

LEXOVIA

Your Legal Path. Simplified.

LEGAL RESEARCH SAMPLE

+ Native-language companion available

Hindi, Bengali, Marathi, Tamil, Telugu

+ Foreign-language companion available

Korean, Japanese, Chinese, French, German, Spanish, Arabic

VISIT LEXOVIA.IN

Not a law firm. Not legal advice.
Statute-backed document drafting and research only.

Meera's Question: Are Live-In Partners in Uttarakhand Legally Protected — And Do They Have to Register?

Legal Research Report — General Research | Live-in Relationships, Maintenance Rights, and the Uniform Civil Code, Uttarakhand, 2024

Facts

Meera XXXXXXXXXX, 29, works in marketing in Dehradun, Uttarakhand. In April 2022, she moved in with Aarav XXXXXXXXXX, 31, a software engineer, into a rented apartment in Dehradun. Neither Meera nor Aarav has ever married, and the two have not solemnised any marriage between themselves. Over more than three years of living together, they have shared household expenses, maintained a joint account for utility bills, and have been introduced to family, friends, and neighbours as a couple. They have no children.

In July 2025, Aarav told Meera that he wishes to end the relationship and intends to move out within thirty days. Meera left a stable job in Delhi to relocate to Dehradun for this relationship, and she is now uncertain of her legal position. She has also heard that Uttarakhand recently brought in a new law — the Uniform Civil Code, Uttarakhand, 2024 — that requires live-in couples to register their relationship with the state, and she is worried because she and Aarav never did so. Meera wants to understand three things: whether Indian law recognises a relationship like hers at all; whether she can claim any maintenance from Aarav now that the relationship is ending; and what the new registration requirement means for a couple, like her and Aarav, who never registered.

A few further facts are relevant to the analysis that follows. The rented apartment in Dehradun is held under a lease naming both Meera and Aarav as joint tenants, and rent has, for most of the tenancy, been paid from the joint account the couple maintained for household bills, with Meera contributing a larger share in the last year after Aarav's employer reduced his working hours. Neither Meera nor Aarav was previously married to anyone else, and neither has been in any other live-in relationship during the period they have lived together. Meera has not yet approached any court, Protection Officer, or the local Registrar's office on any of these questions; she has come to this report first, wanting to understand her position before deciding how, or whether, to act.

Legal Questions Presented

1. Does Indian law recognise a live-in relationship such as the one between Meera and Aarav, and under what conditions does such a relationship attract legal protection?
2. Can Meera claim maintenance from Aarav once the relationship ends, and if so, under which law?

CONTENT WITHHELD — FULL DOCUMENT INCLUDED WITH YOUR PAID ORDER

Applicable Law

A. The constitutional starting point: personal liberty and the right to choose a partner

India's Constitution does not use the words "live-in relationship" anywhere, but the Supreme Court has repeatedly located the right of two adults to live together outside marriage within Article 21 of the Constitution, which protects the right to life and personal liberty. This right has been read to include the freedom to choose whom to live with, whom to love, and whether to marry at all.

In *Lata Singh v. State of U.P.* (2006), the Supreme Court held that a major (an adult) is free to marry whomever she chooses, or to live with anyone she chooses, and that a live-in relationship between consenting adults, while it may be viewed as immoral by some sections of society, is not a criminal offence. The Court went further and directed police authorities across the country to protect adult couples from harassment or violence by family members who disapprove of their relationship choices.

CONTENT WITHHELD — FULL DOCUMENT INCLUDED WITH YOUR PAID ORDER

"In our opinion, a man and a woman, even without getting married can live together if they wish. This may be regarded immoral by society but it is not illegal. There is a difference between law and morality."

— *Payal Sharma v. Superintendent, Nari Niketan, Kalindri Vihar, Agra* (Allahabad High Court, 17 May 2001)

The Supreme Court reaffirmed this constitutional foundation in *S. Khushboo v. Kanniammal* (2010), holding that living together as an unmarried couple is not, by itself, an offence under Indian criminal law, and that the state has no business policing consensual relationships between adults. The Court's reasoning drew on Article 21's guarantee of personal liberty, and it cautioned against using the criminal law to enforce social morality on private, consensual choices. The same reasoning was applied in *Nandakumar v. State of Kerala* (2018), where the Supreme Court held that an adult couple has the right to live together outside marriage and cannot be prevented from doing so — even, the Court noted, where the couple might not yet be legally competent to marry each other.

