

# SOCIAL, PSYCHOLOGICAL AND FINANCIAL CHALLENGES FACED BY MEN AND WOMEN IN LIVE-IN RELATIONSHIPS: A SOCIOLOGICAL STUDY

Amandeep Singh <sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Assistant Professor in Sociology Department of Evening Studies- MDRC Panjab University, Chandigarh, India



## DOI

10.29121/shodhkosh.v5.i1.2024.5373

**Funding:** This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

**Copyright:** © 2024 The Author(s). This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License](#).

With the license CC-BY, authors retain the copyright, allowing anyone to download, reuse, re-print, modify, distribute, and/or copy their contribution. The work must be properly attributed to its author.



## ABSTRACT

It is a feature of Indian culture that the vast majority of Indians live according to their traditional ways. One thing that Indians have kept constant over the years is their cultural values. India's marriages are viewed as a custom, any departure from this will be viewed as a violation. Supporting an odd concept like live-in relationships, however, would undoubtedly cause a lot of problems since it may undermine institutions like marriage and family. For a variety of reasons, various living arrangements were ridiculed upon in India's traditional society. India is home to individuals of many different religions, and according to religious customs, cohabitation between men and women is not recognized as a partnership and is not considered a holy union like marriage. Because of this, a large number of men and women who are tied by live-in relationships are dealing with challenges and issues. Therefore, the present study tries to understand the problems and challenges that men and women face who are in a live-in relationship.

**Keywords:** Live-In Relationship, Problems and Challenges

## 1. INTRODUCTION

There have been many changes in the modern world in every aspect. One of the western concepts and lifestyles that India is gradually embracing is the idea of live-in relationships (also called as cohabitation). One important institution that is widely recognized in society is marriage. <sup>1</sup>Marriage has always been regarded as having great importance for both the state and its citizens. It carries with it psycho-physical intimacy as well as strong bonds of identification, kinship, mutual reliance, and duty. <sup>2</sup>"With Changing Social norms of legitimacy in every society, including ours, what was illegitimate in the past may be legitimate today." Marriage is regarded as a sacred social institution in India, where it is based on tolerance and dedication. People are looking for alternatives to marriage because the definition of commitment has evolved with the times. Live-in partnerships have become more popular as alternatives to marriage in recent years. In metropolitan areas, the number of persons choosing live-in relationships is significantly rising (Chhibber and Aditya Singh, 2015).

<sup>1</sup> Elizabeth Brake, Marriage and Domestic Partnership, Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy

<sup>2</sup> On 31 March, 2011, Honorable justice A. K. Ganguly in *Revanasiddappa vs. Mallikarjun* (2011) 11 SCC 1.

<sup>3</sup>Justice Dipak Misra stated, "Marriage is something you should not take for granted. A continuous attempt must be made to maintain it; there must be an endeavor and an effort. There is a catastrophe when individuals take marriage for granted."

Chhibber and Aditya Singh (2015) According to marriage laws, a man and woman's relationship is considered legitimate if it is founded on a valid marriage and illegitimate otherwise. An unmarried couple who lives together in a long-term relationship that mimics marriage is said to be in a live-in relationship. It is commonly referred to as cohabitation. Before making a commitment, the interested pair wants to see how compatible they are with one another. This is the fundamental premise behind a live-in relationship.

The word "live-in relationship" has no legal definition. According to Anbhule (2013), a live-in relationship is defined as "a living arrangement wherein unmarried couples live together to conduct a long-term relationship similarly as in marriage." It is an agreement wherein two individuals choose to live together permanently or for an extended period of time in a close, emotional, and/or sexual connection. The term is more frequently used to describe unmarried couples.

<sup>4</sup>According to Oxford Dictionary "Live-in relationships are defined as sharing a home and engaging in sexual activity without being married." In contrast to others who have several relationships and have children, this connection limits the family circle to the couple. It attempts to redefine the term "family" as a collection of individuals bound together by marriage, blood, or adoption, forming a single household and relating to one another in their many social roles, typically those of parents, siblings, spouses, and children.

