



GENDERED PROTECTION AND ITS LIMITS: EXCLUSION OF MALE AND LGBTQ+ VICTIMS UNDER THE DOMESTIC VIOLENCE LAWS

Manjuma Hussain¹, Dr. Sumita Gope²

¹Research Scholar, Department of Juridical Studies,

²Assistant Professor, Department of Juridical Studies,

^{1,2} Mahapurasha Srimanta Sankardev Viswavidyalaya, Guwahati Unit. Assam, India

¹ manjuma.hussain25@gmail.com, ²sumitagope19@gmail.com

ABSTRACT :

The Protection of Women from Domestic Violence Act, 2005 (PWDVA) was enacted to address a time-honoured space in India's legal system by acknowledging domestic violence as a violation of women's human rights. However, as society progresses and gender identities branch out, the gender-specific framing of such legislation augment critical questions about inclusivity, equality, and justice. This article looks into the politics underlying "protection"—how laws formulated to shield women from abuse may unintentionally marginalize other victims of domestic violence, including men and members of the LGBTQ+ community. By analysing statutory language, judicial interpretations, empirical findings, and comparative international frameworks, the paper argues for a shift from gender-centric to gender-neutral domestic violence laws to ensure equal protection for all individuals, irrespective of gender or sexual orientation.

Keywords: *Domestic Violence Act, Gender Neutrality, Male Victims, LGBTQ+ Rights, Equality, Misuse of Law, Feminist Jurisprudence.*

I. Introduction:

Law is both a reflector and a weapon of social values. The Protection of Women from Domestic Violence Act, 2005 (PWDVA) was enacted to address a historical and pervasive injustice, violence against women within domestic spaces. While the Act has undoubtedly enabled numerous women, it also raises an intolerable question: Does protection for one gender necessitate the exclusion of others?



The answer lies in analysing what may be termed as the *politics of protection* — the idea that protective laws, though well-intentioned, can reinforce gender stereotypes and create new inequities. The binary legal vision of “male perpetrator–female victim” fails to acknowledge the complex realities of domestic abuse, where men, transgender persons, and same-sex partners may also face violence. Gender-specific laws such as the PWDVA and Section 498A of the *Indian Penal Code, 1860* were introduced as corrective mechanisms to protect women from patriarchal violence. While these provisions played a pivotal role in bringing domestic abuse into the legal sphere, they also constructed a legal narrative where the victim is presumed to be female and the perpetrator male. Male victims rarely disclose abuse because of social stigma, fear of mockery, and the lack of legal recourse, according to studies conducted by the National Crime Records Bureau (NCRB) and other NGOs.

The study aims to explore the implications of gender-specific domestic violence legislation, particularly the Protection of Women from Domestic Violence Act, 2005 (PWDVA), on male and LGBTQ+ victims of domestic abuse in India. It seeks to situate India’s legislative approach within a comparative global framework.

II. Objectives of the Study:

The main objectives in this paper are –

1. To Critically Examine Legal Inclusivity and Marginalization
2. To Compare Indian Legislation with Global Gender-Neutral Models
3. To Propose a Shift from Gender-Centric to Human-Centric Jurisprudence.

III. Methodology:

The present study adopts a qualitative and comparative research methodology to critically examine how gender-specific domestic violence laws impact male and LGBTQ+ victims in India. It relies primarily on doctrinal and socio-legal methods to analyze the statutory framework, judicial interpretations, and policy approaches surrounding the Protection of Women from Domestic Violence Act, 2005. Primary data sources include legislative texts, constitutional provisions, and landmark judicial decisions such as *V.D. Bhanot v. Sabita Bhanot* (2012), *Hiral P. Harsora v. Kusum Narottamdas Harsora* (2016), and *Ajay Kumar v. Lata alias Sharuti*



(2019). Secondary data is gathered from books, scholarly articles, government reports, Law Commission recommendations, and NGO publications that address gender justice and domestic abuse.