More recently, the Supreme Court's decision in Justice K.S. Puttaswamy v. Union of India (2017), which recognised privacy as a fundamental right under Article 21, has reinforced this line of reasoning: the choice of whom to live with, and the details of a private relationship, fall within a zone of personal autonomy that the state may only intrude upon for compelling and proportionate reasons. This principle becomes directly relevant later in this report, when it examines Uttarakhand's new requirement that live-in couples register their relationship with the state.

CONTENT WITHHELD — FULL DOCUMENT INCLUDED WITH YOUR PAID ORDER

B. Long-term cohabitation and the presumption of marriage

Separately from the constitutional right to cohabit, Indian courts have for decades recognised that where a man and a woman live together for a long, continuous period as if they were husband and wife, the law will presume — unless disproved — that a valid marriage exists between them. This principle was laid down by the Supreme Court in *Badri Prasad v. Deputy Director of Consolidation* (1978), a case concerning a couple who had lived together for around fifty years. The Court held as follows:

"The law leans in favour of legitimacy and frowns upon bastardy."

— *Badri Prasad v. Deputy Director of Consolidation*, AIR 1978 SC 1557

CONTENT WITHHELD — FULL DOCUMENT INCLUDED WITH YOUR PAID ORDER

C. When does a live-in relationship count as "in the nature of marriage"?

Not every live-in relationship is treated alike under the law. The Supreme Court's decision in *D. Velusamy v. D. Patchaiammal* (2010) is the leading authority on how courts decide whether a live-in relationship should be treated as being "in the nature of marriage" — a phrase borrowed from Section 2(f) of the Protection of Women from Domestic Violence Act, 2005

(examined in Section E below). The Court set out a list of factors relevant to this inquiry, including: the duration of the relationship; whether the couple held themselves out to society as spouses; whether they were of legal age to marry; whether they were otherwise legally free to marry (for example, that neither was already validly married to someone else); whether they voluntarily cohabited; and whether they pooled resources and shared financial and household responsibilities, such as joint bank accounts, in a manner consistent with a marital household.

Three years later, in *Indra Sarma v. V.K.V. Sarma* (2013), the Supreme Court cautioned that this is not a mechanical checklist: not every live-in relationship, even a fairly long one, will qualify as "in the nature of marriage." The Court in that case denied relief to a woman who had lived with a man for around eighteen years, because he was, throughout that period, validly married to someone else — a fact the Court found incompatible with a relationship that could be treated as marriage-like for legal purposes.

According to the Supreme Court in *Indra Sarma v. V.K.V. Sarma*, the fact that the parties had lived together for a long period of time, and that they had shared financial and household responsibilities, was not sufficient to establish a relationship in the nature of marriage. The Court found that the relationship was not marriage-like for legal purposes.

CONTENT WITHHELD — FULL DOCUMENT INCLUDED WITH YOUR PAID ORDER

The Supreme Court in *Indra Sarma v. V.K.V. Sarma* held that the fact that the parties had lived together for a long period of time, and that they had shared financial and household responsibilities, was not sufficient to establish a relationship in the nature of marriage. The Court found that the relationship was not marriage-like for legal purposes.

D. Maintenance under Section 125 of the Code of Criminal Procedure / Section 144 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita

Section 125 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 ("CrPC") allows a "wife" — along with children and parents — who is unable to maintain herself to claim maintenance from a husband who has sufficient means but neglects or refuses to maintain her. For decades, courts differed on whether a woman in a live-in relationship, who was never formally married, could be treated as a "wife" for this purpose.

The Supreme Court moved toward a broader reading in *Chanmuniya v. Virendra Kumar Singh Kushwaha* (2011), holding as follows:

"Where partners lived together for a long spell as husband and wife, a presumption would arise in favour of a valid wedlock."

