

LEGAL RECOGNITION OF LIVE-IN RELATIONSHIPS

¹Parth Dubey, ²Mahi Anand

¹BA.LL.B. (Hons.) 4th year, Kalinga University, Raipur

²BA.LL.B. (Hons.) 2nd year, Kalinga University, Raipur

ABSTRACT

In an era of revolutionary constitutionalism, India is on the verge of balancing traditional morality and individual liberty. This study examines the complex legal and social aspects of live-in partnerships, a type of non-marital cohabitation that is becoming more common and prevalent in various Indian cities but still remains mostly hidden and concealed due to shame, stigma and unclear laws. While the Supreme Court has acknowledged that live-in partnerships are covered by Article 21 of the Constitution, they remain ambiguous in personal law. The lack of a statutory framework leads to uneven jurisprudence on issues such as maintenance, child legitimacy, succession, and inheritance. By closely examining significant decisions such as *D. Velusamy v. D. Patchaiammal*, *Lata Singh v. State of Uttar Pradesh*, and *Khushboo v. Kanniammal*. The study illustrates the caution by the judiciary but developing acceptance of live-in arrangements as relationships “in the nature of marriage”. Drawing on historical precedents such as the Gandharva Vivah and more recent developments such as the Uttarakhand Uniform Civil Code, this paper suggests that live-in partnerships are not fresh nor foreign to Indian culture. However, in the absence of comprehensive legislation, enforcing cohabiting partners’ rights, particularly those of women and children, is challenging. The paper advocates for the immediate codification of live-in partnerships through a gender-just, secular, and inclusive legislative tool. To prevent exploitation and avoid moralising consenting adult decisions, such a framework must achieve a balance between individual liability and societal objectives. This study seeks to challenge the normative predominance of marriage in Indian family law and influence legislative discourse by addressing the intersection of tradition and modernity.

Keywords: Live-In Relationships, Cohabitation, Personal Liberty, Legal Recognition, Constitutional Morality, Domestic Abuse, Inheritance, Article 21, UCC Uttarakhand.

INTRODUCTION

Current events are evolving quickly. Globalization has brought the world closer together. People in one part of the world are adopting practices and systems from another, even when they are already in their own country, thanks to the media. Our country's social customs have been influenced by Western culture in particular. Basic family traditions are being progressively abandoned by young people in our nation as a result of Western lifestyle influences. For example, our society is starting to embrace another facet of live-in relationships. It has started to supplant the highly revered bond of marriage, though not completely. Couples survive in a non-married state, and the LGBTQ+ community is actively demanding the right to love, get married, and have a family under **Article 21** (right to life and personal liberty). Marriage establishes a legal heirship for the wife and children. In order to circumvent the wife's support, responsibilities, and legal rights to children born out of these marriages, couples tend to live together.

In many Western countries, cohabitation has become a popular alternative to marriage, with unmarried couples living together in committed partnerships that often resemble marital unions. These relationships enable people to determine compatibility before making a lifelong commitment. In some jurisdictions, such agreements are legally recognised even without official ceremonies or registration.

In contrast, Indian society, particularly in rural and semi-urban areas, still considers live-in relationships socially inappropriate. However, in large cities, such alliances are rapidly gaining traction. Changing attitudes, emotional independence, and a lower tolerance for incompatibility have resulted in a trend away from planned marriages and towards love-based and companionate relationships.

Many people desire to live free of the legal and societal constraints that come with marriage. In such arrangements, two people opt to cohabit for an extended period of time without formalising their relationship by marrying. While this resembles the tenderness seen in marital bonds, it lacks legal recognition or commitment.

Judicial interpretations have occasionally allowed that extended cohabitation can amount to a putative marriage, especially if the couple have lived a life similar to that of couples. However, such unions have no legal duties and are not covered by the Hindu Marriage Act of 1955. Despite the lack of official legislation, recent judicial decisions have provided some remedy and acknowledgement to those affected. Courts have granted women rights such as

maintenance, protection, and child support, but adequate statutory regulation is still required to successfully control these areas.

