welfare is only an administrative checkpoint to check that the certificate has been issued and that the identity of the applicant is correct.

Rights organisations for transgender people, such as RFSL and Transgender Europe (TGEU), have responded to the 2025 Act in a highly bifurcated way. They like having the chance to do required medical meetings digitally and the shorter waiting times, but they are strongly against keeping the medical gatekeeping. The Swedish state continues to pathologise transgender identities by requiring medical validation for what is a purely administrative record update, rather than recognising them as essential human realities that need expert certification as medical conditions. The Swedish reform, like Denmark and Norway, operates within a rigidly binary paradigm. The Swedish administrative state still continues

to enforce what can be considered forced assimilation into binary categories for the estimated 3% of the population that identify outside the gender binary.

The Contradiction between Foundational Promises and Bureaucratic Realities: India

The legal route of the Republic of India is a striking paradox, notwithstanding the fact that the Nordic countries have typically moved towards administrative simplification and self-determination, except for Sweden's remaining medicalisation. It starts with a worldwide recognized rights reinforcing judicial ruling, then a decade of methodical legislative watering down, and eventually, with the enactment of the 2026 Amendment Act, a severe constitutional crisis.

The NALSA Judgement 2014- A Global Benchmark

The landmark ruling of the Supreme Court of India in April 2014 in the case of the National Legal Services Authority (NALSA) v. Union of India has brought about a major transformation in the constitutional landscape of the transgender population. In no uncertain terms, the Court held that the right to self-determine one's gender identity was a basic facet of the right to life, dignity and personal autonomy protected under Article 21 of the Constitution of India (Article 21 in Constitution of India, n.d.). The Court expanded the ambit of freedom of speech and expression to include gender expression under Article 19(1)(a) and prohibited all forms of discrimination under Articles 14 and 15.

Most importantly, the Supreme Court rejected the outdated "biological test" for determining gender, and adopted a "psychological test" instead. The Court determined that gender identity is a person's deeply felt internal sense of being male, female, or transgender, and is not determined by chromosomal makeup, genitalia, or surgical status. Establishing this principle, India theoretically created a gold standard for self-determination, circumventing the medicalized gatekeeping that was still plaguing European jurisdictions at the time. The Court ordered the state to provide legal recognition to a "third gender" and to treat transgender people as a "Socially and Educationally Backward Class" (SEBC) (Kothari). This order includes constitutional affirmative action and reservations for education and public employment under Articles 15(4) and 16(4).

Dilution of Bureaucracy and Administrative Violence: The Act of 2019

The state's strong resistance to relinquishing authority over identity verification was evident in the intense structural friction encountered in translating the comprehensive NALSA mandate into statutory legislation. The Transgender Persons (Protection of Rights) Act, 2019, was purportedly enacted to protect the community, but its operational dynamics undermined the basic principle of personal decision-making. The 2019 Act enacted a very paradoxical two-step approach. Section 4 gave a transgender person the right to a self-perceived gender identity. But as a transgender person, to be able to exercise this right legally, one had to ask for a "Certificate of Identity" from a District Magistrate (DM) under Section 6. Section 7 required an individual to produce documentation of "medical intervention," i.e. gender-affirming surgery from a medical superintendent, subject to the DM's final approval, to change the gender marker, strictly to "male" or "female," a requirement for functioning in a binary society (Kothari).

This legal structure produced a lot of administrative violence and bureaucratic obstacles. It denied identity as a right and reversed the NALSA decision connecting a person's identity to state-authorised identification and surgery status. The 2019 Act was silent on the issues of affirmative action and horizontal reservations and failed to take note of the directives of NASLA to address the massive economic and educational

marginalisation of the group (Rights of Transgender Persons After NALSA, 2025).

The daily bureaucratic reality was excruciating for transgender Indians under this government. Updating fundamental functional identity documents like the Aadhaar card, Permanent Account Number (PAN) card, passports, and voter IDs involved navigating a complex maze of notarized affidavits, mandatory publication in national and local newspapers, and application to the Official Gazette of India. Immediate systemic rejections resulted from mismatches between an individual's self-identified gender and legacy official documentation. For example, the government's automated matching engine always rejected the mandatory linking of PAN and Aadhaar cards if the gender fields did not match. This led to inactive PAN cards, suspended income tax refunds and frozen bank accounts.

