The Infinite
An International Peer Reviewed / Refereed Journal of Multidisciplinary Research

An Online Peer Reviewed / Refereed Journal
Volume 3 | Issue 9 | September 2026
ISSN: 3048-9539 (Online)
Website: www.theinfinite.co.in

Rights of LGBTQ+ People in India: A Comprehensive Analysis

Shubhi Gupta
Research Scholar
School of Law and Legal Studies
Sanskriti University, Chhata, Mathura
Under the Guidance of
Dr. Kamal Singh Dhakad
Associate Professor
School of Law and Legal Studies
Sanskriti University, Chhata, Mathura

ARTICLE DETAILS

Research Paper

Keywords :

Rights, Challenges, Equality, Unnatural Offences, Discrimination

ABSTRACT

This paper examines the position of LGBTQ+ persons in India from legal, social, and cultural perspectives. It traces the development of the rights discourse from the colonial criminalization of same-sex intimacy to the constitutional recognition of dignity, privacy, equality, and individual autonomy. Particular attention is given to Section 377 of the Indian Penal Code, the Supreme Court's decision in Navtej Singh Johar v. Union of India, and the legal framework concerning transgender persons under the Transgender Persons (Protection of Rights) Act, 2019. The study also considers the continuing difficulties experienced by LGBTQ+ persons in education, employment, housing, healthcare, and family life. Although the removal of criminal penalties for consensual same-sex relations represented a major constitutional advance, decriminalization by itself has not eliminated discrimination or social exclusion. Questions concerning comprehensive anti-discrimination protection, recognition of same-sex relationships, family rights, healthcare access, and social acceptance therefore remain significant. The paper adopts a doctrinal method and relies upon statutes, judicial decisions, books, scholarly writings, reports, and other secondary

materials. It argues that meaningful equality requires the combined development of law, public policy, institutional sensitization and social awareness.

"Race, gender, religion, and sexuality, we are all

people, and that's it. We're all people. We're all equal."

…**Conor Franta**

INTRODUCTION:

The recognition of LGBTQ+ rights in India has developed through a long and contested process. Lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and queer persons have historically encountered legal restrictions as well as social prejudice, stigma and exclusion. In recent decades, however, constitutional litigation, community activism, civil-society initiatives and changing public attitudes have brought questions of sexual orientation and gender identity into the center of the human-rights debate.

India presents a particularly important setting for examining these issues because its social and cultural traditions are diverse and its modern legal history has been shaped, in part, by colonial institutions. The contemporary rights movement has therefore developed at the intersection of constitutional guarantees, inherited criminal laws, indigenous social practices and evolving understandings of equality and personal liberty. The transformation of Section 377 is a prominent example of this interaction. The provision remained in the criminal law for decades after independence and became a significant source of fear and marginalization for many LGBTQ+ persons.

The constitutional position changed substantially through judicial intervention. The Delhi High Court's decision concerning the Naz Foundation marked an important stage in the movement, although that ruling was subsequently reversed by the Supreme Court in Suresh Kumar Koushal v. Naz Foundation. The constitutional challenge ultimately succeeded in Navtej Singh Johar v. Union of India in 2018, when the Supreme Court protected consensual sexual relations between adults from criminal sanction. The judgment placed autonomy, dignity, privacy and equality at the heart of the discussion.

The rights discourse has also expanded beyond sexual orientation. In National Legal Services Authority v. Union of India (2014), the Supreme Court recognized transgender persons as a distinct gender category and affirmed their constitutional entitlement to equality and dignity. Parliament subsequently enacted the Transgender Persons (Protection of Rights) Act, 2019. Despite these developments, legal recognition has not automatically produced social equality. LGBTQ+ persons may continue to face rejection within

families, discrimination in institutions, barriers to healthcare and pressure to conform to conventional expectations of gender and sexuality.

This research therefore studies both the progress achieved and the gaps that remain. It considers the historical development of LGBTQ+ rights, the consequences of Section 377, the principal features and criticisms of the 2019 transgender legislation, prevailing social attitudes, discrimination experienced by LGBTQ+ persons, and the comparative position of LGBTQ+ rights in selected jurisdictions.