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

The concept of relationship-based cohabitation is not new in Indian society. Historically, a concept known as "maître-karar" allowed people of different sexes to coexist without marrying. Today's live-in relationships take a similar path, while the phrase has no legal or dictionary definitions. Such arrangements entail living together as husband and wife without a formal marriage. According to an American anthropologist, this involves living together for at least five days a week for three months, with or without the aim of marrying. These partnerships are frequently attacked socially and morally.

The concept of cohabitation without the formal institution of marriage is not a new phenomenon in India. Contrary to common opinion, live-in relationships are not a Western import. Historical and cultural references indicate that Indian society has recognised forms of intimate cohabitation other than marriage from ancient times. "Gandharva Vivah" was one of the eight acceptable marriage forms during the Vedic period. This sort of union relied completely on a man and a woman's mutual consent and attraction, with no religious rites, family approval, or societal traditions involved. Such connections, albeit deemed informal, were acknowledged in ancient legal and religious documents, indicating a level of social acceptance for intimate choice partnerships.¹

Aside from that, there was the concept of Maîtrekarar, a companionship arrangement. The Maîtrekarar, which was based on the Dharmashastras and other socio-religious literature, permitted individuals, including widows and unmarried people, to live together in mutual consent for support, care, and emotional companionship.² These agreements did not always include sexual connections and were not confined to heterosexual dynamics. Instead, they were based on mutual understanding and shared duties, providing a social support structure in an era when official marriage was not the only option for cohabitation.

Alternative cohabiting arrangements, such as the Devadasi system and royal concubinage customs, were also part of ancient India's cultural fabric. While these structures were inherently exploitative and oppressive in many cases, they did represent a cultural acceptance of non-

¹ Manusmriti, Chapter III, Verses 21–34; see also P.V. Kane, History of Dharmasastra, Vol. II, Part I (Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, 1941).

² Flavia Agnes, Family Law: Volume I: Family Law and Constitutional Claims 135–137 (Oxford University Press 2011).

marital, long-term partnerships. For example, royal courts frequently had concubines who lived with the king but did not have the status of marriage, and devadasis were temple-bound women who maintained long-term relationships with patrons.³ Though problematic in their own right, these institutions exacerbate the argument that Indian culture completely opposed live-in cohabitation.

However, with the advent of British colonial rule, the traditional Indian understanding of relationships underwent a significant transformation. Colonial lawmaking introduced Victorian ideals of morality that centred on monogamous, institutionalised marriage. These Western legal and cultural norms were gradually codified into Indian law through statutes like the **Hindu Marriage Act, 1955**,⁴ and the **Special Marriage Act, 1954**.⁵ As a result, indigenous non-marital partnerships, such as Gandharva Vivah or Maîtrekarar, were marginalised or delegitimised, and cohabitation outside marriage came to be regarded as immoral or criminal. This colonial influence lasted in post-independence India, reinforcing the idea that marriage is the only acceptable form of personal relationship.

In the decades following independence, Indian society maintained a traditional view of relationships, with live-in arrangements incurring significant social stigma. However, shifting social dynamics, growing urbanisation, and increased exposure to global ideas began to call into question these long-held standards. Live-in relationships become more popular in the twenty-first century, particularly among metropolitan youngsters. This social change was mirrored by a gradual, if careful, growth in judicial interpretation.

The Indian judiciary has played a crucial role in developing the legal framework for live-in partnerships. In the landmark decision of **Lata Singh v. State of Uttar Pradesh**,⁶ The Supreme Court ruled that a live-in relationship between consenting adults is not a criminal act and does not require involvement from others. Later, in **Khushboo v. Kanniammal**,⁷ The Court reinforced that cohabitation by consenting adults falls within the ambit of the right to life and personal liberty under Article 21 of the Constitution of India. These decisions have paved the way for partial recognition of live-in partnerships, especially in matters like maintenance, domestic violence protection, and the legitimacy of children.

³ Sumanta Banerjee, *Dangerous Outcast: The Prostitute in Nineteenth Century Bengal* 59–65 (Seagull Books 2000).