The 2019 Act breached the fundamental right of equality by introducing significant inequalities in the criminal penalties. The 2019 Act (Section 18) prescribed the maximum punishment of two years imprisonment for sexual assault or physical violence against a transgender person. By comparison, the Indian Penal Code and its successor, the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 prescribes a minimum of ten years to life imprisonment for the rape of a cisgender woman. The gap suggested a legislated attitude that violence against transgender bodies was intrinsically less serious (JUSTICE, 2024).

The Transgender Persons Amendment Act 2026

The 2026 Transgender Persons (Protection of Rights) Amendment Act has shattered the fragile and deeply flawed balance that the 2019 Act had struck. The Amendment Act, which was introduced in the Lok Sabha on 13 March 2026, was passed after intense opposition protests and walkouts on 24 March, affirmed by the Rajya Sabha on 25 March, and granted Presidential assent on 30 March, is a sweeping and unprecedented rollback of the constitutional rights established a decade earlier in NALSA.

The 2026 Amendment is a fundamental overhaul of Indian gender law via a series of devastating structural and penal changes.

1. Abolition of self-determination and creation of medical boards

The Amendment expressly deletes section 4(2) of the 2019 Act, removing the statutory right to a "self-perceived gender identity" altogether. The Amendment requires the setting up of state-appointed "Authorities" or Medical Boards, chaired by a Chief Medical Officer (CMO) or Deputy CMO, to assume the purely administrative role of the District Magistrate. A person can get a certificate of identity only after the Medical Board has examined and approved the application, making identity a medical diagnosis that requires bureaucratic clearance (Shreya, 2026).

A new sub-section has been added which says that any medical institution which performs gender-affirming surgeries has to report the details of the patient to the District Magistrate and the Medical Board directly. This leads to the creation of a regime of invasive state surveillance over private medical procedures which constitutes a serious breach of the right to privacy and decisional autonomy protected in Puttaswamy v. Union of India (Justice K. S. Puttaswamy (Retd.) and Anr. v. Union of India,, 2017).

2. Retroactivity and Exclusions Framework for Definition

The bill drastically restricts the definition of what it means to be transgender. The inclusive definition of 2019 is rejected and recognition is restricted to only three categories: (i) a particular set of socio-cultural identities (eg, kinner, hijra, aravani, jogta, or eunuch), (ii) individuals with particular congenital intersex variations, and (iii) individuals who are "compelled" to present as transgender by force or deceit. This definition explicitly excludes trans masculine, genderqueer, and trans women living outside of traditional socio-cultural structures (Bajoria, 2026).

The retroactivity clause in Section 2(k)(ii) of the Amendment, which says that the definition "shall not include, nor shall ever have been so included, persons with different sexual orientations and self-perceived sexual identities," is a serious violation of the legal principle of prospectivity. This section poses a serious threat to the substantive rights of individuals who have successfully migrated under the 2019 framework, by threatening to destroy their legal identities, Gazette notices and lawfully obtained functional documentation.

3. The Chilling Effect of Heavy Criminalisation on Healthcare

The Amendment radically substitutes a graduated penal structure in place of Section 18 of the 2019 Act. While it retains the lesser sentences of 6 months to 2 years for common physical or sexual abuse of transgender persons, it imposes harsh penalties for acts related to transition and presentation. Now, kidnapping or snatching an adult with the purpose of forcing them to appear as a transgender is punishable by 10 years to life imprisonment. The statute expressly defines "grievous hurt" as mutilation, emasculation, castration or any surgical, chemical or hormonal procedure. The punishment is rigorous imprisonment for life. The punishment for forcing someone to portray as a transgender individual and using them for forced labor or begging is 5 to 14 years.

