

## The Uniform Civil Code of Uttarakhand: An Analytical Study

**Prof. Suman Kumar\***

**Pratishtha Rao\***

### Abstract

Uniform Civil Code (UCC) is an idea driven by the assumption that in one nation the implementation of rules must be uniform in civil as well as criminal matters. The debate over the same has been going on since British days. It was widely discussed in the Constituent Assembly also. The challenge of this concept is to maintain the multicultural society of India along with the constitutional design. This is also driven by a long-held assumption that civil uniformity and cultural pluralism cannot coexist. Uttarakhand is the first state of India to test that assumption in practice. On 27 January 2025 the Uniform Civil Code of Uttarakhand, 2024 came into force, making Uttarakhand the first state of independent India to enact a comprehensive civil code governing marriage, divorce, succession and live-in relationships for all residents irrespective of religion, with the exception of Scheduled Tribes.

This paper is a doctrinal and analytical study of the UCC of Uttarakhand, testing it against its own claim of equality and uniformity for all, and against the constitutional commitment to pluralism. It asks whether the Code could be applied nationally in future. The paper finds the Code to be a qualified yes to that question. Its equality core is real and substantial: equal inheritance for daughters and sons, common grounds of divorce, and enforceable maintenance, achieved largely without the imposition of majority customs that minorities feared.

However, there remains a gap between the formal equality the Code promises and the substantive equality it actually delivers. The paper sets out this gap and argues that the Code can be replicated across the country only if the contradictions it identifies are addressed, and through a gradual rollout rather than a rushed one.

**Keywords:** Uniform Civil Code; Uttarakhand; gender justice; formal and substantive equality; right to privacy; personal law; pluralism; live-in relationships.

*\* Prof. Suman Kumar, Department of Political Science, Rajdhani College, University of Delhi, New Delhi*

*\*Ms Pratishtha Rao, Research Scholar, Department of Political Science, Banasthali Vidyapith, Rajasthan*

### Introduction

Uniform Civil Code (UCC) is an idea driven by the assumption that in one nation the implementation of rules must be uniform in civil as well as criminal matters. The debate over the same has been going on since British days. It was widely discussed in the Constituent Assembly also. The challenge of this concept is to maintain the multicultural society of India along with the constitutional design. This is also driven by a long-held assumption that civil uniformity and cultural pluralism cannot coexist. It finds a place in the constitution of India under article 44.

Article 44 is a part of the Directive principle of State Policy (DPSP) of the Indian constitution that directs the state to secure a Uniform Civil Code for citizens all over India. However, for seventy-five years since independence, it remained just an aspiration rather than a statute. Personal laws like marriage, divorce, inheritance and succession remained under the religion specific laws. In various cases like Ahmed Khan vs Shah Bano (1985) and Sarla Mudgal vs Union of India (1995), the debates for the importance of UCC surfaced repeatedly but until 2024 with an exception of Goa which inherited its UCC from the Portuguese era, no other Indian state legislated a comprehensive UCC. Recently, Gujrat and Assam have also followed the path of Uttarakhand.

On 7th February, 2024 the legislative Assembly of the State of Uttarakhand passed the UCC Bill of Uttarakhand to govern the laws related to marriage, divorce, succession, live-in relationships and related matters. The law took effect from January 27, 2025. The UCC overrides religion specific laws like the Hindu Marriage Act, Muslim Personal Law (Shariat), the Indian Christian Marriage Act and the Special Marriage Act for the residents of Uttarakhand by applying uniform set of rules to marriage, divorce, succession, inheritance and live-in relationships irrespective of their religion. Uttarakhand thus became the first state of independent India to enact and implement a Uniform Civil Code which has been long awaited for gender equality in society also.

This paper is an analytical study of the Uniform Civil Code of Uttarakhand, 2024 assessing the significance of the UCC act of Uttarakhand, the tensions built around it and what it brings for the future of India. It asks if the Uttarakhand UCC experiment shows that codified uniformity can deliver equality without erasing pluralism and whether its model is transferable to the rest of India.