⁴ The Hindu Marriage Act, No. 25 of 1955, India Code (1955).

⁵ The Special Marriage Act, No. 43 of 1954, India Code (1954).

⁶ *Lata Singh v. State of U.P.*, (2006) 5 SCC 475.

⁷ *Khushboo v. Kanniammal*, (2010) 5 SCC 600.

Despite this progress, live-in relationships in India still operate in a grey legal zone. While courts have extended limited protections under the **Protection of Women from Domestic Violence Act**,⁸ and recognised the legitimacy of children born out of such unions⁹ Several issues, including inheritance rights, tax benefits, and societal recognition, remain uncertain or challenged. Thus, live-in relationships in India now reside at the crossroads of rising personal liberties and long-standing cultural conservatism.

LANDMARK JUDICIAL PRONOUNCEMENTS: AN OVERVIEW

The Indian judiciary is gradually shifting its understanding of marriage and cohabitation from a rigid traditional stance to a more modern and realistic perspective that reflects the changing social environment. Despite this evolution, children born from such partnerships still face uncertainty about their legal status. Several legal cases have emerged where the courts have interpreted cohabitation as valid, even in the absence of formal marriage. Judges have, at times, concluded that couples who lived together for years should be considered married under the law.

In the case of **A. Dinohamy vs W.L. Blahamy**¹⁰, the Privy Council laid down a broad rule — if a man and woman have lived together for a long time, it can be reasonably presumed they are legally married and not just in a casual relationship. The **Mohabbat Ali v. Muhammad Ibrahim Khan**¹¹ the case followed the same principle. In **Badri Prasad v. Dy. Director of Consolidation**¹² The Supreme Court recognized a 50-year cohabiting relationship as valid and equivalent to marriage, acknowledging the practical reality over mere paperwork.

This reflects a remarkable shift in the judiciary's thinking, and many now consider this a positive development. Earlier opinions often dismissed such relationships, but now, the Court recognizes that live-in relationships aren't automatically illegal or immoral. In **Payal Sharma v. Superintendent, Nari Niketan**¹³, the Allahabad High Court held that though society may view live-in relationships as ethically questionable, they are not unlawful. It also emphasized that morality and legality are not the same. In another case, **Patel & Others**, the Supreme Court

⁸ The Protection of Women from Domestic Violence Act, No. 43 of 2005, § 2(f), India Code (2005) (defining “relationship in the nature of marriage”).

⁹ *Tulsa & Ors. v. Durghatiya & Ors.*, (2008) 4 SCC 520.

¹⁰ *A. Dinohamy v. W.L. Blahamy* AIR 1927 P.C. 185

¹¹ *Mohabbat Ali Khan v. Muhammad Ibrahim Khan* (1929) 31 BOMLR 846

¹² *Badri Prasad v. Dy. Director of Consolidation*, 1978 AIR 1557

¹³ *Payal Sharma v. Superintendent*, AIR 2001 All 254

ruled that two unmarried adults living together is not a criminal offense, nor is there any existing law that prohibits such arrangements. In **Tulsa & Ors v. Durghatiya & Ors**¹⁴, the Court confirmed that long-term cohabitation can be treated similarly to a valid marriage

A significant moment came in the case of **Khushboo v. Kanniammal**¹⁵ where the actress faced backlash over her remarks supporting premarital sex. The prosecution argued that her views hurt societal morals. The Supreme Court, including then Chief Justice K.G. Balakrishnan and Justices Deepak Verma and B.S. Chauhan, questioned whether two consenting adults living together could ever be considered a criminal act. Their response was clear — this was neither a violation of any law nor a crime. The Court sought clarity on the nature of the alleged offence and underlined that Article 21 of the Indian Constitution — the right to life — includes the freedom to choose one's partner and live with them, even outside of marriage. Though this opinion was not legally binding, it strongly influenced public perception.

