



Evolution of joint family structure in India and the role of legislative inroads

Abhirup Ghosh and Debjyoti Basu

Hindu joint family is a kind of family system, which is typically seen amongst the Hindus only. The concept of Hindu joint family is nothing new, and it is in existence since long. This kind of family was well recognised by customary laws. According to the Bombay High Court, a joint Hindu family consists of all persons lineally descended from one common ancestor and includes their wives and unmarried daughters.¹ Joint-ness is the fundamental feature of this kind of family. However, the interpretation of this kind of joint-ness is not to be conceived in literary sense. One may say that mere staying together can constitute the status of joint-ness. The meaning, however, is far wider. The family is treated as joint not only with reference to the estate but also with regard to food and worship. However, the existence of a joint estate is not a

fundamental requirement. A Hindu family can also be treated as joint even in the absence of any joint property. People may stay together for common enjoyment, nature of relationship existing and for mutual support and cooperation.²

The origin of the institution of Hindu joint family can be traced in the ancient texts and writing of the *Smritikars*. This system, in fact, is sprung from the ancient patriarchal family, the earliest unit of human society. The head of such unit was always despotic in its practice. Hence the insertion of coparceners was entirely based on his absolute power. This institution is basically a creation of law and enfolds within it the lineal male descendants of a common ancestor and includes their mothers, wives or widows and unmarried daughters. Joint family status is ordinarily the result of birth or affiliation by the way of marriage and need not necessarily be

linked with the possession of joint family property.³

The presumption as to the jointness of any Hindu family basically revolves around the judicial principles laid down under various case laws. However, the basic premise is that in absence of any apparent division, every Hindu family is considered as joint family. And such presumption is stronger in case of brothers living together rather than cousins. However, this very presumption goes weaker when members keep on going further from the father in terms of relationship with him.⁴ We discuss the following certain principles for the purpose of determining the jointness of any Hindu family.

1. Until the contrary is proved, every Hindu family is assumed to be joint in terms of food, worship and estate. Mere living separately does not breach this jointness. Though it may be a relevant factor towards proving the state of separated but however it is not a conclusive one.⁵
2. Once a family is regarded as joint, then in absence of any clear-cut separation, the presumption of jointness remains intact. This indeed is a very strong presumption and it favours the brothers who are continuing with the state of being joint. The burden of proof lies on the person who alleges that there is a severance of the joint status.⁶
3. In case of a partition already taken place, the general presumption would be that the joint status is no more available. However, at that time, if there is someone alleging that some part of the property is still existing in the undivided form then the burden shall be upon the person who alleges the existence of such unpartitioned property.⁷
4. When a joint family continues to hold property jointly then such property shall be treated as joint family property. However, on the basis of mere fact that the family is joint no assumption can be drawn that the nature of holding property is also joint. This is true because of the principle already referred above that it is not an essential requirement for a joint family to hold or possess property jointly.⁸

While discussing various aspects of Hindu joint family, the concept of coparcenary is

one of the things which can not be left unattended. The system of coparcenary is a narrower concept than that of the Hindu joint family system. In this kind of system, the persons are related only through blood or valid adoption. A person by marriage or by virtue of any agreement can become a coparcener. A coparcenary system is the creation of law.⁹ Thus, in other words, a coparcenary system is a small sphere within the Hindu joint family system that forms the broader circle.

Under old or classical Hindu laws, only male members were allowed to form a coparcenary system. Female members were not entitled to be involved into such system. The seniormost person is treated as the last holder of the property and from him four generations of members are calculated in order to decide whether a particular companion of members in a joint Hindu family can be treated as coparcenary or not. To form a coparcenary system, minimum two members are required. The relationship between the father and the son is ideal in order to start with such coparcenary.

Under Hindu law, every coparcenary has certain fundamental features. They are:

1. The lineal male descendants of a person, up to third generation (excluding him), acquires interest on the coparcenary property held by him.
2. Coparcenary is necessarily a creation of law and it can never be created by agreement or otherwise.
3. In any coparcenary system whenever a coparcener is born acquires an interest by virtue of his birth.
4. A coparcenary system is a unique example of unity of possession and community of interest. Till a partition takes place no coparcener can have absolute ownership on the coparcenary property and hence alienation of such property without required permission and purpose is invalid.
5. The interest in any coparcenary property is always fluctuating as the amount of interest varies with the birth and death of coparceners.
6. A coparcenary property involves collective enjoyment only. There is no concept of individual enjoyment unless there is a partition to the effect.