## **Methodology**

This paper uses a doctrinal and analytical methodology. Primary sources used by this paper are the text of Uniform Civil Code of Uttarakhand, 2024 and the Uniform Civil Code Rules, 2025, along with the relevant provisions of the Constitution of India, mainly Articles 14, 15, 21, 25, 29 and 44. The paper also takes into account the decisions of the Supreme Court on personal law, equality and privacy, the case of Shah Bano (1985), Sarla Mudgal (1995), Shayara Bano vs Union of India (2017), Justice K. S. Puttaswamy vs Union of India (2017),

Lata Singh vs State of Uttar Pradesh (2006) and Navtej Singh Johar vs Union of India (2018).

Due to the recency of the code, empirical data is not collected. The study evaluates the code against its own stated equality objectives and against the competing value of pluralism, and draws on the gap between formal and substantive equality as its primary lens of analysis. The major limitation of the study is the recency of the code; any analysis made in the paper is strictly theoretical due to the lack of empirical data.

## **Constitutional Background**

Uniform Civil Code has its roots in the historical background of India. During the colonial period, after the revolt of 1857, British administration avoided interference in the personal laws of religious communities of India, especially in matters related to marriage, succession, adoption and inheritance. As a result, different religious communities were governed by their own personal laws regarding such personal matters. However, criminal law got codified and was made uniform through Penal Code, 1860 but personal laws remained fragmented on the basis of religion. This divide between uniform public law and fragmented personal laws is the structural legacy that UCC is aiming to change.

After independence, the framers of the constitution envisioned India to be a democratic state based on equality and secularism. Thus came the directive of Article 44 which said “the State shall endeavour to secure for the citizens a Uniform Civil Code throughout the territory of India.” However, this aspiration had to coexist with a competing constitutional commitment of Articles 25 and 29 to protect the freedom of religion and the right to conserve one's culture. Ultimately due to the vast religious and cultural diversity of India, the issue remained politically sensitive and the vision of Article 44 was just kept as a directive for the future. Religious communities also feared that UCC might hinder their personal and religious freedom which was guaranteed by the constitution. The constitution carried a paradox it never resolved, uniform citizenship on one side and protection of Indian diversity on the other.

The constituent assembly debates make this tension explicit (Austin, 1966). They clearly showcase the differences between different leaders regarding the UCC, leaders such as Dr. Bhim Rao Ambedkar who strongly supported UCC for the protection of minorities from being submerged under the identity of majority communities. For him, UCC was important for national integration and social reforms. At the same time many other leaders argued that UCC directly intervenes in the religious practices of different religions. Consequently, the Uniform Civil Code was placed under the Directive Principle rather than being made an enforceable fundamental right.

In recent years, the demand for UCC grew with time in support of gender equality and for true equality before law. Personal laws often act as the bearer of gender inequality which came into scrutiny in the past few years. However, there

was a fear that UCC might come at the cost of India's pluralistic traditions. The legislation regarding UCC has always been on top of the agenda of electoral manifesto of the Bhartiya Janata Party since long. Against this backdrop, Uttarakhand took the first step to enact a comprehensive Uniform Civil Code applicable to all irrespective of their religion.

### **UCC, Uttarakhand 2025: Key Provisions**

The implementation of the Uniform Civil Code in Uttarakhand represents a significant step towards a uniform society in a plural set up. It helps in reducing the legal disparity caused by religion based personal laws in civil matters like marriage, inheritance, succession and divorce. The code applies to every resident of the state, with only one exception i.e. Scheduled Tribes who are not included in this code. The code takes each personal matter earlier defined by religious personal laws and subjects it to a state administered uniform law.

### **Registration of Marriage**

With regards to marriage, one of the most contested issues of UCC, the code lays down a uniform set of conditions required for a valid union, like minimum age, monogamy, soundness of mind and not under the prohibited degrees of relationship. The significance of the code is not just the prohibition but the portrayal that marriage is a legal institution regulated by the state and not solely by religious customs. According to the personal laws, marriage was mainly a religious event that the state recorded from outside, the Code makes it a civil status that the state itself defines according to the UCC, Uttarakhand. Traditionally, marriages were taking place solely through religious customs without any legal backing, a gap which disadvantaged women later whenever disputes arose. Women generally could not prove that they were married at all.