In another case, the Delhi High Court ruled that a live-in relationship was essentially a walk-in, walk-out arrangement. Justice S.N. Dhingra observed that such a connection lacks legal definitions and doesn't form a binding legal relationship. However, the court noted that such rulings have still given people a new sense of hope regarding their personal choices.

A more structured legal framework was discussed in **D.Velusamy vs. D.Patchaiammal**¹⁶, where the Supreme Court clarified what qualifies as a “live-in relationship” or “relationship in the nature of marriage”. The Court laid down conditions under which a woman could seek maintenance in a live-in setup. Justices Markandey Katju and T.S. Thakur stated that a woman can claim such rights only if (1) the couple portray themselves publicly as husband and wife for a significant period; (2) both are legally of marriageable age; (3) neither party is already married; and (4) they voluntarily live together.

Additionally, to qualify under the Domestic Violence Act of 2005, the partners must reside in a “shared household” as defined in section 2(S) of the Act. One-night stands, weekend hookups, or casual flings do not meet the criteria. As the court stated, not every instance of cohabitation can be equated to marriage for the purpose of claiming protection under the law. The conditions must be clearly satisfied and supported by evidence. If they aren't, the woman is not considered a wife in the legal sense. While this position may limit the benefits available to women in non-

¹⁴ Tulsa & Ors v. Durghatiya & Ors AIR 2008 SC 1193

¹⁵ Khushboo v. Kanniammal (2010) 5 SCC 600

¹⁶ D.Velusamy vs. D.Patchaiammal (2010) 10 SCC 469 20

marriage live-in situations, the court emphasized that its role is to interpret the law, not rewrite it.

The Supreme Court, in the case of **Uday Kumar v. Aysha & Others**¹⁷ once more highlighted the legal validity of children born out of cohabiting couples. The decision for the same was that the practice is legal in the eyes of the law. Whereas the judgement contradicts the legitimacy of children who are born out of cohabiting couples. The Court encouraged a more supportive environment for live-in relationships. While modern thinking and exposure have changed how people see these arrangements, they still present challenges for the future. The Court's ruling may lead more people to consider or enter such relationships. Literate sections of the society are slowly beginning to accept live-in relationships. Educated sections of society are slowly beginning to accept live-in relationships. However, many still believe that live-in arrangements weaken the social and moral values associated with traditional marriage — values tied to dowry, caste, religion, language, region, nationality, and profession.

The hope is to build a decent and respectful society. While the intention behind cohabitation may be positive, it can sometimes lead to pain rather than comfort. Western experiences have shown that, in the long run, marriage remains the most valued and binding relationship.

STATUS OF LIVE-IN RELATIONSHIPS IN INDIA:

Over time, Indian laws have evolved to suit changing societal norms. Legal systems, like the evolution of Hindu law, must adjust to changing societal dynamics over time. Cohabitation between unmarried people has been around for a long time, while the term "live-in relationship" is a relatively new concept. Previously, such arrangements were merely referred to as "unmarried couples" without statutory acknowledgement.

Historically, Indian society has had a conservative approach to cohabitation. Prior to independence, living together outside of marriage was socially discouraged, particularly in public or urban areas. Despite the fact that such relationships are becoming more common, they are nonetheless frowned upon morally and lack legal legitimacy. The rights and duties of partners in live-in agreements are unregulated. Courts have attempted to interpret such partnerships in the lack of formal regulations, particularly in terms of inheritance and property succession.

¹⁷ Uday Kumar v. Aysha & Ors CrI M.P. No. 6817 of 2014

Although cohabitation is largely accepted in many Western nations, it is still evolving in India and is considered socially sensitive. Legislative action remains difficult due to low public support and cultural resistance.

Implementation of UCC in Uttarakhand: The Uniform Civil Code (UCC) issued in Uttarakhand explicitly defines a live-in relationship as a domestic partnership between a man and a woman, similar to marriage, as long as the relationship does not exceed a forbidden level. According to Section 378 of the Code, submission of a formal statement by partners to a live-in relationship is mandatory to the registrar in the jurisdiction where they live. This must be completed within thirty days of the beginning of their cohabitation.