While the government says the provisions target trafficking and forced-begging mafias, legal experts and human rights advocates say the broad, vague language in effect criminalizes gender-affirming healthcare. According to compulsion, the law classifies all hormonal procedures and surgeries as "grievous hurt" and thus forever threatens affirmative healthcare providers, supportive parents of transgender youth, and traditional trans kinship networks (gharanas) with life imprisonment. The Telangana High Court has earlier held that such provisions of criminalisation have a serious chilling effect on the freedom of expression and the right to privacy and perpetuate derogatory stereotypes.

Laxmi Narayan Tripathi v. Union of India: The Supreme Court Struggle

The constitutional validity of the 2026 Amendment Act was soon challenged in the Supreme Court of India in Laxmi Narayan Tripathi v. Union of India (Laxmi Narayan Tripathi v. Union of India, , 2026). The petitioners, who filed their petition on April 24, 2026, argue that the exclusionary definitions, the medicalization of identity, and erasure of self-determination violate the fundamental rights to equality, non-discrimination, freedom of expression, and life with dignity as provided in Articles 14, 15, 19, and 21 of the Constitution (https://indiankanoon.org, n.d.).

A Division Bench of Chief Justice Surya Kant and Justice Joymalya Bagchi heard the opening arguments on May 4, 2026. Senior Advocate A.M. Singhvi appearing for the petitioners said the Amendment Act has reduced the transgenders category to a "vanishing point" and the new criminal provisions put the patients undergoing hormonal therapy in immediate peril. Solicitor general Tushar Mehta defended the government, saying the provisions are needed for the establishment of a "verifiable" framework to prevent abuse of welfare benefits and only punishes "forced" procedures. The court declined interim relief on the grounds that the law had not yet been formally notified in the Gazette but issued notices to the union and all states and referred the matter to a larger three-judge bench, leading to a major constitutional showdown.

The Paradox of Welfare Expansion and Administrative Exclusion

But alongside this devastating legislative regression, the Indian state has massively increased economic, educational and health welfare mechanisms for the transgender community. The result is a serious administrative paradox: the state allocates resources, but the intended beneficiaries cannot legally demand

them.

In 2022, the Ministry of Social Justice and Empowerment launched the SMILE (Support for Marginalized Individuals for Livelihood and Enterprise) scheme, a comprehensive framework for transgender welfare with an outlay of ₹265 crore. The program has set up "Garima Greh" shelter homes in 17 states, of which 21 are operational. The homes provide shelter, food, medical and skill development to transgender persons in distress. The program provides scholarships for transgender students from ninth grade through post-graduation to help address the high dropout rate.

The most important scheme implemented by the government was the Ayushman Bharat TG Plus scheme. The scheme offers annual cashless health cover of Rs 5 lakh per beneficiary and is implemented through a Memorandum of Understanding between the Ministry of Social Justice and Empowerment and the National Health Authority. It is unique since it explicitly mentions transition-related care such as hormone therapy, sex reassignment surgery (SRS), post-operative care and psychological counselling for gender dysphoria at empanelled public and private hospitals across the country. The program puts India on top of publicly funded transgender healthcare globally, especially when compared to the long waits and high out-of-pocket costs in the West.

These vital welfare schemes and health benefits require a valid Transgender Certificate and Identity Card which can only be obtained through the National Portal for Transgender Persons. The 2026 Amendment Act has structurally excluded the vast majority of the community from the welfare schemes that were meant to support them. This is because the Act severely restricts who qualifies as a transgender person, explicitly excludes vast swathes of the community and subjects all applicants to highly invasive CMO-led Medical Board scrutiny. A transgender man needs to get a certificate to qualify for state-funded top surgery under Ayushman Bharat TG Plus, but the 2026 Act disqualifies him from the legal definition of a transgender person and he cannot pass through the medical board. This makes the welfare state a phantom to those who need it most.

Learning from Nordic Countries for Indian Legal System

The paper compares the Nordic LGR frameworks with the highly volatile Indian legislative environment, drawing critical, practical conclusions about how state architectures can either facilitate human dignity or perpetuate systemic administrative violence.

1. Distinction between Legal Recognition and Medical Intervention

The perhaps most important lesson from the Nordic region, and from Norway and Denmark in particular, is the absolute and utter necessity of completely decoupling legal gender recognition from medical, psychological and surgical interventions. Norway's 2016 Act treats LGR as a purely administrative function in practice, because it recognizes that a citizen's administrative identity does not need physical or psychiatric validation for it to be valid.