<sup>5</sup>The Indian Perspective claims that the idea of cohabitation is not new in India and was acknowledged and embraced in some Gujarati communities as early as 1993. According to reports, a married Hindu man and his "other woman" signed a "Maitray karars" (Friendship Agreement) to provide the woman with a sense of security. The agreement was also discovered to have filed with the District Collectorate. The sacrament of arranged marriages is gradually giving way to love marriages and, eventually, to cohabitation for a variety of reasons, including a lack of commitment and tolerance. Live-in relationships are not a new concept in Indian society; they have been practiced in many different settings throughout the country's history. The Gandharva type is one of the eight marriage kinds recognized by the Vedas, in which a man and a woman voluntarily agree to get married. This kind of arrangement does not necessitate the couple's parents' approval or any particular ceremonies or procedures to formally consummate the marriage. The Nawabs, princes, and wealthy men of India had numerous marriages, but they also had numerous live-in ladies in their Zenanas (Sandhawalia and Kalra, 2021). The Justice Malimath Committee, which was established by the Supreme Court, said in its 2003 report that "a man and a woman shall be deemed to have married the woman if they are living together as husband and wife for a reasonable long period of time." The Malimath Committee also proposed changing the definition of "wife" under the CrPC to include "a woman living with the man like his wife," meaning that even women who live with men would be eligible for alimony.<sup>6</sup>

Once regarded as unusual for them, live-in relationships are growing more and more common in modern-day India. Globalization has changed views and lifestyles, which has an impact on this tendency. Many people, particularly young people, favor live-in arrangements because they are more flexible and require fewer formal commitments. Because of deeply rooted cultural and traditional traditions, live-in relationships in India have been disliked by society even though they are legal. Although these partnerships are still controversial in many parts of India, the Supreme Court of India has recognized their validity.<sup>7</sup> The Supreme Court affirmed live-in relationships as lawful under Article 21 in *S. Khushboo v. Kanniammal* (2010), holding that cohabitation between consenting adults is not prohibited. Despite court decisions, live-in couples frequently experience practical challenges, legal ambiguity, and social stigma, which reflects the disconnect between the law and public acceptability. The goal of this research was to identify the problems and challenges that men and women face who are in live-in relationships.

<sup>3</sup> Taken from compilation landmarks judgments of High Courts of India on family matters, Year of Publication 2016, Compiled by Jharkhand State Legal Services Authority. See also, A. Nirmal Singh Heera & N. Prabhavathi, *Marriage & Divorce Laws (Including Adoption, Maintenance, Minority and Guardianship)* along with the Prohibition of Child Marriage Act, 2006, 1st Edn, 2017, Yashini Pub, Cuddalore, P.24

<sup>4</sup> <https://www.britannica.com/topic/family-kinship>

<sup>5</sup> Bhumika Sharma, "Live-in-Relationships: The Indian Perspective", *India Law Journal* at p. 43

<sup>6</sup> Dr. Justice V.S. Malimath Report. Committee on Reforms of Criminal Justice System. Government of India, Ministry of Home Affairs. Report Vol I; March 2003. [https://www.mha.gov.in/sites/default/files/criminal\\_justice\\_system.pdf](https://www.mha.gov.in/sites/default/files/criminal_justice_system.pdf)

<sup>7</sup> <https://www.pmfias.com/live-in-relationships/>

## 2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The present study started with a search of published or secondary literature. The gathered published literature showed that no research had been done on cohabitation in relation to social studies. Upon analysis of the compiled published literature, nearly all of the investigations are legal in nature rather than social.

Chhibber and Aditya Singh (2015) Two adults who voluntarily decide to live together in order to maintain a long-term connection that resembles marriage are said to be in a live-in relationship. "Living together is a walk-in, walk-out situation." Since there is no formal commitment between the participants, these relationships are devoid of conditions. The usual obligations of a marriage are not imposed in this partnership. Testing one's compatibility with the other person before engaging into any kind of legal commitment is the fundamental idea behind choosing to live together.