IV. Results and Discussion:

A comparative element is incorporated through the examination of gender-neutral domestic violence legislation in countries such as the United Kingdom, Canada, and Australia, offering insights for possible reform in India. The research remains analytical and interpretative, with its scope confined to legal and policy analysis rather than empirical fieldwork. Ethical considerations, including academic integrity, objectivity, and respect for sensitive subject matter, have been duly maintained throughout the study. In cases where men attempt to seek justice, the lack of statutory recognition leads to procedural hurdles and social disbelief. For instance, in *Kunapareddy v. Kunapareddy Swarna Kumari*, the Supreme Court upheld the right of a woman to seek protection under the PWDVA but made no comment on the possibility of extending such protection to men, thereby reinforcing the gendered application of the law.

This institutional silence perpetuates an asymmetric notion of justice—one that fails to acknowledge that violence is not gender-exclusive. A "domestic relationship" is defined by the PWDVA as one between two people who share a home and are connected by marriage, consanguinity, or a relationship "in the nature of marriage." Despite the constitutional acknowledgment of LGBTQ+ rights in *Navtej Singh Johar v. Union of India*, same-sex couples are inevitably excluded by this definition.

The PWDVA deprives queer people of protection from intimate partner violence by upholding a heteronormative understanding of domestic relationships. ." Given the mounting evidence of domestic violence in LGBTQ+ relationships, which frequently entails both physical and psychological abuse exacerbated by societal stigma, this exclusion is especially troubling. This gender-specific framework, though remedial in intent, reproduces the very binaries it sought to dismantle. It presumes that men are always perpetrators and women, victims—an assumption inconsistent with empirical data and human experience. By confining victimhood within gender lines, such laws fail to address violence in same-sex relationships, or abuse by women against men or other women.



Emerging research reveals that a significant number of men experience domestic abuse—ranging from physical assault to psychological coercion—but rarely report it. The absence of legal recourse and the stigma of masculinity deter them from seeking help. In India, where the PWDVA applies only to women, male victims are left without remedies such as protection orders, residence rights, or maintenance. Comparatively, the United Kingdom’s *Domestic Abuse Act, 2021* defines domestic abuse in gender-neutral terms, extending protection to “any person” subjected to abusive behaviour. This inclusive framing allows men to access the same safeguards as women without diminishing the seriousness of violence against women. Similarly, Canada’s *Criminal Code* and Australia’s *Family Violence Laws* adopt conduct-based definitions that protect all individuals irrespective of gender. The Indian framework’s omission of male victims thus appears increasingly inconsistent with international standards and constitutional equality principles.

Article 14 of the *Constitution of India* guarantees equality before law and equal protection of laws, while Article 15 prohibits discrimination on the grounds of sex. By excluding male and LGBTQ+ victims, the PWDVA arguably violates these constitutional protections. The Supreme Court’s jurisprudence in *NALSA* and *Navtej Johar* underscores that gender identity and sexual orientation are integral to personal dignity and equality.

The notion of “protection” within gender-specific laws stems from historical paternalism. While it initially sought to empower women, it also reinforced stereotypes of women as inherently weak and dependent. In the 21st century, such paternalistic protectionism appears outdated. Equality before the law demands a framework that empowers all victims, not just those in one gender category. A study conducted by the Save India Society and My Nation on 1650 husbands across the country shows that a large number of these men reported domestic abuse. Another survey conducted on 1000 men in District Rohtak showed that 51.4% of these men have experienced gender violence in their lifetime. Emotional abuse accounted for 51.6% and physical abuse accounted for 6%. However, there are no surveys or studies available on official government websites in India that specify the actual number of men in India who are the victims of domestic violence. Violence against men is really underreported in India; this poses a problem in bringing changes to the current legal framework. The reason that the government does not



collect data about domestic violence against men is because of the common notion that men are not the victims of domestic violence. The Indian law may not consider men as victims of domestic violence, but the study shows the reality of the matter at hand. Statistics by a family counselling centre service provider revealed that approximately 70% husbands were harassed in 2013-2014. These men had bruises and bandages over their bodies. 32,224 complaints were recorded by the centre under the Act in January, of which 160 were by men. These men eventually left their homes as they were unable to cope with the situation. This data clearly indicates that men can also be victims of domestic violence. As per the National Family Housing Survey (2005-2006), approximately 1% women-initiated violence against their husbands.