— *Chanmuniya v. Virendra Kumar Singh Kushwaha*, (2011) 1 SCC 141

The Supreme Court in *Chanmuniya v. Virendra Kumar Singh Kushwaha* held that the fact that the parties had lived together for a long period of time, and that they had shared financial and household responsibilities, was not sufficient to establish a relationship in the nature of marriage. The Court found that the relationship was not marriage-like for legal purposes.

CONTENT WITHHELD — FULL DOCUMENT INCLUDED WITH YOUR PAID ORDER

The Supreme Court in *Chanmuniya v. Virendra Kumar Singh Kushwaha* held that the fact that the parties had lived together for a long period of time, and that they had shared financial and household responsibilities, was not sufficient to establish a relationship in the nature of marriage. The Court found that the relationship was not marriage-like for legal purposes.

CONTENT WITHHELD — FULL DOCUMENT INCLUDED WITH YOUR PAID ORDER

With effect from 1 July 2024, fresh maintenance applications are filed under Section 144 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 ("BNSS"), which has replaced the CrPC. Section 144 substantially preserves the same framework and language as the old Section 125, so the body of case law on "wife," including the cases discussed above, continues to guide how Section 144 is interpreted; cases already pending on 1 July 2024 continue to be governed by the old Section 125 CrPC.

For a couple like Meera and Aarav, this means a maintenance claim under Section 125 CrPC / Section 144 BNSS is not automatically available to Meera simply because she and Aarav lived together — she would need to establish, on the evidence, that the relationship was genuinely marriage-like in the sense described in Section C above. This is a real, but not guaranteed, avenue, and it typically runs alongside — not instead of — the remedy under the Domestic Violence Act discussed next.

E. Protection and monetary relief under the Domestic Violence Act, 2005

The Protection of Women from Domestic Violence Act, 2005 ("PWDVA" or "DV Act") offers a separate, and in practice often more directly available, route to relief for women in live-in relationships. Section 2(f) of the Act defines a "domestic relationship" as follows:

"a relationship between two persons who live or have, at any point of time, lived together in a shared household, when they are related by consanguinity, marriage, or through a relationship in the nature of marriage, adoption or are family members living together as a joint family."

— Protection of Women from Domestic Violence Act, 2005, section 2(f)

This definition expressly includes relationships "in the nature of marriage," without requiring a formal marriage ceremony. An "aggrieved person" in a qualifying domestic relationship can seek a range of reliefs under the Act, including protection orders and residence orders (the right to continue living in the shared household), and — importantly for Meera's situation — monetary relief under Section 20, which can cover loss of earnings, medical expenses, loss caused to property, and maintenance for the aggrieved person and any children.

CONTENT WITHHELD — FULL DOCUMENT INCLUDED WITH YOUR PAID ORDER

CONTENT WITHHELD — FULL DOCUMENT INCLUDED WITH YOUR PAID ORDER

For Meera, this means that even if a court were to find her relationship with Aarav falls short of qualifying for a Section 125/144 maintenance claim, she may still be able to seek monetary relief under the Domestic Violence Act, provided the relationship is found to be "in the nature of marriage" under Section 2(f) — the same factual inquiry described in Section C above.

F. Property and inheritance: the position of any children born of a live-in relationship

Although Meera and Aarav have no children, this is a common follow-up question for couples in a live-in relationship, and this report addresses it as part of a general research overview.

Section 16 of the Hindu Marriage Act, 1955 confers legitimacy on children born of marriages that are later declared void or voidable, even though the marriage itself may not be legally valid. Courts have extended similar reasoning, by analogy, to children born of long-term live-in relationships found to be "in the nature of marriage." The extent of such children's property rights was long unsettled: in *Bharatha Matha v. R. Vijaya Renganathan* (2010), the Supreme Court held that a child treated as legitimate under Section 16 could inherit only the father's self-acquired property, not ancestral (coparcenary) property. A differently constituted bench in 2011, in *Revanasiddappa v. Mallikarjun*, appeared to take a broader view, suggesting such children could have a claim on ancestral property too — creating a conflict between the two rulings.