UCC asks for compulsory registration of marriage which solves this type of issue. Registration turns a private ceremony into a documented relationship. In an unforeseen situation this can be used by women to claim maintenance, divorce, or inheritance. The compulsory registration procedure under the UCC provides a legal certainty and institutional acknowledgement to marriages. The main intention behind compulsory registration of marriage is the prevention of cases of fraudulent marriages, child marriages and concealment of marital status. Non-registration can be fined up to ₹10,000 under section 17(1) and section 18. It shows the increasing role of the modern welfare state in controlling civil institutions as well as custom and tradition.

### **Succession and Inheritance**

The clearest equality gain lies in succession. Inheritance practices across communities have long reflected patriarchal structures in which male heirs enjoyed superior rights and daughters' claims to ancestral property were unequal or conditional. The Code replaces this. Under section 51, when a person dies

without a will, every surviving child irrespective of the sex takes one equal share of the estate. The surviving spouse and the parents are each given a share in the same manner equally. The Code grants equal rights to son and daughter in a family and in the matter of property and extends the same parity to every spouse and parent.

The provision of succession and inheritance is the least contested one in UCC as it gives direct statutory effect to the provisions of Article 14 and 15. The Hindu Succession (Amendment) Act, 2005 made daughters coparceners by birth, equal to sons in ancestral property but this ruled only those governed by Hindu law. The UCC of Uttarakhand generalises this principle to all the communities, so that daughters' equal share to ancestral property is not dependent on the religion she is born into.

The stakes in inheritance are not just economically beneficial for women. Economic standing underwrites decision making powers in families. The law itself does not solve the problem, on ground, women might still feel economic and social pressure while claiming their inheritance rights but with UCC in practice, inheritance does not vary according to religion but it is a default legal right and equal control over property has consequences beyond the balance sheet (Parashar, 1992). The Code also defines who counts as an heir. Adopted children, children from surrogacy or biological children, all are on the same footing in inheritance. This is the Code's only mention of adoption, it creates no right or procedure to adopt a child and it continues to be governed by the secular Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act, 2015.

## **Divorce and Maintenance**

The features related to divorce under the Uttarakhand's UCC and also represent a transformation from religion specific personal laws to common legal law. Under section 25, the code introduces uniform grounds for divorce available to every spouse such as cruelty, desertion, conversion, mental disorder and a spouse who has renounced the world or has not been heard of for seven years. Earlier divorce procedures varied across religious communities. Women in certain communities faced legal and social hurdles while trying for divorce. The uniform code standardizes these regulations by treating everyone equally under the law regardless of their background. Section 27 also includes divorce by mutual consent which highlights the increasing respect to personal dignity. It applies the decision of Supreme Court of striking down instantaneous triple talaq in Shayara Bano vs Union of India (2017), calling out the discrimination in religion-based divorce practices which is incompatible with what the constitution guarantees.

Sections 33 and 34 govern maintenance and alimony, to safeguard financial security for dependent spouses and children during the case and after it. Through this attempt UCC works to create a gender sensitive system. It converts financial security from a voluntary moral obligation into a legal responsibility. Such

provisions become significant for women who may face economic vulnerability after separation.

### **Live-in Relationships**

Inclusion of live-in relationships within the Uniform Civil Code of Uttarakhand is regarded as one of the most debated features. Historically, Indian society has regarded marriage as the only socially accepted form of intimate partnership. Relationships outside marriage were often considered socially unacceptable. As social realities changed, Indian courts also began to acknowledge the legitimacy of relationships between consenting adults. In several judgments the Supreme Court said that adults have the freedom to choose their partners without marriage. In this direction the Act acknowledges live-in relationships and makes compulsory registration requirements for couples entering into such relationships. Under the provisions of the Act, partners living together in a relationship similar to marriage are required to register their relationship before the concerned authorities. The state has justified this as it is necessary for ensuring legal protection, particularly for women who may face abandonment or denial of rights after separation.