The judiciary plays a crucial role in shaping the discourse around domestic violence laws and their interpretation. While legislation reflects the legislative intent to protect a specific group, judicial interpretation often determines whether such protection aligns with constitutional principles of equality and justice. In India, courts have grappled with the balance between safeguarding women from patriarchal oppression and preventing misuse of gender-specific statutes. This section examines landmark judgments and comparative case studies that illuminate how courts have addressed issues of gender bias, misuse, and exclusion in domestic violence laws, while also referencing developments from other jurisdictions that have adopted gender-neutral approaches. A few references in terms of the judicial interpretations done in India as well as globally are as under-

4.1 (a): V. D. Bhanot v. Savita Bhanot (2012)

In *V. D. Bhanot v. Savita Bhanot* (2012), the Supreme Court of India clarified that the Protection of Women from Domestic Violence Act, 2005 (PWDVA), applied even to acts of violence that occurred prior to the enactment of the law. The Court emphasized that the purpose of the PWDVA was to provide a remedial framework rather than a punitive one and should be interpreted liberally to protect women from domestic abuse.

While this judgment reinforced the protective nature of the PWDVA, it also indirectly underscored its gender exclusivity by reaffirming that the “aggrieved person” under Section 2(a) of the Act refers only to women. The Court’s interpretation reflects a continuation of the



legislative policy that prioritizes women’s safety without extending similar protection to male or LGBTQ+ victims, revealing a gap between remedial justice and gender equality principles.

4.1 (b): Hiral P. Harsora v. Kusum Narottamdas Harsora (2016)

A turning point came in *Hiral P. Harsora v. Kusum Narottamdas Harsora* (2016), where the Supreme Court struck down the words “adult male” from the definition of “respondent” in Section 2(q) of the PWDVA. The Court reasoned that restricting the definition of the perpetrator to an “adult male” was unconstitutional as it violated Articles 14, 15, and 21 of the Constitution. The judgment broadened the scope of the Act to allow women to file complaints against female respondents as well.

However, the Court did not address the reverse situation where men or persons of other genders might be victims. Thus, the judgment achieved only partial gender neutrality: it acknowledged that both men and women could be perpetrators but maintained that only women could be victims. The omission left male and LGBTQ+ victims still unprotected, demonstrating a judicial reluctance to confront the gender asymmetry in victimhood.

4.1 (c): Rajesh Sharma v. State of Uttar Pradesh (2017)

In *Rajesh Sharma v. State of Uttar Pradesh* (2017), the Supreme Court expressed concern about the misuse of Section 498A of the Indian Penal Code (cruelty by husband or relatives). The Court observed that the provision, although enacted to combat genuine cases of cruelty, had become a tool for “legal terrorism” in some instances. It directed the establishment of Family Welfare Committees to scrutinize complaints before arrests were made.

Though later partially modified, this case highlighted the judiciary’s acknowledgment of the potential misuse of gender-specific laws. It signified a growing judicial consciousness of the need to balance women’s protection with fairness to men. The Court’s remarks echoed the broader societal debate about whether legal frameworks designed for one gender might inadvertently cause injustice to others.

4.1 (d): Inderjit Singh Grewal v. State of Punjab (2011)

In *Inderjit Singh Grewal v. State of Punjab* (2011), the Supreme Court reiterated that the PWDVA was meant to provide immediate relief to aggrieved women and was not punitive in



nature. However, the Court also acknowledged the possibility of vexatious or frivolous complaints, stressing that such cases should be approached cautiously. Although the judgment did not directly address male victimization, it implied judicial awareness of procedural abuse within gender-centric legislation.