That conflict was resolved by a three-judge constitutional bench of the Supreme Court in a September 2015 ruling in *Revanasiddappa v. Mallikarjun*. The 2015 bench held that a child born of a void or voidable marriage is entitled to a share, inherited through a father,

CONTENT WITHHELD — FULL DOCUMENT INCLUDED WITH YOUR PAID ORDER

the court's reasoning provided the broader 2015 ruling on ancestral property should not be read as overruling the 2010 decision, and the report says that representative reporting notes that citing the 2015 ruling as if it overruled without say so that specific point.

This body of law is not, on its own terms, specific to registered live-in relationships or to Uttarakhand — it applies wherever a court is asked to determine the status of a child born outside a valid marriage, including from a live-in relationship recognised as being "in the nature of marriage." The new Uttarakhand law discussed next adds a further, express statement on this question for relationships within its scope.

G. The new law: the Uniform Civil Code, Uttarakhand, 2024 and its live-in relationship registration requirement

Uttarakhand became the first Indian state to enact a Uniform Civil Code when The Uniform Civil Code of Uttarakhand, 2024 (Act No. 3 of 2024) received the President's assent on 11 March 2024 and was notified in the state gazette the following day. The accompanying procedural rules — the Uniform Civil Code Rules, Uttarakhand, 2025 — came into force on 27 January 2025. It is important to be precise about scope: this is a state law. It applies within the territorial jurisdiction of Uttarakhand; it is not a national or central law, and it does not, on its own, alter the legal position for live-in couples living outside Uttarakhand.

The Act creates, for the first time in India, a formal registration system for live-in relationships. Section 378 requires partners in a live-in relationship within Uttarakhand — whether or not they are themselves residents of the state — to submit a "statement of live-in relationship" to the Registrar with jurisdiction over the area where they live. Read with Section 381(1), this statement must be submitted within one month of the relationship's commencement.

The accompanying regulations, The Registrar is empowered to conduct a preliminary inquiry under the Uniform Civil Code Rules, 2025, to determine whether the statement from the government's own published text — the Registrar's preliminary inquiry form — is the right one. It is not, however, a criminal offence under the Act to provide false information to the Registrar. The Registrar is required to maintain a register of all statements submitted to it, and to make this information available to the public.

CONTENT WITHHELD — FULL DOCUMENT INCLUDED WITH YOUR PAID ORDER

The Registrar is required to maintain a register of all statements submitted to it, and to make this information available to the public. The Registrar is required to maintain a register of all statements submitted to it, and to make this information available to the public. The Registrar is required to maintain a register of all statements submitted to it, and to make this information available to the public.

Failing to submit the required statement carries a criminal penalty. Under Section 387 of the Act, a couple that continues in a live-in relationship for more than one month without submitting the statement required by Section 381(1) commits an offence, reportedly punishable — according to multiple legal commentators who have reviewed the Act's text — with imprisonment of up to three months, a fine of up to ₹10,000, or both; if the couple still does not comply after receiving a formal notice, the reported penalty escalates to imprisonment of up to six months, a fine of up to ₹25,000, or both. Providing false information in the statement is separately punishable. This report was able to directly verify, from the government's own published Rules, the thirty-day Registrar timeline and the fact that non-registration is referred to a magistrate as an offence under Section 387; the precise rupee and imprisonment figures above are reported consistently across three independent

110 SERVICES

24-48HR DELIVERY

FREE EDUCATIONAL BRIEF

PRICING AT LEXOVIA.IN

secondary legal sources, but this report was not able to extract the verbatim statutory text of Section 387 itself from the official Act document during this research, and that specific figure should be treated as reliable but not independently primary-source-confirmed within this report.

On the question of children, the Act and its accompanying commentary indicate that any child born of a live-in relationship — whether or not the relationship was registered — is to be treated as a legitimate child, addressing directly, for relationships within Uttarakhand's scope, the kind of uncertainty discussed in Section F above.

This report was unable to provide the verbatim text of the relevant provisions of the Act, as the official document was not available during this research. The report is based on the secondary sources consulted, and the verbatim text of the Act is not included in this report. The report is based on the secondary sources consulted, and the verbatim text of the Act is not included in this report.

