“Relationships in the Nature of Marriage” must be broadly construed to ensure protection to all women from intimate partner violence

The Protection of Women from Domestic Violence Act, 2005 extends to women in:

Section 2(f) “domestic relationship” to mean those who “live or have, in any point of time lived together in a shared household, when they are related by consanguinity, marriage or through a relationship in the nature of marriage, adoption or are family members living together as a joint family;

“.....the family is defined broadly as a site of intimate personal relationship. A subjective definition, i.e. any unit where individuals feel they are a family, is more inclusive than an objective one.....Rather than relying upon institutional definitions of family imputed by the State, notions of family should be re-conceptualised around expressions of ideals of nurturance and care. There is a need to make room for ‘difference and plurality’ within our understanding of what constitutes family.”


“.....the concept of the family may differ in some respects from State to State, and even from region to region within a State, and it is therefore not possible to give the concept a standard definition.”

General comment on 19 (1990) on Article 23 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, para 2.

“.....the form and concept of the family can vary from State to State, and even between regions within a State. Whatever form it takes and whatever the legal system, religion, custom or tradition within the country, the treatment of women in the family both at law and in private must accord with the principles of equality and justice for all people.”


“The relationships which come within the purview of legislation on domestic violence must include: wives, live-in partners, former wives or partners, girl friends (including girl friends not living in the same house), female relatives....”
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