4.1 (e): Navtej Singh Johar v. Union of India (2018)

The landmark judgment in *Navtej Singh Johar v. Union of India* (2018), which decriminalized same-sex relations, also has significant implications for domestic violence law. The Supreme Court emphasized the principles of dignity, autonomy, and equality of sexual minorities, holding that constitutional morality must prevail over social morality.

Despite this progressive interpretation, the PWDVA remains silent on violence within same-sex relationships. The judiciary's recognition of LGBTQ+ rights under Article 21 thus coexists with legislative silence, creating a legal vacuum where same-sex domestic abuse is concerned. The absence of an inclusive legal framework undermines the spirit of *Navtej Singh Johar* and highlights the inconsistency between constitutional principles and statutory protections.

Several High Courts have also contributed to the evolving interpretation of the PWDVA:

- In *Ajay Kumar v. Lata alias Sharuti*, the Allahabad High Court reiterated that the PWDVA was enacted to provide an “efficacious remedy to women,” emphasizing its social justice intent. However, it maintained that the law could not be invoked by men under any circumstances, reinforcing the legislative exclusivity.
- In *Kunapareddy v. Kunapareddy Swarna Kumari* (2016) 11 SCC 774, the Supreme Court held that procedural amendments could be made in ongoing domestic violence cases to ensure justice, further strengthening women's access to remedies under the Act.

These cases collectively show that Indian courts have adopted an expansive interpretation to protect women but have refrained from extending similar protections to other genders a gap that remains constitutionally and morally problematic.

4.2 (a): United Kingdom: Yemshaw v. Hounslow London Borough Council (2011)

In *Yemshaw v. Hounslow London Borough Council* [2011] UKSC 3, the UK Supreme Court broadened the definition of “domestic violence” to include psychological, emotional, and



financial abuse, rejecting a narrow interpretation limited to physical harm. The Court explicitly recognized that domestic abuse could occur between individuals of any gender or sexual orientation, aligning judicial reasoning with the UK's gender-neutral legislative framework. This case underscores how judicial interpretation can reinforce inclusivity rather than restrict it, thereby shaping both legal and social perceptions of domestic violence.

4.2 (b): Canada: R. v. Lavallee (1990)

In *R. v. Lavallee* [1990] 1 SCR 852, the Supreme Court of Canada recognized battered woman syndrome as a legitimate defense in homicide cases, marking a milestone in understanding the psychological dimensions of domestic abuse. While primarily addressing female victimhood, Canadian jurisprudence subsequently evolved toward gender-neutral reasoning. Courts in Canada now recognize that domestic abuse can affect all genders, reflecting a holistic understanding of intimate partner violence (Department of Justice Canada, 2018).

4.2 (c): Australia: Osland v. The Queen (1998)

In *Osland v. The Queen* (1998) 197 CLR 316, the High Court of Australia addressed the complex realities of domestic violence and its psychological impact on victims. Australian courts, operating within a gender-neutral statutory context, have interpreted domestic violence laws inclusively, ensuring that men and LGBTQ+ persons can seek remedies without discrimination (Australian Law Reform Commission, 2020).

These comparative examples highlight how judicial activism can either entrench or dismantle gender hierarchies within domestic violence jurisprudence. Where Indian courts have largely upheld gendered protection, courts in other common law jurisdictions have moved decisively toward neutrality and inclusivity.

The Indian judiciary's interpretation of domestic violence law reveals a constitutional paradox. While Article 14 guarantees equality before law, the judicial emphasis on "protective discrimination" under Article 15(3) has justified gender-specific legislation. Courts have often upheld the PWDVA as a valid exercise of state power to protect women, treating it as a reasonable classification rather than invidious discrimination.