CONTENT WITHHELD — FULL DOCUMENT INCLUDED WITH YOUR PAID ORDER

This report was unable to provide the verbatim text of the relevant provisions of the Act, as the official document was not available during this research. The report is based on the secondary sources consulted, and the verbatim text of the Act is not included in this report. The report is based on the secondary sources consulted, and the verbatim text of the Act is not included in this report.

H. Does this apply to Meera and Aarav, and what follows from not having registered?

On the facts given, Meera and Aarav have lived together in Dehradun, within Uttarakhand, since April 2022 — well before the Act's commencement in March 2024 and before the Rules took effect on 27 January 2025. Because the registration requirement applies to live-in relationships within Uttarakhand regardless of when they began, Meera and Aarav's relationship would, in principle, fall within the scope of the registration requirement once the law came into force. This report has not been able to verify, with certainty, the exact transitional deadline that applied to couples — like Meera and Aarav — who were already cohabiting in Uttarakhand when the Rules commenced on 27 January 2025; that is a specific procedural question a Uttarakhand Registrar's office, or a lawyer practising before it, would be best placed to confirm, and it is flagged here rather than answered with an assumed figure.

This report was unable to provide the verbatim text of the relevant provisions of the Act, as the official document was not available during this research. The report is based on the secondary sources consulted, and the verbatim text of the Act is not included in this report. The report is based on the secondary sources consulted, and the verbatim text of the Act is not included in this report.

CONTENT WITHHELD — FULL DOCUMENT INCLUDED WITH YOUR PAID ORDER

This report was unable to provide the verbatim text of the relevant provisions of the Act, as the official document was not available during this research. The report is based on the secondary sources consulted, and the verbatim text of the Act is not included in this report. The report is based on the secondary sources consulted, and the verbatim text of the Act is not included in this report.

110 SERVICES

24-48HR DELIVERY

FREE EDUCATIONAL BRIEF

PRICING AT LEXOVIA.IN

CONTENT WITHHELD — FULL DOCUMENT INCLUDED WITH YOUR PAID ORDER

I. Open questions: privacy and proportionality concerns

The Uttarakhand live-in registration requirement has drawn substantial criticism from legal commentators, and more than one public interest litigation has reportedly challenged aspects of the law before the Uttarakhand High Court at Nainital. The central objection draws on the Supreme Court's recognition of privacy as a fundamental right in Justice K.S. Puttaswamy v. Union of India (2017): critics argue that compelling disclosure of an intimate relationship to a government Registrar — who, under the Rules, forwards certain information toward local police — intrudes on personal autonomy in a way that may not satisfy the necessity and proportionality standard the Supreme Court set out in Puttaswamy for any state action that limits the right to privacy. Commentators have also pointed to the criminal penalty for non-disclosure, and the absence, as reported, of a specific penalty for third-party misuse or leakage of a couple's registered information, as areas of concern.

CONTENT WITHHELD — FULL DOCUMENT INCLUDED WITH YOUR PAID ORDER

J. Beyond Uttarakhand: Gujarat and Assam have since followed

Uttarakhand's live-in registration model has not stayed unique for long. The Gujarat Legislative Assembly passed its own Uniform Civil Code Act in March 2026, making Gujarat the second state to adopt a UCC, and the Assam Legislative Assembly followed with the Uniform Civil Code Bill, 2026, making Assam the third. Both states' live-in provisions largely track the Uttarakhand model — requiring registration of a live-in relationship (and, separately, a declaration on its termination) — with reported variations in the fine print. Comparative reporting on the three states' laws describes Gujarat as having moved toward a more compliance-driven framework, with commentators describing its enforcement mechanisms as stricter than Uttarakhand's, while Assam's provisions are reported to largely mirror the Uttarakhand model with only minor procedural adjustments. As with the Uttarakhand law, both of these newer state codes exclude Scheduled Tribes and certain constitutionally protected customary-law communities from their scope.