The UCC has implemented various progressive safeguards. Women who have been abandoned by their live-in partners can now claim support in the same way as legally married spouses do. The rule also protects housing – landlords cannot refuse to rent to unmarried couples who have a valid registration certificate. Furthermore, children born from such relationships are considered legitimate, with inheritance rights equal to those of children born in wedlock.

PROTECTION OF WOMEN FROM DOMESTIC VIOLENCE ACT, 2005:

The 2005 Safety of Women from Domestic Violence Act defines domestic relationships as "relationships similar to marriage" or live-in relationships. Section 2(a) defines an "Aggrieved Person" as any woman who is or has been in a relationship with the respondent who claims to have been a victim of domestic violence. According to Sec. 2(f), a "Domestic Relationship" refers to a relationship between two people who live together or have previously lived in the same home, regardless of their relationship status (consanguinity, marriage, adoption, or joint family). The terms used to describe marriage are straightforward and align with the social concept of living together.

JUSTICE MALIMATH COMMITTEE REPORT:

In November 2000, the Supreme Court received the Justice Malimath Committee's findings, which declared that "if a man and a woman live together as husband and wife for a reasonable period of time, the man is considered to have married the woman."

The Malimath Committee approved amendments to CrPC Section 125. The committee wanted to widen Section 125's definition of "wife" "to include a woman who changed into living with

the person as his spouse for a fairly lengthy tenure, during the subsistence of the primary marriage." The definition of "wife" is sometimes inaccurate due to its context in secondary relationships between married males.

THE MAHARASHTRA GOVERNMENT PROPOSAL 2008:

In October 2008, the Maharashtra government proposed that a woman who lives with someone for an "affordable tenure/duration" could obtain the status of wife. The statistics and conditions of each incident determine whether a duration is an "affordable duration" or not.

RECOMMENDATION OF THE NATIONAL COMMISSION FOR WOMEN 2008:

On June 30, 2008, the National Commission for Women proposed to the Ministry of Women and Child Development that women in live-in relationships be included in the term "wife" under Section 125 of the Criminal Procedure Code. The campaign was perceived as an attempt to stigmatize second-degree relationships and promote in-law relationships. The campaign was seen as an attempt to criminalize second marriages and promote non-marital heterosexual relationships among young people.

RIGHTS AND PROTECTIONS AFFORDED TO WOMEN AND CHILDREN IN LIVE-IN RELATIONSHIPS: A LEGAL ANALYSIS

The legal system is critical to ensuring social justice and societal order. However, legislation does not act in a vacuum; it operates within a complicated framework shaped by social norms and structural conditions. While the law is a tool for keeping the peace, there is no legislated structure for maintaining intimate connections like live-in agreements. Notably, the People's Law and the 1973 Code of Criminal Procedure do not officially recognise "live-in relationships".

Nonetheless, legislative efforts such as the 2005 Protection of Women from Domestic Violence Act seek to protect women by prohibiting such unions in which abuse occurs. Nonetheless, both domestic and international laws remain ambiguous about the legal status of cohabiting partners, particularly in terms of property rights, financial liabilities, child custody, healthcare access, and survivor benefits.

Women, children, and dependent parents can claim maintenance under Section 125 of the CrPC, however this usually applies only to those who are legally married, divorced, or judicially separated, not to those who live in a shared residence.

In June 2008, in response to cultural changes, the National Commission for Women suggested that Section 125 be amended to include female partners in live-in relationships. This was supported in **Abhijit Bhikaseeth Auti v. State of Maharashtra**¹⁸, which concluded that maintenance rights should not be withheld purely because of a lack of official marriage.

More progress was made in October 2008, when the Maharashtra Government, backed by the Malimath Committee and the Law Commission, recognised that women who had cohabited with a man for a significant period of time deserved spousal status under Section 125 CrPC.

The Supreme Court reiterated similar thoughts in **Koppiseti Subbarao Subramaniam v. State of Andhra Pradesh**¹⁹, emphasising that legal protection from dowry harassment should apply to live-in partners. The Court rejected the argument that the term "wife" should be limited to official marriages, noting that annulled marriages and children born from them are legally recognised. Therefore, the term "wife" must be understood in an inclusive and liberal sense.