However, this reasoning falters when protection transforms into exclusion. As *Navtej Singh Johar* (2018) and *National Legal Services Authority v. Union of India* (2014) demonstrated, the Constitution envisions a society where gender identity and sexual orientation cannot be the basis for denial of rights. Continuing to interpret domestic violence law through a gender transformative judicial approach would interpret the PWDVA in light of constitutional morality and human rights principles, extending its protection to all victims irrespective of gender. Courts could adopt a purposive interpretation that views the term “aggrieved person” as any person in a domestic relationship, thereby aligning statutory interpretation with constitutional values.

The Indian judiciary has already demonstrated such progressive interpretation in contexts like privacy (*Justice K.S. Puttaswamy v. Union of India*, 2017) and sexual orientation (*Navtej Singh Johar*, 2018). A similar approach to domestic violence law would uphold the constitutional ethos of inclusivity, ensuring that protection from abuse is treated as a human right rather than a gender privilege.

The legal analysis of domestic violence jurisprudence reveals both progress and limitation. Indian courts have played a pivotal role in expanding women’s rights, yet their interpretations often remain confined within gendered boundaries. In contrast, courts in the United Kingdom, Canada, and Australia have embraced a more inclusive understanding, reinforcing the universality of protection under law.

Domestic violence, long conceptualized as a gendered problem, is often examined through a feminist lens that situates men as perpetrators and women as victims. While this framework historically served an emancipatory purpose, offering visibility to the pervasive issue of violence against women, it has also inadvertently obscured other forms of victimhood. A nuanced theoretical approach requires situating the problem of domestic violence within broader frameworks of feminist legal theory, queer theory, intersectionality, and critical masculinity studies each offering insights into the social construction of gender, power, and victimization in the constitutional journey toward equality.



Feminist legal theory emerged in response to the patriarchal structure of legal systems that historically silenced women's experiences of violence and discrimination. The second-wave feminist movement of the 1970s and 1980s played a decisive role in reforming laws relating to rape, dowry, and domestic abuse. The Protection of Women from Domestic Violence Act, 2005 (PWDVA) in India is a direct product of such feminist advocacy, recognizing women as a structurally vulnerable group in need of state protection.

However, this gender-specific legal architecture rests upon a dichotomous framework that equates masculinity with aggression and femininity with victimhood. While this served to correct historical injustices, it also entrenched gender essentialism—the idea that men and women are inherently predisposed to specific social roles. Consequently, when men or LGBTQ+ individuals experience domestic abuse, their experiences are often dismissed or trivialized, as they do not fit within the law's gendered imagination of a victim.

Contemporary feminist scholarship has begun to recognize this limitation. The move from “equality feminism” to “difference feminism”, and now toward “postmodern feminism,” reflects a growing awareness that gender-based laws must accommodate the diversity of human experiences. This shift calls for gender neutrality in protective legislation, not as a dilution of women's rights, but as a deepening of feminist goals of equality and justice.

While feminist legal theory laid the groundwork for gender-based protection, queer theory offers an essential critique of its heteronormative foundations. Judith Butler's (1990) theory of gender performativity destabilises the notion of fixed gender categories, arguing that gender is not a biological fact but a social performance maintained through repetition. In this sense, laws that classify victims and perpetrators strictly as “women” and “men” perpetuate heteronormative assumptions, marginalising those who fall outside this binary.

In India, despite judicial advancements such as *National Legal Services Authority v. Union of India* (2014), which recognised the rights of transgender persons, and *Navtej Singh Johar v. Union of India* (2018), which decriminalized homosexuality, domestic violence laws remain heteronormative. The PWDVA, 2005, does not explicitly include same-sex couples or gender-



diverse individuals within its definition of “domestic relationship.” This exclusion reflects a “heterosexual bias” embedded in legal protection mechanisms.

Critical masculinity studies examine how cultural constructions of masculinity prevent men from recognizing or reporting victimization. Traditional socialization patterns equate masculinity with dominance, emotional stoicism, and physical strength, rendering victimhood as incompatible with male identity. Consequently, men who suffer domestic violence often internalize shame and refrain from seeking help.