OBJECTIVES:

The main objectives of this research paper are outlined as follows:

1. To study the discrimination faced by LGBTQ+ individuals in society – This includes exploring the various social, cultural, and legal challenges and prejudices encountered by the community.
2. To analyze Section 377 of the Indian Penal Code – The objective is to examine its historical background, legal implications, and the impact it has had on the lives and rights of LGBTQ+ individuals in India.
3. To provide an overview of the Transgender Persons (Protection of Rights) Act, 2019 – This includes understanding the key provisions of the Act and evaluating its effectiveness in protecting the rights of transgender individuals.
4. To compare LGBTQ+ rights in India with those in other countries – The research aims to identify similarities, differences, and areas where India can improve by studying international practices and policies.
5. To promote inclusive education and raise awareness about LGBTQ+ issues– Emphasis is placed on sensitizing society, especially educational institutions, to foster acceptance and equality.

METHODOLOGY OF THE STUDY:

In this research, the researcher has employed the doctrinal method, which primarily involves a detailed and systematic study of legal principles, statutes, case laws, and academic commentary. This method relies on secondary sources for data collection and analysis. Accordingly, the researcher has gathered information from a wide range of authoritative legal resources, including textbooks, scholarly journals, academic articles, newspapers, and other published materials. These sources have been critically examined to understand the existing legal framework, interpret relevant legal provisions, and analyze judicial decisions. The use of doctrinal methodology enables a comprehensive exploration of the subject by

focusing on the interpretation and synthesis of legal norms as established in existing literature and legal documents. This approach provides a strong theoretical foundation for the research and helps in identifying gaps, inconsistencies, and potential areas for reform within the current legal structure.

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND:

The history of LGBTQ rights in India is marked by a complex interplay of colonial influences, cultural norms, legal developments, and evolving societal attitudes. Understanding this history provides insights into the challenges faced by the LGBTQ community and the progress made in the fight for equality. The roots of LGBTQ discrimination in India can be traced back to the colonial era when British colonial rule introduced Victorian-era laws and moral codes. In 1861, the British colonial administration enacted Section 377 of the Indian Penal Code (IPC)[1], which criminalized "unnatural offences," including consensual same-sex sexual activities. This law remained in effect long after India gained independence in 1947 and served as a tool of oppression against the LGBTQ+ community and in the late 20th century, LGBTQ activism began to emerge in India. Under the Bhartiya Nyaya Sanhita (BNS), 2023, the entire Section 377 has been omitted. The 1980s and 1990s witnessed the formation of organizations such as the Humsafar Trust and the Naz Foundation, which worked towards creating awareness, providing support, and advocating for LGBTQ rights. A significant milestone in the fight for LGBTQ rights in India was the Naz Foundation's legal challenge against Section 377. In 2009, the Delhi High Court delivered a groundbreaking judgement in the case, decriminalizing consensual same-sex relationships between adults. The court recognized that Section 377 violated the fundamental rights of LGBTQ individuals, including the rights to equality, privacy, and dignity. However, in 2013, the Supreme Court of India overturned the Delhi High Court's decision in the case of Suresh Kumar Koushal v. Naz Foundation.[2] The apex court reinstated the criminalization of consensual same-sex relationships, stating that it was the role of the legislature to amend or repeal Section 377. Case law of Navtej Singh Johar v. Union of India in the fight for LGBTQ rights regained momentum, and in a historic judgment in September 2018, the Supreme Court of India, in the case of Navtej Singh Johar v. Union of India,[3] struck down parts of Section 377. The court held that consensual same-sex relationships between adults were no longer criminal. The judgment recognized the importance of individual autonomy, non-discrimination, and the protection of fundamental rights for LGBTQ individuals. In addition to the struggle for decriminalization, the transgender

[1] Indian Penal Code, 1860, (Act 45 of 1860), Sec. 377
[2] Suresh Kumar Koushal v. Naz Foundation AIR 2013 SC 563
[3] Navtej Singh Johar v Union of India AIR 2018 SC 4321

community in India has also fought for recognition and protection of their rights. In 2014, the Supreme Court recognized transgender individuals as the "third gender" and affirmed their rights to equality and protection under the law. The Transgender Persons (Protection of Rights) Act, 2019, was enacted to safeguard the rights of transgender persons, although there has been criticism and ongoing debate regarding certain provisions of the Act.