CONTENT WITHHELD — FULL DOCUMENT INCLUDED WITH YOUR PAID ORDER

K. Practical procedure: where and how each remedy is actually pursued

It is useful to see, in one place, how the different remedies discussed above are actually accessed, since each follows a different procedural track. A claim under Section 144 of the BNSS (successor to Section 125 CrPC) is filed before a Magistrate, who can also grant interim maintenance while the main application is pending; the applicant bears the initial burden of showing the relationship and her inability to maintain herself, after which the respondent must disclose his means. An application under the Domestic Violence Act, 2005 is filed before a Magistrate as well, typically with the assistance of a Protection Officer appointed under the Act, and can combine a monetary relief claim under Section 20 with a residence order under Section 19 and a protection order under Section 18 in the same proceeding — which is one reason this route can offer broader relief than a maintenance application alone. Both routes require the claimant to place evidence of the relationship before the court, of the kind described in the Frequently Asked Questions section below.

CONTENT WITHHELD — FULL DOCUMENT INCLUDED WITH YOUR PAID ORDER

110 SERVICES

24-48HR DELIVERY

FREE EDUCATIONAL BRIEF

PRICING AT LEXOVIA.IN

CONTENT WITHHELD — FULL DOCUMENT INCLUDED WITH YOUR PAID ORDER

Application of the Law to Meera and Aarav's Facts

Applying the factors discussed in Section C to Meera and Aarav's relationship, several elements point toward a relationship that a court could plausibly find to be "in the nature of marriage": the couple lived together continuously for more than three years; they shared a single household in Dehradun; they held a joint account for shared bills; neither partner was married to, or in a live-in relationship with, anyone else during this period; and, on the facts given, they were introduced to family and friends as a couple, suggesting some degree of public acknowledgment of the relationship. Weighed against this, three years and four months is a materially shorter period than the decades-long cohabitation seen in cases such as *Badri Prasad* (around fifty years) or *Indra Sarma* (around eighteen years, though ultimately unsuccessful on other grounds); Indian courts have granted relief on shorter cohabitation periods than this in some reported cases, but the outcome is never guaranteed by duration alone, and a court examining Meera's case would weigh all the *D. Velusamy* factors together rather than any single one in isolation.

CONTENT WITHHELD — FULL DOCUMENT INCLUDED WITH YOUR PAID ORDER

On the registration question, Meera and Aarav's relationship — begun in April 2022 and continuing through the commencement of the Uttarakhand Act and Rules — falls within a category (relationships pre-dating the law) whose exact transitional registration deadline this report has flagged, in Section H, as unverified with certainty. What is clear is that the underlying registration obligation exists for live-in couples in Uttarakhand going forward, that non-registration beyond the applicable window carries the criminal exposure described in Section G, and that this exposure is analytically separate from, and does not appear, on the current text of the law, to bar Meera's ability to pursue maintenance under either of the two

routes described above. Given the relationship is now ending, one specific question can be answered from the Rules reviewed for this report: the Act's termination-statement mechanism (Section 384, discussed in Section G) applies to a relationship that was actually registered, so it does not, on its face, impose a separate filing requirement on Meera and Aarav simply because they are separating — there is no registered relationship for them to formally terminate. What remains open, and is flagged for confirmation with a Uttarakhand Registrar or local counsel, is whether the underlying non-registration exposure under Section 387 for the period the couple did cohabit in Uttarakhand without registering survives or lapses once the relationship itself has ended.

Frequently Asked Questions

Q1. Does Meera have to prove she and Aarav were "married" to get any legal protection?

No. None of the remedies discussed in this report require Meera to prove an actual marriage took place. The Domestic Violence Act's "relationship in the nature of marriage" standard, and the case law under Section 125 CrPC / Section 144 BNSS, both allow relief without a marriage certificate — but Meera would need to prove, with evidence, that the relationship had the characteristics of a marriage-like union described in Section C of this report.

Q2. What evidence would typically help show a relationship is "in the nature of marriage"?

CONTENT WITHHELD — FULL DOCUMENT INCLUDED WITH YOUR PAID ORDER

Q3. If Meera and Aarav never registered under the Uttarakhand UCC, is their relationship legally invalid?