A report by the Save Family Foundation found that nearly one in three men surveyed in urban India had faced physical or emotional abuse from their partners. Yet, due to social stigma, few approached law enforcement agencies. Similarly, the National Family Health Survey (NFHS-3) reported that approximately 1% of women admitted initiating violence against their husbands a figure that likely underrepresents actual incidents due to underreporting by men.

Synthesizing these theoretical frameworks leads to a pluralist understanding of domestic violence one that recognizes the multiplicity of identities and power relations involved. The goal is not to erase the gendered realities of violence against women but to expand the protective circle to include all individuals vulnerable to abuse.

From a sociological perspective, gender-neutral legislation can foster restorative justice by focusing on harm, accountability, and healing rather than on binary categorizations of victim and perpetrator. Ultimately, theories of feminism, queer identity, and masculinity converge on a shared insight: justice must evolve with society’s understanding of gender and power. To remain just, the law must reflect the fluid and diverse nature of human relationships.

Feminist jurisprudence itself has evolved to embrace intersectionality, recognizing that oppression is multidimensional. Extending legal protection to men and queer individuals does not negate women’s struggles; rather, it situates the discourse within a broader, more inclusive vision of justice.

The call for reform in domestic violence legislation must be grounded in the constitutional ideals of equality, non-discrimination, and human dignity. The current gender-specific



orientation of laws such as the *Protection of Women from Domestic Violence Act, 2005* in India, while historically justified as a measure of affirmative protection, has inadvertently created blind spots in addressing abuse suffered by men and members of the LGBTQ+ community. A progressive reform strategy should therefore aim at reconciling the original protective intent of such statutes with the contemporary understanding of gender and sexuality.

First, domestic violence statutes should be amended to adopt gender-neutral terminology. The definition of “aggrieved person” should encompass “any person subjected to domestic violence by a family or household member,” thereby extending protection to all victims irrespective of sex, gender identity, or sexual orientation. Countries such as Australia, the United Kingdom, and Canada have successfully implemented gender-neutral frameworks without diluting women’s protections; these systems can serve as legislative models for reform in India and other jurisdictions with gender-specific statutes.

Second, training and sensitization of law enforcement and judicial officers must accompany legislative reform. The perception that men or same-sex partners cannot be victims of abuse is deeply rooted in social and institutional biases. Comprehensive capacity-building modules, grounded in empirical understanding of the dynamics of intimate partner violence, should be introduced through judicial academies and police training institutes.

Third, policy frameworks must be broadened to include crisis shelters, counselling services, and helplines accessible to all genders. Most state-run support systems and NGOs cater exclusively to women, leaving male and LGBTQ+ survivors with little recourse. A restructured service network featuring inclusive shelters, mental health counselling, and legal aid clinics would ensure that legislative rights translate into tangible protection. International best practices, such as the United Kingdom’s *Men’s Advice Line* and Canada’s inclusive domestic abuse shelters, provide viable operational templates.

Fourth, data collection and empirical research must be expanded to generate reliable statistics on domestic violence against men and gender-diverse individuals. Official crime records, including those maintained by the National Crime Records Bureau (NCRB), currently recognise only female victims, resulting in significant under-representation of male and



LGBTQ+ cases. Incorporating inclusive categories in surveys and administrative data would aid evidence-based policymaking and reveal the true spectrum of domestic abuse in society.

Fifth, a balanced framework of penal and rehabilitative measures should be incorporated into domestic violence law. Mediation, family counselling, and community-based rehabilitation should complement legal remedies such as protection orders or compensation. This would align domestic violence jurisprudence with international human rights standards and the reformative philosophy embedded in Indian criminal justice.

Finally, a consolidated National Policy on Gender-Neutral Protection from Domestic Law. The policy must also integrate the concerns of men's rights groups and LGBTQ+ advocacy organisations, thereby creating a pluralistic dialogue on domestic violence that transcends binary gender frameworks.