This kind of registration becomes significant in settling disputes related to financial maintenance or legal rights of children born from these relationships because having official papers makes it easier to fight for financial security. Through a paper trail mechanism, the government tries to mitigate ambiguity and offer institutional protection. The main intention behind this is to cut any kind of guess work and offer financial safety to people. Furthermore, the Act also places specific rights and obligations upon partners involved in registered live-in relationships. This shows the state's acknowledgment to treat such relationships not merely as private arrangements but as legally accountable relationships carrying responsibilities, which may discourage reckless behaviour.

Perhaps the most controversial aspect of the Uttarakhand's UCC is its regulation of live-in relationships. The act makes compulsory registration of live-in relationships and imposes penalties upon partners in case of failure regarding registration. The government has justified that it is necessary for protecting women from exploitation, abandonment and denial of legal rights.

The code leaves Scheduled Tribes outside its scope. Tribal customs are protected by the constitution and tied closely to tribal identity. By leaving them out the Code also shows that uniformity can be applied selectively and not forced on everyone. Equal civil law while respecting the plurality of identities can exist together. This matters for any law to be extended to the rest of India.

### **Equality on Paper and in Practice**

A right available on paper is not always the one people can actually use. This gap is called formal equality and substantive equality. Formal equality means

one rule for all, the same rule applies to everyone. Substantive equality asks whether people can actually use that right on ground given the unequal positions they start from. The Code gives equal rights to daughters for claiming equal share in family property, this is called formal equality and it is there but will the daughter claim it given the societal conditioning and pressures and lack of legal awareness is the question of substantive equality. The narrower the gap between the two will decide the real success of the Code.

Another gap in the Code itself, section 51 gives every child an equal share, but only when a person dies without a will. Section 61 lets any adult of sound mind dispose of their entire estate by will. Under the Hindu Succession Amendment Act, 2005, daughters' birthright share couldn't be willed away but here the Code removes this protection. So, the mentioned equality on paper might not be available on ground.

Bridging that gap is not just a legal job but also an administrative job. The state has set up registration offices and local officers to record marriages, divorce, succession and live in relationships. UCC mandates that now courts are required to resolve disputes strictly according to the single civil framework set up under the Act. This transition helps cut down conflicts arising from different personal rules and ultimately simplify judicial procedures. Online portals have also been created to reduce frauds in record keeping. The design is very reasonable as it does not lock anyone out and is available to all. Registration can be done both online and offline. However, the system is built digital first so the offline route is a secondary route not the primary one. People with lack of internet connectivity depend on a single local official. The deeper constraint is not access but awareness.

Two more aspects decide whether these rights become substantive or not. The first is awareness, people can't use the right they aren't aware of, and lack of awareness is one of the biggest limitations of this Code. The second is administrative capacity to implement the bill. Compulsory registration and monitoring add to official's workload which can cause delays and misuse of power. These problems are there with the implementation of the law not with the law itself. But implementing a law efficiently is as important as making it. That is exactly where the Code's promise is kept or lost. The Act increases the role of the state controlling personal and family matters. Too much involvement of government in personal relationships may lead to unnecessary interference in the private sphere and hurting individual freedom.

There is a resistance from the side of culture and customs. Practices around marriage, inheritance and family are tied to religion and identity and a law can't erase them overnight. People might still be following their customs and beliefs informally even when the law says otherwise. This can happen out of societal conditioning, peer pressure or habit. This is not an argument against the Code, rather a reminder of the work still needed on the ground, which will require proper education and awareness not just penalties.

To implement the Uniform Civil Code all over India, there is support needed like working administration, Internet access, steady awareness campaigns and a step-by-step rollout. The lesson from Uttarakhand is not that uniformity cannot work but that it has to be properly resourced with greater understanding.