7. In a *Mitakshara* coparcenary any major coparcenary can ask for partition any time. Such right for the asking for partition is an inherent right by virtue of his birth in that very coparcenary property and such right can not be taken away by any contract in contrary.

8. If a property is a coparcenary property then alienation of interest is of any kind with respect to that property is null and void since every coparcener gets a birth right on that property hence without giving their due interests.¹⁰

In a Hindu joint family, the position of the karta

is *sui generis*. The term Karta in general parlance can be understood as the main functioning person or head. In a Hindu joint family the seniormost male member is entitled to be karta. However his position is not because of any agreement or consent of other coparceners. He may be aged or ailing but still by virtue of being the seniormost member he can continue to become karta.¹¹

Generally karta is a person on whom the entire management of the family is vested for the welfare of the family. His relationship with the other members of the family is not in the form of principal and agent. In addition to that, his status is not to be confused with that of the manager of any commercial firm. Therefore, in terms of family management, he is the sovereign; however his powers can not be so used as they can become detrimental to the family itself.¹²

Under a Hindu coparcenary system, the karta enjoys certain powers. These powers can be with respect to power to manage the family for its beneficial continuance, power to receive income with respect to any joint family property, power to represent the family in case of any litigation brought against or by the family, power to compromise with any

The origin of the institution of Hindu joint family can be traced in the ancient texts and writing of the Smritikars. This system, in fact, is sprung from the ancient patriarchal family, the earliest unit of human society. The head of such unit was always despotic in its practice. Hence the insertion of coparceners was entirely based on his absolute power.

claims where he is of the opinion that such would be in the beneficial interest of the family etc.¹³

Like a karta, all the coparceners in a Hindu joint family are also entitled to enjoy certain rights. These rights are right to claim a share in the coparcenary property by virtue of birth in the system; each and every coparcener enjoys a right of common enjoyment of the property held by the coparcenary system; in case of the death of any coparcener his part of the property devolves with the other coparceners and does not go outside the coparcenary system; in a joint family generally it is the karta who manages

the family. However, the coparceners reserve a right to ask for accounts. Such a right keeps a check on the misappropriation tendency, if any, and ensures fairness; though in a coparcenary property, all the coparceners possess equal rights but there is no bar on the coparceners to acquire and own any separate property. Such property is treated as separate property and it is out of the purview of partition; every coparcener has a right on the property held under the system and hence after attaining majority they can ask for partition at any time; the law also entitles a coparcener to renounce his interest in the coparcenary property absolutely or conditionally. In case of absolute renouncement he can not claim any right thereafter; a coparcener in a Hindu joint family can also challenge any unauthorised alienation of the property by any other coparcener.¹⁴

In the above forethought we have dealt with the general perception of a Hindu joint family and other concepts related to it. Now, in the subsequent part, our focus will shift from the general concept towards the evolution of joint family system in India and the responsible legislative inroads behind such evolution. However, before going to

this discussion, let us have an overview of the entire phenomenon.

Hindu joint family is a very old system but still prevailing. In the old times the intricacies of Hindu joint family were only governed by the old customary laws. This used to prevail even during the continuance of the British period. However it is from that very time that the legislature had started intervening into the system slowly. The legislative intervention kept on increasing from time to time, and after independence, there have been substantial inroads by the legislature into this system. Not only the parliament but various state legislatures too have helped in giving newer shape to this system of joint family.

As far as the legislative interventions are concerned, one may face this particular question as to what made the legislature intervene into the system of joint family. The general answer could be the appearance of certain irregularities in the eyes of legislature. This is true that in the old customary laws there were inequalities with respect to distribution of property in a joint family and such inequalities were apparent in case of females. Hence there was an imperative for the legislature to intervene in this system to make it equitable. Thus family system should not be spared only because it is governed by personal sphere of the individuals. As far as the evolution of Hindu joint family is concerned, the following legislative interventions can be considered substantial.