Kaur (2019) In Indian society, the term "live-in" has gained more meaning, particularly in recent years. Instead, the growing number of live-in relationships in Indian culture poses a serious threat to the concept of a couple as well as the entire fabric of values and ethics that form the foundation of Indian culture. This training is currently prohibited in India and often leads to social rejection or boycott. Additionally, since there is no guarantee that living partners are single, it will often encourage adultery. Furthermore, the privilege of such live-in couples is not guaranteed by any regulation of development and maintenance. Furthermore, these relationships are brittle and subject to dissolution at any time

Malatesh, G. (2018) The study's findings revealed that women were more likely than men to have unfavorable opinions regarding cohabitation. The survey also revealed that a large number of men and women thought that cohabitation had an impact on a child's personality development. Compared to marriage, infidelity live-in couples will be more prevalent, resulting in financial losses from legal non-recognition and lower levels of happiness among cohabitating couples. In such a relationship, women do not have the status of a wife and are neither sanctified nor accepted by society. The study concludes that promoting live-in relationships will spread bigamy and damage the nation's social fabric.

Dey (2022) There is still no specific category for cohabitation in Indian government documents. Consequently, couples have challenges while trying to create joint accounts, appoint nominees, acquire insurance, obtain visas, and handle other official affairs.

Sepaha (2021) Live-in relationships are still frowned upon in Indian society and are frequently seen as immoral and unethical, even though they are legal. Such arrangements are viewed with suspicion in Indian society, which presents many difficulties for couples. These challenges include rejection from family, societal exclusion, difficulties finding rental housing, and potential negative outcomes at employment.

Suman, et., al. (2023) Cohabitation may be seen as a natural and acceptable step by modern parents, but only 13% of the population agrees with this view; the majority disagree. Similarly, the majority of respondents stated that cohabitation is still not accepted in society. The majority of respondents agreed with the statement that "physical abuse is common during cohabitation," with only roughly 25% disagreeing.

Avantika Sarkar (2015) While Christianity in some ways embraces live-in relationships, Islam and Hinduism reject the idea, which is a step forward. People's mindsets in India are greatly influenced by their beliefs, customs, usages, and culture people do not accept it easily. As a result, rather than laws, the prominence of individual beliefs determines whether new norms are accepted. Since live-in relationships are still a delicate topic, attention must be paid to their difficulties.

Jayashree Kandhare (2015) discusses the virtues of marriage using connections to Sanskrit. According to the article, a live-in relationship cannot take the place of a marriage since it cannot provide the same level of security or emotional fulfillment. The author accuses people who advocate social violation of being proponents of the live-in notion.

Choudhary, et al, (2021) If one partner discovers they are completely incompatible, the breakup becomes extremely difficult, drawn out, complex, and upsetting for everyone involved once they formally enter into a marriage. However, cohabitating for a while without getting married legally allows for a simple separation without resorting to onerous legal processes. However, there are drawbacks to such a partnership without any responsibilities.

According to the 2005 Protection of Women from Domestic Violence Act, a woman who has lived with a man for a significant amount of time is recognized as a wife. She is so entitled to certain privileges, such as support and property rights. Nevertheless, the Act does not provide men or LGBT (Lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender) couples with the

same level of protection. Men who misrepresent a live-in relationship as a marriage may therefore be accused of sexual assault or fraud. Ironically, no measures are in place to empower men in these circumstances. These complicated concerns call for the creation of particular laws that handle the intricacies of cohabitation (Dey, 2022; Sepaha, 2021).

### 3. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

**Functionalist Theory:** Society is made up of interconnected structures, including social institutions, social interactions, social phenomena, and social processes, all of which serve distinct purposes and cooperate through consensus to successfully function and reproduce society (Bert, 1998). The organism will die if any of its component's society, system, institutions, and relationships do not function (Ritzer, 1996). In order to sustain the equilibrium among all aspects or components, there must be interconnectedness, interrelationships, and interdependency for such institutions, systems, or, to put it another way, societies (Cuff et al. 1990). Therefore, based on common standards and values, society will find a way to prohibit or eradicate activities that are thought to upset the equilibrium of the social system. Interdependency, interrelationships, and connectivity are necessary for such institutions to maintain the balance among all elements or components. Live-in relationships are not tolerated by society, which disrupts the interdependencies, interactions, and connections within the community.