No. Registration under the Uttarakhand Act is not what makes a live-in relationship lawful — the Supreme Court has held live-in relationships between consenting adults to be lawful independently of any registration scheme (Section A of this report). Non-registration under the Uttarakhand Act creates its own, separate penalty exposure (Section G), but it does not, on the text reviewed, undo the relationship's basic legality or automatically bar central-law remedies like maintenance.

Q4. Could Aarav be prosecuted for the couple's failure to register?

CONTENT WITHHELD — FULL DOCUMENT INCLUDED WITH YOUR PAID ORDER

Q5. Does this Uttarakhand law apply if Meera and Aarav later move to another state?

No. The Uniform Civil Code, Uttarakhand, 2024 is a state law that applies within Uttarakhand. If the couple relocates outside the state, the Uttarakhand registration requirement itself would no longer apply to their ongoing relationship. As Section J of this report explains, Gujarat and Assam have since passed their own UCC laws in 2026 with broadly similar live-in registration requirements, so a move to one of those two states specifically could bring a comparable obligation under that state's own law; this report has not researched the Gujarat or Assam provisions in the same depth as the Uttarakhand Act, and a move to any other state would not currently attract a registration requirement of this kind at all.

Q6. Can Meera claim a share in any property Aarav owns?

This document contains content that has been withheld for your privacy. The full document is available for purchase at Lexovia.

CONTENT WITHHELD — FULL DOCUMENT INCLUDED WITH YOUR PAID ORDER

This document contains content that has been withheld for your privacy. The full document is available for purchase at Lexovia.

Q7. What if Meera and Aarav had children — would the children be considered legitimate?

Under the general law discussed in Section F, children born of a relationship found to be "in the nature of marriage" have generally been treated, by analogy to Section 16 of the Hindu Marriage Act, as entitled to a share in their father's own property, though not automatically as coparceners in ancestral property, per the Supreme Court's 2023 Revanasiddappa ruling. Separately, and specifically within Uttarakhand, the new Act is reported to treat children born of any live-in relationship as legitimate, without qualifying that on registration.

Q8. Is there a time limit on when Meera must file a maintenance claim after the relationship ends?

This document contains content that has been withheld for your privacy. The full document is available for purchase at Lexovia.

CONTENT WITHHELD — FULL DOCUMENT INCLUDED WITH YOUR PAID ORDER

This document contains content that has been withheld for your privacy. The full document is available for purchase at Lexovia.

Q9. Does either partner need a lawyer to file a "statement of live-in relationship" with the Registrar?

The Rules reviewed for this report describe a Registrar-driven administrative process — submission of a statement, inquiry, and a certificate or rejection order — which appears designed to be usable without a lawyer, though partners are always free to seek legal assistance, particularly if the Registrar raises objections or the statement is contested.

Q10. Could Meera and Aarav's relationship still be found not to be "in the nature of marriage," even after three years together?

CONTENT WITHHELD — FULL DOCUMENT INCLUDED WITH YOUR PAID ORDER

Q11. What if Aarav disputes that the relationship was ever a genuine live-in relationship in the legal sense?

This is a common line of defence in these cases, and it is precisely why the D. Velusamy factors discussed in Section C matter: Meera would need to place evidence before the court or Protection Officer — shared address proof, joint financial records, photographs, witness statements, and similar material — to establish the relationship's character, rather than relying on the mere fact of having lived at the same address. A contested factual dispute of this kind is decided on the evidence led by both sides, and this report cannot anticipate how such a dispute would be resolved on facts not yet in evidence.

Q12. Does it matter, legally, that Meera relocated from Delhi to Dehradun for this relationship?

CONTENT WITHHELD — FULL DOCUMENT INCLUDED WITH YOUR PAID ORDER

Q13. Can Meera obtain urgent or interim maintenance while a full case is pending?

Both the Section 144 BNSS route and the Domestic Violence Act route allow a court to grant interim relief while the main proceeding is still being heard, so a claimant is not necessarily left without support for the full duration of the case. Whether interim relief would actually be granted, and in what amount, depends on the specific facts placed before the court at that stage, which this general research report has not been asked to assess.