This view was confirmed in the landmark decision of **Chanmuniya v. Virendra Kumar Singh Kushwaha**²⁰, in which the Court declared that a man and a woman living together as husband and wife may be subject to Section 125. As a result, documentation of a formal marriage should not be required for claiming maintenance.

Finally, on October 21, 2010, the Supreme Court issued a decision that defined the legal position on such relationships, advocating a more inclusive vision of familial obligations and the rights of women and children in non-marital partnerships.

The Indian judiciary has relatively clarified the legal status of children born out of live-in relationships. In the pathbreaking case of **Tulsa vs. Durghatiya**,²¹ The Supreme Court struck down the view that children born in the case of a long-standing live-in relationship would not

¹⁸ Abhijit Bhikaseeth Auti v. State of Maharashtra CRIMINAL WRIT PETITION NO. 2218

¹⁹ Koppiseti Subramaniam v. A.P. State AIR 2009 SC 2684

²⁰ Chanmuniya v. Virendra Kumar Singh Kushwaha (2011) 1 SCC 141

²¹ Tulsa & others vs Durghatiya and others ((4) SCC 520).

be considered illegitimate so long as the couple had lived under a common roof long enough such that they are viewed as husband and wife by society. Specifically, the court noted that such a relationship cannot be the type of relationship in which one walks in and walks out only, but one that can be characterised by stability and continuity.

More guidance on this principle can be traced in Section 16 of the Hindu Marriage Act, 1955, and Section 26 of the Special Marriage Act, 1954, that authorise the legitimacy of children born out of void and voidable marriages. In these provisions it is provided that children born of a marriage which is treated as one that is null and void, or of which, in regard to which, a decree of nullity is given, shall be treated as legitimate. Subsection (3) of both acts, however, restricts the proprietary rights of such children to the self-acquired property of the parents. So, these children do not have a coparceny right to the ancestral property or to the Hindu Undivided Family (HUF) property of the father in case the parents did not get lawfully wedded.

However, the right to claim maintenance is clearly protected. Section 125 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973, entitles both legitimate and illegitimate children to maintenance from their father, thus securing financial support regardless of the legal status of the relationship between the parents. Moreover, when it comes to guardianship matters, the mother is generally regarded as the natural guardian for such children, particularly when the relationship between the parents is not formalised through legal marriage.

LIVE-IN RELATIONSHIPS: A SOCIETAL DILEMMA

While India is gradually accepting Western influences such as non-marital cohabitation, deep-rooted cultural traditions and societal conventions continue to impede its widespread adoption. Live-in relationships, according to some, pose a challenge to the established institution of marriage.

Marriage is still a legal and social privilege in Indian society. Maintenance rights, inheritance claims, offspring legitimacy, and general societal acceptance are all benefits of legal marriage. Nonetheless, many couples, particularly in metropolitan areas, prefer live-in arrangements over marriage due to changing lifestyles, a desire to escape cultural restrictions, or a wish to assess compatibility. These relationships provide greater personal freedom and liberty, but they also create obstacles, most notably legal uncertainty and the possibility of abuse owing to mismatched expectations.

Such interactions present a significant challenge to India's established social structure. Historically, legal systems have encouraged marriage by providing exclusive legal privileges to married individuals. Although living together without marriage is not illegal, it does not have a substantial legal basis. Courts frequently decline to validate pledges made in such unions, citing policy issues²².

However, current judicial tendencies show a change. The Supreme Court stated in **D. Velusamy v. D. Patchaiammal**²³ that not all live-in partnerships are legally lawful. Women in long-term, stable relationships, however, may be protected by domestic abuse legislation. The Court stated unequivocally that the goal is to protect women from danger rather than to formalise these relationships. It also stated that morality is culturally influenced and not always dictated by law. As society attitudes shift, there is a growing demand for a formal legal framework to govern live-in couples. Without such control, legal ambiguity prevails, and courts frequently adopt inconsistent rules. Legislation should ideally specify the minimum term of legal recognition, optional registration systems, and the rights of children born in such unions.