**Conflict Theory:** Conflict theorists investigated topics like incest, marital rape, sexual assault, and domestic violence (spousal and child), or they can focus on disputes as basic as the application of rules from parent to kid. Engels (1988) asserts that individual families comprise the entirety of modern society as its molecules, and that the modern individual family is based on the open or covert enslavement of women in the home. Marxist conflict theory holds that human connections resulting from economic systems lead to marriage. Conflict theory is predicated on the idea that change is permanent and unavoidable, that conflicting interests are at odds, and that force is frequently used to gain control (Dahal, 2020). Families, whether they are married or cohabitating, are based on the open or covert enslavement of women.

**The Demographic Transition theory:** It states that shift in culturally particular value orientations are what propel changes in family behaviors. Specifically, the level of individualization in a community predicts the convergence of partner behaviors over time and explains the difference in living together partnerships, premarital sex relationships, and separation across settings (Lesthaeghe, 2010). The "profound shift in norms and attitudes regarding personal relationships, fertility, and the family that has led to dramatic rapid change in Europeans' demographic behavior" is one of the points of emphasis for the demographic transition approach (van de Kaa, 1987). Unexpectedly, cohabitation has turned into a means of preserving and protecting marriage as the ideal for long-term commitment and emotional closeness, despite the rise in living together relationships, premarital sex, and cohabitation culture (Perelli-Harris et al., 2010). However, the world's societies and cultures are distinct in their own right, and they are ever-evolving, evolving from one culture to another according to its context and content.

**The second Demographic Transition (SDT) theory:** Delaying marriage and the start of a family is one of the main principles of the SDT doctrine. Couples who decide to live together prior to or instead of being married are frequently viewed as exemplifying this trend in live-in relationships (Visaria, 2022). SDT theory recognizes the adaptability and fluidity of modern relationships, including the freedom to join and quit relationships. This flexibility is best exemplified by live-in partnerships, which enable partners to try out various living situations, assess compatibility, and modify their partnership in response to evolving situations (Chakravorty et al., 2021).

The goal of this research was to identify the problems and challenges that men and women face who are in live-in relationships.

#### 3.1. OBJECTIVES

- 1) To investigate the Social Pressure faced by men and women who are in live-in relationships.
- 2) To investigate the Economic and Financial Challenges faced by men and women who are in live-in relationships.
- 3) To investigate the Psychological and Emotional Challenges faced by men and women who are in live-in relationships.

#### 4. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The present study was conducted in New Delhi and the area of study was Mukherjee Nagar and Rajendra Nagar of New Delhi. 60 respondents in total served as the basis for the sample size. 30 respondents from each area. 15 males, 15 females were selected from both Mukherjee Nagar and Rajendra Nagar each making a total of 60 respondents. Respondents who were of the age of twenty-five and above were taken as the sample of the study. The respondents of the present study were selected based on their agreement that their parents are aware of their cohabitation.

##### 1) Area of Study

The primary focus of the present study was to understand the problems and challenges that a couple in a live-in relationship encounter. For this purpose, Mukherjee Nagar and Rajendra Nagar of New Delhi were taken as the area of research.

##### 2) Sampling Techniques of Data Collection

Although there are married persons in the population, live-in couples are difficult to locate. This restriction led to the use of the snowball sampling approach. An interview guide and case study approach were employed in this analysis to obtain a thorough grasp of this problem. Sixty respondents were selected to examine the issues and difficulties faced by cohabitating couples. This allowed the researcher to fully comprehend the issues and difficulties faced by men and women who are in a live-in relationship. Since then, information was gathered from sixty participants. Thirty males and thirty females were taken as the respondents of the case study. This gave the researcher a thorough understanding of the scope and nature of the difficulties faced by men and women who are in a live-in relationship.

##### 3) Significance of Study

It has been noted that, traditionally, cohabitation has not been the subject of any social studies research. Almost all of the studies are legal in character rather than social, especially in India. In this subject of study, many elements need to be examined. It seems that not much work has been done in this area after looking over all of the literature on the subject. Therefore, this study will make it easy to comprehend the problems and challenges faced by men and women who are in a live-in relationship.