The history of LGBTQ rights in India reflects both the challenges faced by the community and the progress made in recent years. Legal battles, activism, and changing societal attitudes have contributed to significant milestones in the recognition and protection of LGBTQ rights. However, there remain ongoing challenges, including social stigma, discrimination, and the need for further legal reforms to ensure full equality and acceptance for the LGBTQ community in India.

ANALYSIS OF SECTION 377 OF THE INDIAN PENAL CODE AND ITS IMPACT ON THE LGBTQ COMMUNITY:

Section 377 occupied a central place in the legal history of LGBTQ+ rights in India. Although the text of the provision was not limited exclusively to same-sex relations, its application and social consequences were strongly associated with the policing of sexual minorities. The criminal character of consensual same-sex intimacy contributed to a climate in which LGBTQ+ persons could be threatened with exposure, harassment, prosecution, or blackmail.

The existence of the provision affected the constitutional interests of equality, dignity, privacy and personal autonomy. Individuals could not enjoy their intimate lives on the same legal footing as others while the state retained the power to criminalize consensual adult conduct. The resulting stigma extended beyond the courtroom and influenced family relationships, educational environments, workplaces, and public institutions.

Section 377 also had consequences for access to healthcare. Fear of disclosure or discriminatory treatment could discourage members of the LGBTQ+ community from approaching healthcare institutions, including for sexual-health services and HIV-related testing or treatment. Where healthcare providers lacked appropriate knowledge or sensitivity, the legal stigma associated with homosexuality could compound existing barriers to care.

The provision also affected social participation. Criminalization reinforced the perception that LGBTQ+ identities and relationships were improper or illegitimate. This could contribute to exclusion from employment, housing, education and community life. Activists and organizations working on LGBTQ+

rights also had to operate in an environment in which the legal status of same-sex intimacy remained uncertain and vulnerable to misuse.

The impact was not limited to formal legal consequences. Criminalization can influence how individuals perceive themselves and how families and institutions treat them. Fear of rejection, discrimination and exposure may produce significant emotional and social burdens. At the same time, resistance to Section 377 became a catalyst for organized advocacy, constitutional litigation and public discussion. The eventual decision in Navtej Singh Johar therefore represented not merely a change in criminal law but a broader constitutional rejection of state-sponsored stigma against consensual adult same-sex intimacy.

Following the Supreme Court's 2018 judgment, consensual same-sex relations between adults are no longer criminalized under Section 377. The later Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, does not reproduce the former Section 377 provision. Nevertheless, the removal of criminal liability should not be equated with the complete elimination of discrimination. The continuing challenge is to translate decriminalization into effective equality across social and institutional settings.

OVERVIEW OF THE TRANSGENDER PERSONS (PROTECTION OF RIGHTS) ACT, 2019:

The Transgender Persons (Protection of Rights) Act, 2019, represents an important legislative attempt to establish a statutory framework for the protection and welfare of transgender persons in India. The legislation addresses discrimination, identity, welfare measures, institutional mechanisms and certain offences against transgender persons.

The Act recognizes transgender persons and provides a legal framework concerning gender identity and official documentation. It seeks to protect transgender persons from discrimination in areas such as education, employment, healthcare, housing and access to public services. Its broader objective is to facilitate equal participation and prevent exclusion on the basis of gender identity.

The legislation also contemplates welfare-oriented measures. These include access to healthcare, HIV-related prevention and counselling, vocational training and rehabilitation. It further envisages steps toward creating safer and more inclusive public facilities. The National Council for Transgender Persons provides an institutional mechanism for advising on policies and programs and for considering matters relating to the welfare of transgender persons.