The Court observed in **Lata Singh v. State of Uttar Pradesh**²⁴ that, while consensual adult relationships are legal, they may be considered as immoral in society. This emphasises the persistent conflict between legal acceptability and cultural standards. Imposing severe legal constraints on such connections may stymie social growth. Instead, a broader legal framework is required.

Although cohabitation is not prohibited in India, the law does not actively encourage or promote it. Historically, Indian legal systems have favoured marriage, promoting certain gender biases, most notably the belief that women require protection in both marital and non-marital situations²⁵. To guarantee equity and justice, live-in partnerships should be recognised as normal adult relationships demanding legal protection, rather than as anomalies.

CONCLUSION:

²² Alok Kumar v. State & Anr., (2010) DLT 286 (India) (holding that a live-in relationship is a walk-in and walk-out relationship, lacking legal obligations unless proven otherwise).

²³ D. Velusamy v. D. Patchaiammal, (2010) 10 SCC 469 (India)

²⁴ Lata Singh v. State of U.P., (2006) 5 SCC 475 (India)

²⁵ Flavia Agnes, Family Law: Volume I – Family Law and Constitutional Claims 88–89 (Oxford Univ. Press 2011)

As citizens of the Indian subcontinent, our Constitution confers on us some rights and freedoms through which we can lead our lives on our own terms and conditions; citizens are free to choose who they want to marry in order to start a family. Establishing a sense of connection is the aim of marriage, despite its challenges. Marriage provides safety and legal standing in society, but it does not guarantee eternal happiness. Changes should be made to cohabitation arrangements as they pertain to privacy and individual rights. There are serious concerns that eventually people may choose these practices over traditional marriage, even if there may not be many people who support them. Without regulations, Indian judicial wisdom has significantly increased our understanding of cohabitation-related difficulties and maintained a balanced stance. Live-in relationships can present challenging difficulties, despite their novelty and allure. Bigamy and many-partner relationships can disrupt the social fabric of the nation. Women in these partnerships do not have the same societal recognition and respect as wives. Lack of rules increases the risk of women being exploited in these situations. A study found that couples in these relationships rarely had children, and even if they did, they were not accepted or recognised by the society or even by the parents, which even led to a massive increase in the unnecessary Abortion. Couples without children sometimes lack affection and parental care, which might negatively impact their children's interests. Concerns include rising disputes over child support, legality, and inheritance. Moral standards and cultural norms should not be abandoned for progress, even when society adapts over time. There is a great need to inform the younger generation about the true meaning of marriage. It's important to educate the current generation about marriage and family and encourage parents to respect their children's choices by enabling them to choose their life partners. This is only possible if parents accept their children's emotions and preferences and allow them to marry freely. In conclusion to that, India requires a complete law governing live-in relationships which respects the emotions and requirements of all the generations and also provides fair justice in case of any violation of peace and harmony and exploitation of any group or individual in the society.

REFERENCES:

1. Law Comm'n of India, Report No. 252, Need to Recognise and Regulate Live-in Relationships (2015).
2. Manusmriti, The Oxford International Encyclopedia of Legal History (2009), Oxford University Press,

3. Sumanta Banerjee, *Dangerous Outcast: The Prostitute in Nineteenth Century Bengal* 59–65 (Seagull Books 2000).
4. Flavia Agnes, *Family Law: Volume I: Family Law and Constitutional Claims* 135–137 (Oxford University Press 2011).
5. The Uniform Civil Code of Uttarakhand, 2024 – available at
6. Special Marriage Act, No. 43 of 1954, 26 (India).
7. Hindu Marriage Act, No. 25 of 1955, 16 (India).
8. The Protection of Women from Domestic Violence Act, No. 43 of 2005, 2(f), 2(a), 3 (India).
9. Code of Criminal Procedure, No. 2 of 1974, 125 (India).