#### 5. SOCIAL, PSYCHOLOGICAL AND FINANCIAL CHALLENGES

**Table 1:** Showing Social Pressure faced by Men and Women who are in live-in relationship

Social Pressure	Men	Women	Total
Subject to social rejection or boycott	18(60)	20(66.7)	38(63.3)
I experience exploitation and discriminatory treatment at home	19(63.3)	26(86.7)	45(75)
I experience exploitation and discriminatory treatment at work-place	2(6.7)	4(13.3)	6(10)
Family rejection/ disapproval of my relationship from family	19(63.3)	28(93.3)	47(78.3)
Family members pressurize me to get married or separated from my partner	24(80)	29(96.7)	53(88.3)
Always looked downward by society	10(33.3)	25(83.3)	35(58.3)
Lack of social acceptance	21(70)	28(93.3)	49(81.7)
Always viewed with suspicion by society	9(30)	25(83.3)	34(56.7)
<b>Total</b>	<b>30(100)</b>	<b>30(100)</b>	<b>60(100)</b>

Figures in parentheses column wise indicate percentages

\*The respondents have given multiple answers. Total percentage was calculated from the total number of both male and female respondents separately (i.e., 30 each).

Table 1 shows the Social Pressure faced by Men and Women who are in live-in relationship. There were 60 percent of men and 66.7 percent of women who said that they are 'Subject to social rejection or boycott'. The study supports the findings of Kaur (2019) and who stated that the growing number of live-in relationships in Indian culture poses a serious



threat to the concept of a couple as well as the entire fabric of values and ethics that form the foundation of Indian culture. The study also supports the findings of Malatesh, G. (2018) who stated that in such a relationship, women do not have the status of a wife and are neither sanctified nor accepted by society. The study concludes that promoting live-in relationships will spread bigamy and damage the nation's social fabric. This training is currently prohibited in India and often leads to social rejection or boycott. There were 63.3 percent of men and 86.7 percent of women who experience exploitation and discriminatory treatment at home. There were 6.7 percent of men and 13.3 percent of women who experience exploitation and discriminatory treatment at work-place. There were 63.3 percent of men and 93.3 percent of women who said that their Family rejected them/ disapproved their relationship. The study supports the findings of Suman, et., al. (2023) who stated that Cohabitation may be seen as a natural and acceptable step by modern parents, but only 13% of the population agrees with this view; the majority disagree. There were 80 percent of men and 96.7 percent of women whose 'Family members pressurize them to get married or separated from their partner'. There were 33.3 percent of men and 83.3 percent of women who said that they are 'Always looked downward by society'. There were 70 percent of men and 93.3 percent of women who mentioned they 'Lack social acceptance'. The study supports the findings of Suman, et., al. (2023) and Avantika Sarkar (2015) who stated that the majority of respondents stated that cohabitation is still not accepted in society. People's mindsets in India are greatly influenced by their beliefs, customs, usages, and culture they do not accept it easily. There were 30 percent of men and 83.3 percent of women who said that they are 'Always viewed with suspicion by society'. The functionalist theory fits in here which states that 'Live-in relationships are not tolerated by society, as it disrupts the interdependencies, interactions, and connections within the community.'

**Table 2:** Showing Economic and Financial Challenges faced by Men and Women who are in live-in relationship

Economic and Financial Challenges	Men	Women	Total
The issue of economic uncertainty worries me	18(60)	20(66.7)	38(63.3)
Faces Financial problems	20(66.7)	21(70)	41(68.3)
Lack of financial support from family	22(73.3)	19(63.3)	41(68.3)
Difficulty to find accommodation	25(83.3)	26(86.7)	51(85)
I face hurdles in opening joint bank account with my live-in partner	20(66.7)	22(73.3)	42(70)
<b>Total</b>	<b>30(100)</b>	<b>30(100)</b>	<b>60(100)</b>

Figures in parentheses column wise indicate percentages

\*The respondents have given multiple answers. Total percentage was calculated from the total number of both male and female respondents separately (i.e., 30 each).