Caste Disabilities Removal Act 1850

To discuss the scheme of this Act, it is necessary to look at the background of this Act. Before the passing of this Act, difference of religion between the intestate and the legal heir created a kind of impediment for succession as at that point of time the general rule was that only a Hindu can inherit from another Hindu. Thus if any Hindu changes his religion before succession then he was considered no longer entitled to receive the property. Hence a Hindu, by the reason of his conversion, was subject to disqualification from his property rights. To overcome this problem, the British government brought this particular legislation.¹⁵

Now the result after passing of this Act is that a Hindu does not lose his proprietary

rights because of the only reason of conversion into another religion. He continues to be a member of the family for the purpose of inheritance of the property. However the Hindu converting into new religion alone is entitled to take benefits of this Act and not his legal heirs. It is indeed landmark legislation with respect to the joint family system and that too in such a time period when the society was hugely divided in terms of race, religion, caste and all. The greatest achievement of this Act is doing away with the existing customary laws or usages leading to the deprivation of proprietary rights on the grounds of caste, religion etc.¹⁶

The Hindu Women's Right to Property Act 1937

This is perhaps the second incident of legislative intervention into the system of Hindu joint family system. This Act provided that where a Hindu dies intestate leaving behind any property, then the widow or widows of the Hindu dying shall be entitled to same share of the property as a son.¹⁷ In case of widow of a predeceased son, she shall inherit the property in the same manner in which the son would inherit if he were alive.¹⁸ If the Hindu dying belongs to any other school than the *Dayabhaga* leaves certain interest in a Hindu joint family property then his widow shall also be entitled to the same interest like that of the male Hindu himself had in the property.¹⁹ However any of such interest vested on a Hindu woman shall be treated as limited interest known as Hindu Women's Estate provided however that she shall have the same right of claiming a partition as a male owner.²⁰ This Act has an overriding effect on the ground that this law shall be applicable even if there is a customary law contrary to the provisions of this Act.²¹

The Supreme Court considered this Act in one of the cases. In that case, the one of the coparceners died in the year 1938. This was after the Act came into force. One of the widows in the family demanded partition in the year 1950 and by that time other coparceners also died. The court held that she was entitled to receive the property in the form of half share on partition.²² From this decision it became clear that the widow of the coparcener incidentally gets the benefit

out of the rule of survivorship which is in operation as between other coparceners.²³ The Supreme Court got another opportunity to interpret this Act. In that very case a person died in an undivided family. Now, by virtue of the 1937 Act, his widow stepped into his shoes. She then demanded a partition. However the partition did not take place in metes and bounds before her death. After her death the daughter claimed the property in the capacity of reversioner. However this was objected by the other parties on the ground of survivorship. However the court held

The presumption as to the jointness of any Hindu family basically revolves around the judicial principles laid down under various case laws. However, the basic premise is that in absence of any apparent division, every Hindu family is considered as joint family. And such presumption is stronger in case of brothers living together rather than cousins.

that daughter was entitled to acquire the property. The court observed that the Act of 1937 had no effect in making the widow as a coparcener. However, the 1937 Act allows the widow to enter into the steps of her husband and to claim the property in the capacity of a coparcener. But it can not be said that this Act makes widow a coparcener in true sense as she is not a coparcener because of her own capacity.²⁴ This Act has been repealed by Hindu Succession Act of 1956.

The Hindu Succession Act of 1956

This Act is the principal legislation governing the succession amongst the Hindus. This law is much simpler than the old customary Hindu law. This Act lays down the uniform law which will govern the succession of all Hindus. This Act nullifies all old Hindu customary rules contrary to the provision this Act. This Act preserves the dual ways of devolution of property under Hindu Mitakshara School. This Act does not override the method of partition and allows devolution of property also with the rule of succession laid down under this Act. This Act basically inculcates the principle of propinquity that is preference to be given on the basis of nearness in the terms of

relationship. This Act, further, also recognises the rule of testamentary succession through which a Hindu before death can bequeath his personal property upon anybody by will.²⁵

This Act made certain other fundamental changes. One was that the widow, the daughter and the widow of the predeceased the son got the same right as that of the son in the matter of inheritance, and the daughter was given full and equal share like that of the son. Another change which this Act brought was recognition of more number of female legal heirs than the cluster

already existing in the earlier system of Dayabhaga and Mitakshara Schools. The third change introduced by this Act was the abolition of discrepancies²⁶ existing within the female legal heirs in the earlier schools of Hindu laws. The last important change was with respect of rule of inheritance in the Dayabhaga School of Hindu law. Previously in this school the father succeeded the son in preference to the mother. This rule has been altered by this present Act of 1956.²⁷

This Act has brought substantial changes in the concept of *stridhana* and widow's estate. The reflection of such change has been given effect by Section 14 of the Hindu Succession Act. Under the earlier Hindu law, several kinds of *stridhanas* were envisaged and such property used to depend on many other factors. However, Section 14 of the present Act departs from the earlier system and negates all the religious encumbrances which used to be attached with the earlier concept. This section overrides all the customary laws contrary and provides that if any female Hindu possesses any property acquired before or after the commencement of this Act is entitled to hold the property in the capacity of full owner and not as a limited owner.²⁸