### **Customs, Traditions and the Limitations**

India is a highly multicultural society where people follow different religions, traditions and cultural practices. Historically, customs have played an important role in influencing personal matters such as marriage, inheritance, succession and family relations. In many communities, customs are not merely regarded as social habits but are closely connected with religious beliefs and cultural identity. Therefore, whenever the idea of a Uniform Civil Code is discussed, questions regarding the future of traditional customs naturally emerge. Hence the impact of the Uniform Civil Code on traditional customs followed by different communities in India is regarded as the most controversial aspect of the act.

The constitution itself faces this paradox. While Article 44 urged the government to establish a Uniform Civil Code, Articles 25 and 29 actively protected religious freedom and cultural rights. This foundational set-up itself highlights the complexity of Indian democracy which treats both equality and pluralism as coequal virtues. The relationship between tradition and reform also forms a major dimension of the UCC. Supporters of the UCC believe constitutional values should trump discriminatory practices, and they have a point. Historically, several customs have denied equal rights to women in inheritance, divorce and property ownership and those cannot be preserved simply because they are old. India's vast diversity makes complete legal uniformity difficult because customs are not merely social practices but an integral part of historical identity. Because of this, many people believe that a Uniform Civil Code may weaken India's cultural diversity. Consequently, the debate over UCC is not merely legal but also political, cultural and emotional in nature.

An important aspect of the Uttarakhand's UCC is the exclusion of Scheduled Tribes from the scope of the Act, which reflects the state's recognition of the importance of customary practices of minorities. Tribal and indigenous communities in India have different customary practices. These customs are protected because they form an essential part of tribal identity. The exemption granted to tribal communities under the Act itself demonstrates that complete legal uniformity is difficult in a country where customs remain deeply connected with community life.

Another important question in this debate is whether customs should remain unchanged in a modern constitutional society or should also evolve with changing social realities. Society continuously evolves with education,

urbanisation and changing social values. Certain customs which were accepted in earlier times may later be viewed as discriminatory or inconsistent with constitutional principles of equality and dignity. Therefore, legal reforms often attempt to modernise social practices according to democratic and constitutional ideals. Ultimately, social customs cannot be dismantled overnight by passing a new legislation. Social practices are deeply tied to people's consciousness, emotions and daily routines. Even when a common law establishes uniformity, communities will likely keep following their traditional customs informally due to cultural habits. This proves that the efficacy of real legal reform requires public acceptance and gradual social change more than legal enforcement.

This leaves the relationship between customs and the Uniform Civil Code highly contentious. On one hand constitutional equality demands a clean-up of outdated traditions, while on the other hand cultural diversity forms a bedrock feature of India's democratic identity. India's social fabric is so deeply linked with religion and achieving absolute legal uniformity becomes a massive hurdle. Therefore, the real challenge lies in striking a balance between social progress and cultural respect, ensuring that constitutional advancement does not erase democratic diversity.

### **The Privacy Issue and Live-in Registration**

The judicial pronouncements have now started moving towards protecting personal choice in relationships. Traditionally, marriage was considered as the only acceptable form of partnership and anything away from it was considered unacceptable and unethical as well. Over time, the Supreme Court began to realise that consenting adults are free to choose their partners in whichever manner, with or without marriage. It upheld the freedom to choose a partner from any community in *Lata Singh vs State of Uttar Pradesh* (2006) and protected relationships between consenting adults in *Navtej Singh Johar vs Union of India* case (2018).

In *Justice K.S. Puttaswamy & Anr. vs. Union of India & Ors.*, a nine-judge bench held that Right to Privacy is a fundamental right under Article 21 of the constitution. It is also known as the Right to Privacy verdict (2017). Privacy is divided into two parts here, one is making personal choices without the permission of the State and second, control over personal information about yourself. Forcing live-in couples to register touches both the aspects of their privacy.

The Code goes the other way on live-in relationships. Under section 378, partners in a live-in relationship must register it else it's a punishable offence. Living together for more than a month without registering can be fined up to ₹10,000 or three months in jail or both. Failing to register even after the registrar's notice under section 386 can bring up to ₹25,000 fine or up to six months jail or both. If a partner is under 21, the registrar is supposed to tell their parents. The state is calling it all protection. It argues that registration protects

women from being abandoned without legal remedy. It is the same logic given for equality but here the results are quite different.