Table 2 shows the Economic and Financial Challenges faced by Men and Women who are in live-in relationship. It was found that there were 60 percent of men and 66.7 percent of women who mentioned that 'The issue of economic uncertainty worries them.' There were 66.7 percent of men and 70 percent of women who faces financial problems. There were 73.3 percent of men and 63.3 percent of women who lack financial support from family. The study supports the findings of Malatesh, G. (2018) who stated that compared to marriage, Live-in couples will be more likely to commit adultery/fraud, resulting in financial losses from legal non-recognition and lower levels of happiness among cohabitating couples. There were 83.3 percent of men and 86.7 percent of women who said that they face 'Difficulty to find accommodation'. The study supports the findings of Sepaha (2021) who stated that cohabiting couples face difficulties. These difficulties include social exclusion, trouble renting a place to live, rejection from family, and possible bad consequences at work. There were 66.7 percent of men and 73.3 percent of women who said that they face hurdles in opening joint bank account with their live-in partner. The study supports the findings of Dey (2022) who stated that cohabitating couples have challenges while trying to create joint accounts, appoint nominees, acquire insurance, obtain visas, and handle other official affairs.

**Table 3:** Showing Psychological and Emotional Challenges faced by Men and Women who are in live-in relationship

Psychological and Emotional Challenges	Men	Women	Total
--	-----	-------	-------

Lack of commitment/ security	17(56.7)	22(73.3)	39(65)
Feel socially isolated	7(23.3)	17(56.7)	24(40)
Lack of emotional support from family	9(30)	10(33.3)	19(31.7)
Stress about lack of caretakers during illness and being left alone in an emergency	14(46.7)	8(26.7)	22(36.7)
I experience emotional stress and psychological issues	19(63.3)	26(86.7)	45(75)
The sense of belonging to the family is absent	10(33.3)	28(93.3)	38(63.3)
My family does not treat me with the same respect as earlier	13(43.3)	26(86.7)	39(65)
My neighbors and relatives taunt me	5(16.7)	22(73.3)	27(45)
My neighbors and relatives taunt my parents	8(26.7)	27(90)	35(58.3)
Social pressure and negative judgments of others make me feel low in self-worth	12(40)	22(73.3)	34(56.7)
I feel anxious and depressed because of the taunts from my family and society	4(13.3)	22(73.3)	26(43.3)
<b>Total</b>	<b>30(100)</b>	<b>30(100)</b>	<b>60(100)</b>

### Figures in parentheses column wise indicate percentages

**\*The respondents have given multiple answers. Total percentage was calculated from the total number of both male and female respondents separately (i.e., 30 each).**

Table 3 shows the Psychological and Emotional Challenges faced by Men and Women who are in live-in relationship. It was found that there were 56.7 percent of men and 73.3 percent of women who said they feel 'Lack of commitment/security'. The study supports the findings of Kaur (2019) who stated that the privilege of such live-in couples is not guaranteed by any regulation of development and maintenance. Furthermore, these relationships are brittle and subject to dissolution at any time. The study supports the findings of Jayashree Kandhare (2015) who stated that the virtues of marriage using connections to Sanskrit. According to the article, a live-in relationship cannot take the place of a marriage since it cannot provide the same level of security or emotional fulfillment. There were 23.3 percent of men and 56.7 percent of women who said they feel socially isolated. There were 30 percent of men and 33.3 percent of women who lack emotional support from their family. There were 46.7 percent of men and 26.7 percent of women who feels 'stressed about lack of caretakers during illness and being left alone in an emergency'. There were 63.3 percent of men and 86.7 percent of women who 'experience emotional stress and psychological issues.' There were 33.3 percent of men and 93.3 percent of women who said that 'The sense of belonging to the family is absent.' There were 43.3 percent of men and 86.7 percent of women who said that their 'family does not treat them with the same respect as earlier.' There were 16.7 percent of men and 73.3 percent of women 'whose neighbors and relatives taunt them.' There were 26.7 percent of men and 90 percent of women whose neighbors and relatives taunt their parents.' There were 40 percent of men and 73.3 percent of women who said that 'Social pressure and negative judgments of others make them feel low in self-worth.' There were 13.3 percent of men and 73.3 percent of women who 'feel anxious and depressed because of the taunts from my family and society.'