The Act contains provisions addressing certain forms of abuse and exploitation. It seeks to penalize specified offences against transgender persons, including physical and sexual abuse, forced eviction and

denial of rights. In this respect, the statute moves beyond symbolic recognition and attempts to create enforceable protections.

At the same time, the legislation has been the subject of criticism from activists and members of the transgender community. Concerns have included the adequacy of its anti-discrimination framework, the manner in which identity certification operates, the severity of penalties for some offences, and the extent to which the legislative process reflected the views of transgender communities. Critics have also argued that statutory recognition must be accompanied by effective implementation, accessible remedies and meaningful institutional participation.

The significance of the 2019 Act must therefore be assessed in practical as well as formal terms. Recognition in legislation is important, but its effectiveness depends upon implementation by government departments, educational institutions, employers, healthcare providers and local authorities. Continued engagement with transgender communities is essential if the statutory framework is to respond adequately to lived realities.

EXAMINATION OF PREVAILING SOCIETAL ATTITUDES TOWARDS HOMOSEXUALITY AND TRANSGENDER IDENTITIES:

Social attitudes toward homosexuality and transgender identities in India are diverse and continue to evolve. Historical and cultural sources contain references to forms of gender and sexual diversity, yet contemporary social institutions have often been influenced by conservative expectations concerning family, marriage, gender roles and sexuality. The legal reforms of recent years have therefore occurred alongside a much slower process of social change.

The 2018 decriminalization decision had considerable symbolic importance. It removed the criminal stigma attached to consensual same-sex intimacy and gave constitutional recognition to the autonomy and dignity of LGBTQ+ persons. Nevertheless, a judicial decision cannot immediately alter family attitudes, community practices or institutional behaviour. Acceptance varies considerably by region, generation, social environment and level of public awareness.

Urban areas and younger sections of society may display greater visibility and acceptance, partly because of increased access to information, social media and LGBTQ+-inclusive public discussions. However, prejudice remains present in many settings. LGBTQ+ persons may face ridicule, bullying, exclusion, verbal abuse or pressure to conceal their identity. Transgender persons can encounter particularly visible forms of discrimination because gender expression may make them more vulnerable to social scrutiny.

Family remains an important area of concern. Many LGBTQ+ persons experience pressure to conform to heterosexual marriage and conventional gender expectations. Disclosure of sexual orientation or gender identity may lead to conflict, emotional pressure, social isolation or rejection. In some cases, individuals may be compelled or strongly pressured to enter heterosexual marriages despite their own wishes, thereby affecting personal autonomy and the well-being of all persons involved.

Media representation, public discussion, pride events and advocacy organizations have contributed to greater visibility. Positive representation can challenge stereotypes and create opportunities for dialogue. However, visibility alone does not guarantee equality. Sustainable social change requires education, sensitization and institutional policies that treat LGBTQ+ persons with respect and ensure that constitutional values are reflected in everyday interactions.

THE LGBTQ+ COMMUNITY IN INDIA HAS FACED VARIOUS FORMS OF DISCRIMINATION, PREJUDICE, AND VIOLATIONS OF THEIR RIGHTS:

Even after the decriminalization of consensual same-sex relations, LGBTQ+ persons may experience discrimination in multiple areas of life. Legal recognition of private relationships does not by itself guarantee equal treatment in employment, housing, education, healthcare or access to services. The persistence of social stigma can continue to produce exclusion even where criminal law no longer directly intervenes.

In educational institutions, LGBTQ+ students may face bullying, derogatory language, social isolation and pressure to conceal their identity. A lack of awareness among teachers and administrators can make such environments more difficult to navigate. Inclusive institutional policies, grievance mechanisms and sensitization programmes can help create educational spaces in which students are able to participate without fear of humiliation or discrimination.

Employment presents another important challenge. LGBTQ+ persons may encounter discriminatory recruitment practices, hostile workplace environments, denial of opportunities or pressure to hide their identity. Transgender persons may experience additional barriers to formal employment. Equality in the workplace therefore requires not only formal statements of non-discrimination but also effective complaint procedures and organizational cultures that respect diversity.