This is the centre of the problem. Forcing couples to register their relationship with the government is, for many, an intrusion to something deeply private. It can hurt their dignity and it can also be dangerous for them. When married couples register themselves publicly, there are no threatening social consequences but it is not the same with live-in couples in Indian society. In conservative areas especially being placed on a government list can bring stigma and a sense of being watched.

When a law clashes with a fundamental right, courts ask a simple question, Is the method heavier than the aim requires? Here it actually is. The aim of protecting women and children is genuine. But the state could approach it in lighter ways, without compulsory registration, by making it voluntary and by giving them the right to maintenance and protection without the fear of penalty.

The live-in rules were challenged on the grounds of privacy. The state amended the rules four times in 2025 and the fourth amendment tried to solve the issues of privacy breach. A positive duty is placed on the administration to ensure the privacy of the information. Most details were made optional for the parties. However, the most contested issue remained the same, compulsory registration and the offence under section 387 remained intact. For a society like India, it becomes very threatening and scary for couples to disclose such sensitive information about themselves.

### **An Analysis**

A true judgement of any law is not a tally of its pros and cons. It is judged on three questions: First, does the Code deliver equality on paper; second, does it protect India's diversity; and third, does that equality reach people in real life?

On equality on paper the Code succeeds. It replaces a patchwork of religion-based rules with one uniform standard. Every child has an equal share in the estate, irrespective of their sex and whether they are adopted or born through surrogacy. The grounds for divorce are the same for everyone. Compulsory marriage registration will ensure safety and maintenance for both women and children. Documented relationships can have enforceable protections. These can help curb fraud and child marriage. These are the real gains possible through the Code, which gives direct effect to equality mentioned in Article 14 and 15 of the constitution.

On diversity, the general concern with UCC is that imposing a single uniform law might indirectly push the social values of majority communities upon minority sections. This becomes a sensitive issue in democracy, where protecting the rights of minorities is one of the core principles of the constitution. It became really tough for communities to willingly accept these changes, because traditional communities are heavily attached to their custom so social acceptance of the law may become difficult for them. Ultimately certain sections

of UCC may create a tug of war between constitutional equality and cultural autonomy. However, UCC of Uttarakhand follows a secular language and also under section 2, excludes the Scheduled Tribe from it which follows the path of uniformity with accommodation rather than following uniformity imposed.

The UCC is going to be challenging particularly in rural and remote regions where digital infrastructure and administrative accessibility remain severely constrained. Deficits in internet connectivity and digital literacy may create massive practical headaches on the widespread ground compliance which will be a greater burden rather than protection.

On whether equality reaches real life or not, the verdict is mixed. A major limitation on ground is implementation, a right is only as good as the awareness, reach and access that allows people to use it. But the law barely a year on ground cannot be judged based on these. But there are issues with Code's design as well, the equal inheritance share applies only if a person dies without a will, because the Code lets anyone will away their entire estate, this may still be used as a loophole to continue following the customary inheritance procedure in favour of the sons of the house. Here formal equality does not match with substantive equality partly because delivery lags and partly because the law leaves a door open.

An even bigger fault in the Code, one that might not work on the ground, is the compulsory registration of live-in relationships. It is not a flaw in procedure but in principle: forcing couples into a government register is itself the intrusion, and in a society where living together outside marriage is already a stigma, registering it does not give them a safe way out. The Act guarantees privacy of the records, but that guarantee is only as strong as its weakest leak — and a single leak can put a couple in real danger. Informing the parents of partners below 21 is not protection but paternalism. And enforcement is the deepest problem, a duty to detect who is living in a live-in cannot be carried out without prying, and in regressive hands the register becomes a ready tool to harass couples. So the provision fails on its own terms, on paper it protects women, but in practice it discourages the very relationships it claims to regulate. The four rounds of amendments in 2025 softened the process but still kept the compulsion, which is the part that should go. It is the provision that should be struck down, which a national code must not copy.