Scope of This Report

This report addresses Indian law as it applies to the legal status, maintenance rights, and Uttarakhand UCC registration position of a live-in couple in Meera and Aarav's situation, current as of August 2026. It draws on reported Supreme Court and High Court judgments, the central statutes discussed above, and the primary text of the Uniform Civil Code of Uttarakhand, 2024 and its 2025 Rules, cross-checked against independent secondary legal-

analysis sources. It does not address tax, insurance, immigration, employment, or succession-planning questions that can also arise for live-in couples, none of which were raised in the facts provided; it does not offer an opinion on the merits of any specific claim Meera or Aarav might bring; and, as flagged throughout, several narrow points — the exact transitional registration deadline for pre-existing relationships, and the verbatim text of Section 387's penalty figures — could not be fully confirmed against the primary Act text within this research and are marked accordingly rather than presented as certainties.

References

1. Badri Prasad v. Deputy Director of Consolidation, AIR 1978 SC 1557 (Supreme Court of India, 1 August 1978).
2. S. Khushboo v. Kanniammal, (2010) 5 SCC 600 (Supreme Court of India, 28 April 2010).
3. Lata Singh v. State of U.P. CONTENT WITHHELD — FULL DOCUMENT INCLUDED WITH YOUR PAID ORDER
4. Payal Sharma v. Superintendent, Nari Niketan, Kalindri Vihar, Agra (Allahabad High Court, 17 May 2001).
5. D. Velusamy v. D. Patchaiammal, (2010) 10 SCC 469 (Supreme Court of India).
6. Indra Sarma v. V.K.V. Sarm. CONTENT WITHHELD — FULL DOCUMENT INCLUDED WITH YOUR PAID ORDER
7. Nandakumar v. State of Kerala, 2018 INSC 383 (Supreme Court of India, decided 20 April 2018).
8. Chanmuniya v. Virendra Kumar Singh Kushwaha, (2011) 1 SCC 141 (Supreme Court of India).
9. Ajay Bhardwaj v. Jyotsn. CONTENT WITHHELD — FULL DOCUMENT INCLUDED WITH YOUR PAID ORDER
10. Lalita Toppo v. State of Jharkhand (Supreme Court of India, decided 30 October 2018).
11. Revanasiddappa v. Mallikarjun, (2011) 11 SCC 1 (Supreme Court of India) — position on ancestral property superseded in part; see entry 12.
12. Revanasiddappa v. Mallikarjun. CONTENT WITHHELD — FULL DOCUMENT INCLUDED WITH YOUR PAID ORDER
Constitution Bench, 1 September 2018.
13. Bharatha Matha v. R. Vijaya Renganathan, (2010) 11 SCC 483 (Supreme Court of India).
14. Joseph Shine v. Union of India, (2019) 3 SCC 39 (Supreme Court of India, Constitution Bench, 27 September 2018).
15. Justice K.S. Puttaswamy v. Union of India. CONTENT WITHHELD — FULL DOCUMENT INCLUDED WITH YOUR PAID ORDER
CONTENT WITHHELD — FULL DOCUMENT INCLUDED WITH YOUR PAID ORDER
judge bench).

110 SERVICES

24-48HR DELIVERY

FREE EDUCATIONAL BRIEF

PRICING AT LEXOVIA.IN

16. The Hindu Marriage Act, 1955, section 16.

17. The Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973, section 125.

18. The Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023

CONTENT WITHHELD — FULL DOCUMENT INCLUDED WITH YOUR PAID ORDER

19. The Protection of Women from Domestic Violence Act, 2005, section 2(f).

20. The Protection of Women from Domestic Violence Act, 2005, section 20.

21. The Uniform Civil Code of Uttarakhand, 2024 (Act No. 3 of 2024)
387.

CONTENT WITHHELD — FULL DOCUMENT INCLUDED WITH YOUR PAID ORDER

22. The Uniform Civil Code Rules, Uttarakhand, 2025.

23. The Indian Penal Code, 1860, section 497 (struck down in 2018).

24. The Gujarat Uniform Civil Code Act, 2026
March 2026).

CONTENT WITHHELD — FULL DOCUMENT INCLUDED WITH YOUR PAID ORDER

25. The Assam Uniform Civil Code Bill, 2026 (passed by the Assam Legislative Assembly, 2026).