In contrast, the 2026 Amendment in India reverts to the discredited biological model requiring individuals to get validation from a Medical Board headed by a CMO and hospitals to report. In spite of the Swedish 2025 Act that doggedly keeps a medical certificate requirement, the psychiatric diagnosis of gender dysphoria was specifically removed and the authority was moved from a centralised state board to local healthcare providers. This explicitly separated bottom surgery from the legal marker change. India's return to centralized medical scrutiny, a blatant violation of the NALSA mandate that explicitly rejected medical gatekeeping, is stark and hostile in opposition to global trends on human rights.

2. Bureaucratic Efficiency Versus Paternalistic Gatekeeping

Norway's National Population Register's electronic notification system for gender marker changes is a great example of bureaucratic efficiency with respect for individual autonomy. The 2019 Rules had envisaged a simplified process, with a National Portal for Transgender Persons, ensuring paperless, time-bound processing (Welfare, 2019). But this efficiency is actively undermined by the 2026 Amendment with the inclusion of unaccountable Medical Boards and compulsory hospital reporting in the chain of verification.

The Indian government's extreme gatekeeping measures are justified mainly on the basis of preventing the "misuse" of welfare benefits by non-transgender people who are "masquerading" to obtain reservations or funds. But the empirical evidence and comparative international jurisprudence have shown that this fear is totally unfounded. There is no evidence of broad systemic fraud in countries that use self-determination, such as Denmark, Ireland, Norway and Argentina. Heavy bureaucratic gatekeeping disproportionately harms marginalized individuals who don't have the financial resources, pristine documentation, or social capital to navigate complex, hostile medical and legal systems, because it simply serves as an insurmountable barrier rather than preventing fraud.

3. Responding to the Needs of Minors and Capacity Building

In the treatment of transgender minors, for example, there are stark ideological disparities between the regions. The Nordic countries are slowly increasing the rights of minors, recognizing the deep, life-threatening psychological distress caused by puberty and social misfit. In Norway there is a safety valve in that the County Governor can intervene if the parents disagree but the change is in the best interest of the child. It is possible to change gender legally from the age of six with parental consent. Denmark, which is bound by the European Convention on Human Rights, issued guidelines in 2023 to allow minors accessing healthcare to update their CPR numbers. (Sweden lowered the age of LGR to 16 in 2025.)

Conversely, India's 2026 Amendment Act uses the rhetoric of child protection to broadly criminalize the process of transition. In practice, the Indian state criminalises gender-affirming care for adolescents, intimidating parents and medical professionals who do so, prescribing strict life imprisonment and huge fines for "compelling" a child to present as transgender or causing "grievous hurt" (a word weaponised to include hormonal procedures or surgeries). This paternalistic approach is in direct contradiction with the international standards on the developing capacities of the child, and the fundamental right to health.

4. The Persistent Dichotomy of the Administrative

It's a shared failing of the progressive Nordic systems and the regressive Indian system, in their inability to adequately accommodate non-binary identities. Norway and Denmark have progressive laws around self-identification, but because the national ID numbers are binary-coded (CPR and PIN systems), non-binary people are forced to select either male or female, enacting a kind of definitional violence. Sweden's 2025 Act lacks a third legal marker.

The Supreme Court in NALSA recognised a category of third gender to recognise fluid identities in India. The biological definition in the 2026 Amendment is exceedingly restricted and does not at all include genderqueer, agender, and trans masculine people for statutory recognition. For substantive equality, global administrative structures need to transcend binary classification and create neutral identification systems that do not make gender registration a prerequisite for socio-economic participation.

Conclusion

A comprehensive comparative study of laws on gender identity in Sweden, Norway, Denmark and India

confirms a basic, unavoidable fact: legal gender recognition is not merely a bureaucratic administrative process; it is a profoundly human issue of dignity, bodily autonomy and constitutional liberty.