The narratives of the respondents indicate that cohabitating individuals face numerous problems and challenges. They listed a few characteristics that their family, neighbors, and relatives use to characterize them in their daily encounters, which they have to put up with since they are in this kind of relationship. They presented the following statements:

Some female respondents' common narration about their family, neighbors, and relatives' opinion:

'Agar bacche ho gaye to unko kесе dekhoge...unki life kharab mat kro...unko kya sikhaoге ki tum bhi shadi mat krna future main...shadi se security rehti hai sabki islye legal way se shadi kar leni chahiye'.

'Abhi to partner theek hai but in future agar domestic violence hui to kya krogі family ka support bhi nahi milega aise relation ko'

'Society accept nahi karegi aise relationship ko...agar sath rehna hi hai to shadi kar ke rehlo problem kya hai'

'Achhe ghar ki ladkiyan aise relation main nahi rehti...shdi krlo fir sath reh lo'

‘As in the event of a split or domestic conflict, the SC's ruling permits live-in couples to cohabit, but it offers little legal protection. To family ko future ki hi tension rehti hai ki kuch galat na ho jaye’

‘Hume khud bhi commitment ka issue lagte hai but no other option...partners ko live-in main hi rehna hai’

Some male respondents’ common narration about their family, neighbors, and relatives’ opinion:

‘Relatives sare taunt karte hai ki tumhara beta bina shadi ke reh raa hai..agar sath rehna hi hai to shadi kr lo..ye kya matlab hua ki pehle sure hona hai..hmare time pe surety hi hoti thi’

‘Shadi krenge to dar lagte hai kahii wife koi nakli case main na fasa de...islye live-in hi theek hai jb man kre relation rakha or na kare to breakup but ab isme bhi dar lgta hai ki agar kisi bat se in future koi problem aa gai relation main to partner koi jhutha case na karde...

‘Kabhi Kabhi financial problems face karni padhti Hai...and family doesnot help us financially or any other way..relation hi nahi rakha family ne humse to help to kya hi krenge...shadi kisi or se karne ko bolte hai...to vo stress ki vjeh se relationship main bhi problems creat ho jati hai...’

The narratives of the present study support the findings of Choudhary, et al, (2021) who stated that if one partner discovers they are completely incompatible, the breakup becomes extremely difficult, drawn out, complex, and upsetting for everyone involved once they formally enter into a marriage. However, cohabitating for a while without getting married legally allows for a simple separation without resorting to onerous legal processes. However, there are drawbacks to such a partnership without any responsibilities.

The narratives of the present study support the findings of Suman, et., al. (2023) who stated that the majority of respondents agreed with the statement that "physical abuse is common during cohabitation," with only roughly 25% disagreeing.

The narratives of the present study support the findings of Dey, (2022); Sepaha, (2021) who stated that according to the 2005 Protection of Women from Domestic Violence Act, a woman who has lived with a man for a significant amount of time is recognized as a wife. She is so entitled to certain privileges, such as support and property rights. Nevertheless, the Act does not provide men or LGBT couples with the same level of protection. Men who misrepresent a live-in relationship as a marriage may therefore be accused of sexual assault or fraud. Ironically, no measures are in place to empower men in these circumstances. These complicated concerns call for the creation of particular laws that handle the intricacies of cohabitation.

## 6. CONCLUSION

Due to ingrained cultural and traditional traditions, live-in relationships in India are socially disapproved of even though they are legally permitted. Live-in couples frequently experience social stigma, legal ambiguity, and practical challenges in spite of court decisions, which reflects the disconnect between the law and public acceptability. Despite legal decisions, live-in relationships are viewed with skepticism in Indian society. "Live-in relationships are not tolerated by society, as they disrupt the interdependencies, interactions, and connections within the community," according to the functionalist theory, which is relevant in this context. Even though choosing a living arrangement of her choice such as a live-in relationship, it may be said that women have more problems than men. Married or cohabiting families are founded on the overt or covert enslavement of women. The Conflict theory also fits in here which predicated on the idea that change is permanent and unavoidable, that conflicting interests are at odds, and that force is frequently used to gain control (Dahal, 2020). Families, whether they are married or cohabitating, are based on the open or covert enslavement of women.