Another change brought about by this Act is pertaining to the opening of the succession. It is always subject of controversy as to whether the succession opens at the death of the intestate male or at the expiry of the limited owner (including female). However this controversy has been brought into an end by this Act. This Act provides that succession really opens on the demise of the intervening female heir and it would be wrong to say that the succession opens at the death of the last male holder. A widow or other limited owner of the property inherited by her subject to certain constraints on alienation of the property. The estate is vested for time and she is entitled to represent the property completely.²⁹

Apart from making the daughters' coparcenary and rendering them equal rights to ask for partition, this Act has also brought about changes with respect to the principle of pious obligation which was recognised by earlier Hindu law. The doctrine of pious obligation made it compulsory for the sons to pay the debts incurred by the father. However the Act has brought radical change in this regard³⁰ and provided that no court shall recognise the right of a creditor to proceed against a son, grandson or great-grandson for the debts contracted by the father, grandfather or great-grandfather on the ground that it is pious obligation. However the rights of the creditors before the amendment comes into force are protected. Hence the doctrine of pious obligation stands negated to the extent that the specified heirs are not liable to satisfy the debts incurred by the category of persons referred in the section.³¹

The legislations referred above are central legislations to create inroads into the system of Hindu joint family. However, apart from the central laws, there have been a number of states which have passed certain Acts with respect to Hindu joint family system. Some states have enacted separate pieces of legislation whereas some states have amended the Hindu Succession Act 1956 within the capacity of their respective legislative power. In the following we will discuss the scheme of different state legislations regarding Hindu joint family system in their respective territories.

Kerala Joint Hindu Family (Abolition) Act 1975

This was a landmark step taken by the Kerala legislature to do away with the system of Hindu joint family as a whole. The reason attributable could be to avoid the complexities which generally used to arise in case of devolution of property of a joint family. Under the Hindu Succession Act, right on the property is given by virtue of birth in the family. However this Act has brought in a change to the effect of negating such birth right over the property. Right on the ancestral property just because of birth is not recognised under this Act and hence remedy in the court of law is barred.³²

Another change that this Act marked was replacement of joint tenancy by tenancy-in-common. The necessary implication of this provision is presumptive partition. That means that at the commencement of this very Act there will be a presumption as if the partition has already taken place and the members are entitled to enjoy their respective shares what they could get if there had been a real partition.³³

Like Hindu Succession (Amendment) Act of 2005, this Act abolished the rule of pious obligation long back. The same rule applies here as well. However, the debts transacted before the commencement of this Act was left open for the creditors to take action against son, grandson or great-grandson. But after such commencement, the court is barred to provide remedy of enforcement of the contract against the son or other like legal heirs.³⁴ This Act also does not affect the liability of the members of a joint Hindu family arising out of a contract entered before the commencement of this Act. In case of such debts, where the joint family members are liable to pay, this Act provides for a deeming clause as if the Act has not come into existence.³⁵

Hindu Succession (Andhra Pradesh Amendment) Act 1986

This Act also forms an important inroad with respect to the Hindu joint family system in that very state. This act draws its fundamental spirit from the concept of right to equality as enshrined under the Constitution of India. Such spirit has been reflected in the preamble of this very Act.³⁶ This Act wants to ensure that in case of

inheritance of Hindu joint family property, both sons and daughters shall be treated equally.

The fundamental change that this Act has brought about is again the empowerment of daughters to become coparceners. The daughters, by virtue of birth, are entitled to become coparceners, and they are subject to the same rights and liabilities as the male coparceners are.³⁷ By virtue of becoming coparcenaries, the daughters are also entitled to claim for partition, and in case of partition she will be allotted the same amount of share as the son.³⁸ Once a female receives property by virtue

of section 29A (i) then notwithstanding any contrary provision of any other law, she is entitled to hold the property absolutely and also capable of disposing of it testamentary.³⁹ This Act retains the concept of survivorship as far as a female's interest in the property is concerned. It provides that if after the commencement of this Act any female Hindu dies leaving an interest in the coparcenary property, then such interest is capable of devolving, according to the rule of survivorship amongst the other surviving members of the coparcenary.⁴⁰

This Act also provides for some kind of pre-emptory right. It provides that where after the commencement of this Act any heir of the property proposes to transfer his interest, then other heirs shall have preferential right to acquire the property proposed to be transferred.⁴¹