V. Conclusion:

Through these measures, domestic violence law can evolve from a gender-centric mechanism into a truly human-centric instrument of justice. The transition toward gender neutrality does not undermine women's protection; rather, it expands the moral and constitutional promise of equality to all victims of intimate violence, restoring the balance between protection and fairness that the rule of law demands.

Reference:

- 1] Agnes, F. (1999). *Law and gender inequality: The politics of women's rights in India*. Oxford University Press.
- 2] *Ajay Kumar v. Lata alias Sharuti*. (2019). 15 SCC 352.
- 3] Narrain, A. (2004). *Queer: Despised sexuality, law and social change*. Yoda Press.
- 4] Bates, E., & Graham-Kevan, N. (2014). Male victims of intimate partner violence: A challenge to the gendered paradigm. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 19(4), 363–371. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2014.04.001>
- 5] Connell, R. W. (1995). *Masculinities*. University of California Press.
- 6] *Constitution of India*, arts. 14–15.
- 7] Crenshaw, K. (1991). Mapping the margins: Intersectionality, identity politics, and violence against women of color. *Stanford Law Review*, 43(6), 1241–1299. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1229039>



- 8] Department of Justice. (2019). *Family violence laws in Australia*. Commonwealth of Australia.
- 9] *Domestic Abuse Act 2021*, c. 17, s. 1 (UK).
- 10] *Domestic and Family Violence Protection Act 2012* (Qld) (Australia).
- 11] *Family Violence Protection Act*, R.S.O. 2000 (Canada).
- 12] Frug, M. J. (1992). Postmodern legal feminism. *Harvard Law Review*, 105(5), 1045–1074. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1341456>
- 13] *Hiral P. Harsora v. Kusum Narottamdas Harsora*. (2016). 10 SCC 165.
- 14] Human Rights Campaign. (2020). *Intimate partner violence and the LGBTQ+ community*. <https://www.hrc.org>
- 15] *Inderjit Singh Grewal v. State of Punjab*. (2011). 12 SCC 588.
- 16] International Institute for Population Sciences (IIPS), & Macro International. (2007). *National Family Health Survey (NFHS-3), 2005–06: India: Volume I*. IIPS.
- 17] Kapur, R. (1999). Gender, sovereignty and the politics of women’s rights in India. *Feminist Legal Studies*, 7(2), 123–142. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1024699402334>
- 18] Kapur, R. (2002). The tragedy of victimization rhetoric: Resurrecting the ‘native’ subject in international/post-colonial feminist legal politics. *Harvard Human Rights Journal*, 15, 1–37.
- 19] Kishwar, M. (2006). Domestic violence law: Too much feminism, too little justice. *Manushi*, 151, 3–8.
- 20] Kotiswaran, P. (2015). *Towards an economic sociology of law*. Cambridge University Press.
- 21] *Kunapareddy v. Kunapareddy Swarna Kumari*. (2016). 11 SCC 774.
- 22] Law Commission of India. (2003). *243rd Report on Section 498A IPC*. Government of India.
- 23] Law Commission of India. (2012). *Report No. 243 on Section 498A IPC*. Government of India.
- 24] MacKinnon, C. A. (1989). *Toward a feminist theory of the state*. Harvard University Press.
- 25] Malik, J. S., & Nadda, A. (2019). A cross-sectional study of gender-based violence against men in the rural area of Haryana, India. *Indian Journal of Community Medicine*, 35(1), 35–38. <https://doi.org/10.4103/0970-0218.62554>
- 26] Menon, N. (2012). *Seeing like a feminist*. Zubaan.
- 27] Ministry of Women and Child Development. (2016). *Draft National Policy on Women 2016*. Government of India.
- 28] Mishra, M. (2014, February 15). Number of battered husbands in Jabalpur on the rise. *The Times of India*. <http://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/articleshow/30421072.cms>
- 29] National Commission for Women. (2019). *Annual report on complaints received under the Protection of Women from Domestic Violence Act, 2005*.