## CONFLICT OF INTERESTS

None.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

None.



## REFERENCES

- Anbhule, Rajendra. (2013). Aggrieved Women and Live - in Relationships: Judicial Discourse, *Bharati Law Review*, pp. 67 - 77.
- Bert, P. (1998), *Social Theory in the Twentieth Century*, Polity Press in association with Blackwell Publishers, U.K.
- Chakravorty S, Goli S, James KS. (2021). *Family Demography in India: Emerging Patterns and Its Challenges*, SAGE Open, pp. 1-18.
- Chhibber and Singh. (2015). Live-in relationships: An ethical and a moral dilemma, 1(8), pp. 74-77.
- Choudhary, Laxmi Narayan, et al., (2021). Live - in Relationships in India: Legal and Psychological Implications, *Journal of Psychosexual Health*, 3(1), pp. 18-23.
- Cuff E.C., Sharrock W.W., Francis D.W. (1990). *Perspectives in Sociology*, Third Edition, Unwin Hyman Ltd. London
- Dahal, Bishnu Prasad. (2020). Living Together Relationships: Towards A New Pattern of Adult Life in Kathmandu. *International Journal of Social Science and Human Research*, 03(10), pp. 191- 201.
- Dey KB. (2022). Live-in-Relationship and marriage pattern in India-A Study, *IOSR Journal of Humanities and Social Science (IOSR-JHSS)*, 27(4), pp. 59-62. Retrieved on 23rd March 2023 from: <https://DOI.org/10.9790/0837-2704055962>
- Engels, F. (1988). Origin and Evolution of the Family, *Population and Development Review*, 14(4), pp. 705-729.
- Kaur, Mandeep. (2019). Legal Perspective on Live- in Relationship in Present Scenario, *International Journal of Research and Analytical Reviews*, 6(1), pp. 938 - 943.
- Khandare, Jayashree. (2015). Live-in-Relationships—Are They Menaceto the Institution of Marriage, 9(2) (8 pp.) VII Retrieved on 23rd March 2022 from: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=2713778>
- Lesthaeghe, R. (2010). The Unfolding Story of the Second Demographic Transition, *Population and Development Review*, 36(2), pp. 211–251.
- Malatesh, G. (2018). Perception of Youth toward Live in Relationship, *J Krishi Vigyan*, 7(8), 120. Retrieved on 23rd March 2022 from: 10.5958/2349-4433.2018.00172
- Perelli-Harris, B., Sigle-Rushton, W., Lappegard, T., Keizer, R., Kreyenfeld, M., Berghammer, C. (2010). The educational gradient of childbearing within cohabitation in Europe, *Population and Development Review*, 36(4). Retrieved on 23rd March 2022 from: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/21174870/>
- Ritzer, G. (1996), *Modern Sociological Theory*, Fourth Edition, McGraw Hill Inc.
- Sandhawalia, Ramanpreet Kaur and Kalra, Nuvita. (2021). Judicial Approach to Live – in Relationship: Protection and Other Related Issues. *International Journal of Law*, 7(4), pp.44 -50.
- Sarkar, Avantika. (2015). Law, Religion and Conjugal Ties: A Study of ‘Live-in-Relationships’ in Contemporary Indian Society”, *IJHRLR Vol. 1*, pp. 2455-5924.
- Sepaha, P. (2021). Live-in Relationship in India: Laws and Challenges, *Law Colloquy Journal of Legal Studies (LCJLS)*, 1(2), pp. 1-12.
- Suman, O., Jamuna, KV, & Jaiswal, J. (2023). A Study on Etiology of Co-Habitation in Bangalore. *International Journal of Indian Psychology*, 11(3), pp. 1355-1363. Retrieved on 23rd October 2023 from: 10.25215/1103.130
- Van de Kaa, D.J. (1987) Europe's second demographic transition, *Population bulletin*, 42, pp. 1–59.
- Visaria, L. (2022). India's date with second demographic transition, *China Population and Development Studies*, 6(3), pp. 316-337. Retrieved on 23rd March 2023 from: <https://DOI.org/10.1007/s42379-022-00117-w>