The overall judgement is neither a praise nor rejection but a qualified success. The Code's work on equality is sound and specific, its vision on diversity is better than critics allow and its weaknesses are of two kinds, a delivery gap and two design faults: disinheritance through will and compulsory registration of live-in relationships, which needs correction. Its real success will depend more on the implementation and how well it is carried out and how honestly it is amended. Reform needs to be gradual and not abrupt, because law shifts what is enforceable long before it shifts what people believe.

## Conclusion

The Uniform Civil Code adopted by Uttarakhand is a landmark turning point in the development of constitutional India. The issue of UCC remained contested for decades in constitutional and political debates. With the enactment of the UCC of Uttarakhand, the concept has now moved from theoretical discussions to practical reality. It represents not just a state-level reform but also an important constitutional experiment. Through this act, the state seeks to support equality before law, gender equality and legal uniformity. The law also represents the increasing role of the modern democratic state in managing civil institutions according to constitutional principles instead of religious laws. It also reflects the changing realities of society, as modernisation, urbanisation, migration and education have transformed the Indian social structure. The code thus tries to align these civil laws with evolving social values.

Consequently, the rollout of the UCC has sparked a tension between constitutional fairness and cultural diversity, largely because Indian civilisation is shaped by a mix of different religions and customs. In India personal laws are deeply tied to community identity by causing an inferiority complex among minority groups. This anxiety shows that legal reform in a diverse society needs deep constitutional sensitivity and gradual adjustment rather than harsh legal enforcement. Supporters argue uniform laws are necessary for ensuring equal treatment. However, critics worry that the push for uniformity may weaken cultural diversity.

Ultimately, the UCC of Uttarakhand has also revived the national discourse surrounding the feasibility of bringing parallel reforms across other Indian states, or at the national level as a whole. Its long-term impact will therefore depend entirely upon society's willingness to bridge the gap between constitutional modernity and the diverse cultural foundations of the country. Because of this, Uttarakhand's Uniform Civil Code should not be viewed merely as a law confined to a single state. It represents a larger constitutional movement that reflects India's continuing struggle to balance equality, diversity, and secularism.

## References

- Ahmed, T., Bahri, A., & Sana, A. (2023). Can a Uniform Civil Code address injustices for Muslim women in India? *Manchester Journal of Transnational Islamic Law & Practice*, 19(4), 94–111.
- Austin, G. (1966). *The Indian Constitution: Cornerstone of a nation*. Oxford University Press.
- Bilimoria, P. (2023). Personal laws in India: Colonial legacy and constitutional debates. *Manchester Journal of Transnational Islamic Law & Practice*, 19(4), 73–93.
- Government of India. (1950). *The Constitution of India*. Ministry of Law and Justice.
- Government of India. (2023). *Twenty-second Law Commission of India consultation paper on Uniform Civil Code*. Law Commission of India.

- Government of Uttarakhand. (2025). The Uniform Civil Code Rules, 2025. Government of Uttarakhand.
- Jain, M. P. (2021). Indian constitutional law (9th ed.). LexisNexis.
- Mustafa, F., & Ahmad, N. (2023). Indian polity and personal law challenges of the proposed Uniform Civil Code. *Manchester Journal of Transnational Islamic Law & Practice*, 19(4), 25–44.
- Parashar, A. (1992). *Women and family law reform in India: Uniform Civil Code and gender equality*. Sage Publications.
- Sarkar, T. (2001). *Hindu wife, Hindu nation: Community, religion and cultural nationalism*. Permanent Black.
- Shetreet, S., & Chodosh, H. E. (2023). Uniform Civil Code for India revisited: Evaluating the contemporary debate and process of legal change. *Manchester Journal of Transnational Islamic Law & Practice*, 19(4), 45–72.
- Singh, S. (2023). The many lives of the Uniform Civil Code: Muslim engagements with law in India. *Manchester Journal of Transnational Islamic Law & Practice*, 19(4), 156–180.
- Tripathi, D. (2025). Personal laws, constitutional morality, and the road to a Uniform Civil Code. *Journal of Emerging Technologies and Innovative Research*, 12(12). <https://www.jetir.org/papers/JETIR2512546.pdf>

\*\*\*