Other State Amendments

Apart from these, some other states have also passed amendment Acts with respect to Hindu joint family system. They are in the order of The Hindu Succession (Tamil Nadu Amendment) Act of 1989, The Hindu Succession (Karnataka Amendment) Act of 1990, and The Hindu Succession (Maharashtra Amendment) Act of 1994. However, the

***This is true that
in the old customary laws
there were inequalities
with respect to
distribution of property
in a joint family,
and such inequalities
were apparent in case of
females. Hence there was
an imperative for
the legislature to
intervene in this system
to make it equitable.
Thus, family system
should not be spared
only because it is
governed by personal sphere
of the individuals.***

provisions contained in these Acts are same as that of the Andhra Pradesh Act. They just only differ in terms of territorial applicability. Therefore, in terms of state amendment to the Hindu Succession Act, the state of Andhra Pradesh is in fact the torch bearer.

However, with regard to different state legislations, some kind of uncertainty has also been created. In case of such a conflict, the rule relating to the conflict of laws may not be apt to provide a suitable answer. Because of these various state laws, different high courts are free to give different opinions and hence confusion is inevitable.

Hence uniformity in legislations is an imperative.⁴²

However this position seems to be changing after the passing of amendment to Hindu Succession Act 1956 in the year 2005 by the parliament itself. Now it can not be said that the law is not uniform. The amendment has led to the uniformity in case of succession rules and also made daughters as coparceners.

The legislative interventions into the system of Hindu joint family were indeed drastic steps. The Hindu joint family system before such interventions was totally tentacled by various customary rules and usages, and those rules were sometimes really discriminatory against the concept of justice and equality. It really appears unfair that merely on the basis of gender or religion one has to lose his/her equal rights what he/she is otherwise entitled to enjoy. Thus on these grounds legislative interventions are most welcome even if they sometimes go against the customs or practices in continuance since time immemorial. Now the entire world is taking steps for the empowerment of women and removal of social ills, and the society is moving towards a more liberal era. Hence in such a circumstance, it

is imperative to remove all kinds of fetters of inequality and to make the system more just and equal. Thus the legislative interventions were really trendsetters.

End Notes

1. Commissioner of Income Tax v Lakshmi Narayanan, AIR 1935 Bom 412
2. Kader, S A, **The Hindu Succession Act 1956**, Eastern Law House, 2004, p.16-17. A Hindu Joint Family must consist of at least two members. An unmarried male Hindu, on partition, does not by himself alone constitute a Hindu undivided family.
3. Agarwala, R K, **Hindu Law**, Dr. S.K. Singh (Eds), Central Law Agency, 2006, p.284. Since time immemorial the Hindus are accustomed to live in joint family units. Hence a joint Hindu family may best be understood by showing the status of jointness of members of whom it is made up. The existence of a joint property is again not required but what is required is ordinary household articles which they enjoy in common.
4. Binod Jena v Abdul Hamid Khan, AIR 1975 Orissa 159
5. Supra note 3 at p. 285.
6. Bharat Singh v Bhagirathi, AIR 1966 SC 405
7. K V Narayanswami Iyer v K V Ramakrishna Iyer, AIR 1957 SC 289
8. D Rudrappa v H Renukappa, AIR 1993, Kant, 148
9. Sudarsanam v Narsimhulu, (1902) ILR Mad 149, p.154-7
10. Saxena, Poonam (2006), **Family Law Lectures**, Lexis Nexis Butterworths, New Delhi, p.111-3
11. Man v Gaini, (1918) 40 All. 77
12. Diwan, Paras (1999), **Modern Hindu Law**, Allahabad Law Agency, p.260-3. Though large powers are given to a karta, he can not be a despot by virtue of that. He has after all blood ties with other members. He earns no rewards for the services rendered and discharges onerous responsibilities towards the family and its members. To know the true legal nature of his position we must enter into the sphere of his powers and liabilities.
13. Ibid at p. 260-2
14. Keasri, U P D (2006), **Modern Hindu Law**, Central Law publications, Allahabad, p 348-351
15. Supra note 10 at p. 128
16. Section 1 of this Act reads so much of any law or usage now in force within India as inflicts on any person forfeiture of rights of property, or maybe held in any way to impair or affect any right of inheritance by reason of his or her renouncing or having been excluded from the communication of, any religion, or being deprived of his caste shall cease to be enforced as law in any Court.
17. Section 3 (1) reads when a Hindu governed by Dayabhaga school of Hindu law dies intestate leaving any property, and when a Hindu governed by any other school of Hindu law or customary law dies intestate leaving separate property, his widow, or if there is more than one widow, all his widows together, shall subject to the provisions of Sub-section (3), be entitled in respect of property in respect of which he dies intestate to the same as a son.
18. Proviso (1) to Subsection 3 (1) reads provided that the widow of a predeceased son shall inherit in like manner as a son if there is no son surviving of such predeceased son, and shall inherit in like manner as a son's son if there is surviving a son or son's son of such predeceased son.
19. Sub-section (2) of section 3 states than when a Hindu governed by any school of law other than the Dayabhaga school or by customary law dies having at the time of his death an interest in the joint family property, his widow shall, subject to the provisions of Sub-section (3), have in the property the same interest as he himself had.
20. Sub-section (3) of Section 3
21. Section 4 reads notwithstanding any rule of Hindu law or custom to the contrary, the provision of Section 3 shall apply where a Hindu dies intestate.
22. Potti Lakshmi Perumallu v Krishnavenamma, AIR 1965 SC 825
23. Subba Rao, G C V, **Family Law in India**, Subba Rao, T V (Dr) & Kumar, Vijender (Eds) (2006), S Gogia & Company, Hyderabad, p.81.
24. Satrugan v Sabujpari, AIR 1967 SC 272
25. Diwan Paras (2005), **Family Law**,