The Nordic models, particularly the Norwegian model and the Danish model in progress, articulate that the modern state is best and most equitably served when gender identity is understood and acknowledged as an innate truth that is spoken by the individual, not a pathology that must be diagnosed, policed, and administered through medical and bureaucratic institutions. The recent 2025 legislation in Sweden, although a missed opportunity to fully embrace self-determination, is an important pragmatic step forward, explicitly decoupling legal recognition from surgical interventions and abolishing the psychiatric diagnosis of gender dysphoria.

The Republic of India is currently facing a serious constitutional crisis. The 2026 Transgender Persons (Protection of Rights) Amendment Act is a systemic betrayal of the globally acclaimed NALSA judgement. By reinstating medical boards headed by CMO, passing of exclusionary biological definitions, creating retroactive invalidations of identity and introducing draconian criminal liabilities that threaten the delivery of life-saving healthcare, the Indian state has weaponized administrative law against one of its most vulnerable populations. While the SMILE scheme and Ayushman Bharat TG Plus are both economic and healthcare schemes that can go a long way in improving the lives of individuals, their utility is rendered completely null and void if the statutory gatekeeping of the 2026 Act prevents the community from legally existing in the eyes of the state so that it can claim them (Delhi, 2026).

If India is to reclaim its position as a global leader in progressive gender jurisprudence, it must act swiftly to repeal the 2026 Amendment Act. The state must re-configure its statutory framework in line with the supreme constitutional guarantees of Articles 14, 15, 19 and 21 and evolve a resilient, purely administrative model of self-identification on the lines of the Norwegian model. Furthermore, it is imperative to continue the decade-old judicial order that provides for horizontal reservations; equalize penal provisions for sexual violence; and protect the rights of transgender youth to gender-affirming care.

In the last analysis, the legitimacy, strength and morality of a democracy is not measured by the degree to which it constrains the identities of its marginalized citizens, but by the degree to which its institutions grow to recognize and protect their existence.

Bibliography

1. (n.d.). Retrieved from https://indiankanoon.org: https://indiankanoon.org/doc/609295/
2. *Article 21 in Constitution of India*. (n.d.). Retrieved from https://indiankanoon.org: https://indiankanoon.org/doc/1199182/
3. Bajoria, J. (2026, March 26). *India's Transgender Rights Bill a Huge Setback*. Retrieved from https://www.hrw.org: https://www.hrw.org/news/2026/03/26/indias-transgender-rights-bill-a-huge-setback
4. Delhi, P. (2026 , April 20). *From Margins to Mainstream*. Retrieved from https://www.pib.gov.in: https://www.pib.gov.in/PressReleasePage.aspx?PRID=2253621&reg=3&lang=1
5. Justice K. S. Puttaswamy (Retd.) and Anr. v. Union of India,, 10 SCC 1 (Supreme Court of India, 2017).
6. JUSTICE, M. O. (2024, April 1). *The Gazette of India.* Retrieved from https://www.mha.gov.in: https://www.mha.gov.in/sites/default/files/250883_english_01042024.pdf

7. Kothari, J. (n.d.). *Centre for Law & Policy Research* . Retrieved from https://clpr.org.in: https://clpr.org.in/wp-content/uploads/2024/12/Accessible_Transgender-Rights-Resource-Book-3.pdf
8. Laxmi Narayan Tripathi v. Union of India, (Supreme Court of India, Division Bench April 24, 2026).
9. National Legal Services Authority (NALSA) v. Union of India, , 5 SCC 438 (Supreme Court of India 2014).
10. *Rights of Transgender Persons After NALSA*. (2025, October). Retrieved from https://www.scobserver.in: https://www.scobserver.in/supreme-court-observer-law-reports-scolr/transgender-rights-reduced-to-a-dead-letters-by-state-indifference/
11. Shreya, A. (2026, April 20). *Certifying Identity: The Constitutional Validity of Medical Boards under the 2026 Transgender Amendment*. Retrieved from https://papers.ssrn.com: https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=6576519
12. Welfare, S. J. (2019, November). Retrieved from https://prsindia.org: https://prsindia.org/billtrack/the-transgender-persons-protection-of-rights-bill-2019