Allahabad Law Agency,
Allahabad, p.448

26. In the old Hindu law female legal heirs were discriminated on the basis that whether they are rich or poor and whether they are with issue or issue. This kind of discriminatory treatment has been brought to an end by this Hindu Succession Act 1956.

27. Basu, Monmayee (2001), **Hindu Women & Marriage Law; From Sacrament to Contract**, Oxford University Press, New Delhi, p.141-2

28. Gandhi, B M (2003), **Hindu Law**, Eastern Book Company, Lucknow, p.188-9

29. Gupte, A G (2005), **Gupte's Hindu Law**, Premier Publishing Company, Allahabad, p. 980

30. Hindu Succession (Amendment) Act 2005

31. Desai, S A (2005) (Eds), **Mulla Hindu Law**, Volume II, Lexis Nexis Butterworths, New Delhi, p.311-311A

32. Section 3 of the Act provides for not giving any rights on the property by virtue of being born in that family. On and after the commencement of this Act no right to claim any interest in any property of an ancestor during his or her lifetime which is founded on the mere fact that the claimant was born in the family of the ancestor shall be recognized by any Court of law.

33. Section 4 provides for the replacement of joint tenancy with tenancy in common. However there is one proviso attached to the sub-section 1 to this very section which provides a non-obstante clause. According to the proviso the right to maintenance or that of marriage expenses or that of residence belonging to any Hindu undivided family remains unaffected even though this Act is there in the place.

The legislative interventions into the system of Hindu joint family were indeed drastic steps.

The Hindu joint family system before such interventions was totally tentacted by various customary rules and usages, and those rules were sometimes really discriminatory against the concept of justice and equality.

34. Section 5(1) abrogates the doctrine of pious obligation of Hindu son whereas Section 5(2) retains the principle with respect to the debts contracted before the commencement of the Act. 35. Section 6 deals with the liability of members of Hindu joint family before the commencement of this Act and provides for not affecting to those liabilities. 36. The preamble of this Act reads Whereas the Constitution of India has proclaimed equality before law as a fundamental right; And whereas the exclusion of the daughter from participation in the coparcenary ownership merely by reason of sex

is contrary there to; And whereas such exclusion of the daughter has led to the creation of socially pernicious dowry system which is attendant social ills; And whereas the baneful system of dowry has to be eradicated by positive measures which will simultaneously ameliorate the condition of women in Hindu society.

37. Section 29A (i)

38. Section 29A (ii)

39. Section 29A (iii)

40. Section 29B of this Act provides for devolving of interest according to the rule of survivorship amongst other coparcenaries where the female dying was having some interest on the coparcenary property.

41. Section 29C (1) provides for such preferential rights in case one heir intends to transfer his interest.

42. Bhadbhade, Nilima, **State Amendments to Hindu Succession Act and Conflict of Laws: Need for Law Reform**, 2001 SCC VOL 1 p.48 ■

The authors: Abhirup Ghosh is a student of the Gujarat National Law University, and Debjoyoti Basu is a student of the Department of Law at the University of North Bengal.