Housing can also become a site of exclusion. Individuals may face refusal of accommodation, intrusive questioning or unequal treatment because of their sexual orientation or gender identity. Such practices can

be difficult to challenge where specific statutory remedies are unavailable or where social stigma discourages individuals from reporting discrimination.

Healthcare access is another area requiring attention. LGBTQ+ persons may encounter providers who lack adequate understanding of their specific needs. Transgender persons may require gender-affirming healthcare, hormone-related services and specialized mental-health support, while sexual-minority communities may need confidential and non-judgmental sexual-health services. Training healthcare professionals in LGBTQ+-sensitive care can reduce avoidable barriers.

Family and community rejection can deepen these difficulties. Where individuals lack supportive networks, discrimination may result in isolation and economic vulnerability. Hate-motivated physical or verbal abuse and other forms of violence further undermine the right to live with security and dignity. Effective legal remedies, institutional support and community-based services are therefore necessary to supplement constitutional recognition.

The work of LGBTQ+ organizations, activists and allies remains important in addressing these problems. Support groups, awareness programmes, legal advocacy and community initiatives can provide safe spaces and improve access to information and assistance. The larger challenge is to transform isolated initiatives into durable systems of protection and inclusion.

COMPARATIVE PERSPECTIVE: INDIA AND OTHER JURISDICTIONS

The legal status of LGBTQ+ persons differs substantially across jurisdictions. India's 2018 decriminalization of consensual same-sex relations was a significant constitutional development, but the legal framework does not provide the same range of relationship and family rights available in several other countries.

A number of jurisdictions have introduced legislation recognizing same-sex marriage or equivalent relationship rights. Countries such as Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Canada, Colombia, Germany, the Netherlands, New Zealand, South Africa, Spain, and Uruguay have recognized same-sex marriage. These systems demonstrate different legal approaches to extending marital rights and associated benefits to same-sex couples.

Family and parenting rights also differ. In several jurisdictions, same-sex couples may jointly adopt children and exercise parental rights on substantially the same basis as different-sex couples. Canada, Denmark, the Netherlands, Spain and the United Kingdom are examples of countries that have developed

broader legal recognition in this field. In India, same-sex couples continue to face limitations regarding joint adoption and the legal recognition of their relationships as marriages.

Anti-discrimination protection provides another important point of comparison. Many countries have enacted laws that expressly prohibit discrimination on grounds of sexual orientation and gender identity in areas such as employment, education, housing, and public services. India has developed constitutional protections and a statutory framework specifically concerning transgender persons, but it does not have a single comprehensive anti-discrimination statute covering LGBTQ+ persons across all these spheres.

Approaches to transgender rights also vary. Some jurisdictions, including Argentina, Denmark, Malta and Norway, have developed comparatively broad systems for legal gender recognition and protection. India's legal framework has moved toward recognition and protection, but debates concerning identity documentation, implementation, and access to healthcare demonstrate that further development remains possible.

Social attitudes differ just as much as legal rules. Countries such as Canada, the Netherlands, Sweden and the United Kingdom are often associated with comparatively higher levels of public acceptance, although no jurisdiction is completely free from prejudice. The comparison suggests that legal reform and social transformation are mutually reinforcing: law can establish minimum standards of equality, while education, representation, and public awareness can make those standards meaningful in everyday life.

CONCLUSION:

The development of LGBTQ+ rights in India demonstrates a significant movement from criminalization toward constitutional recognition. The 2018 decision in Navtej Singh Johar was a decisive milestone because it affirmed that consensual adult intimacy cannot be treated as criminal merely on the basis of sexual orientation. The constitutional principles of equality, dignity, privacy and autonomy provide a strong foundation for continuing this process.

However, decriminalization represents only one stage in the achievement of substantive equality. LGBTQ+ persons may still experience discrimination in education, employment, housing, healthcare and family life. Social stigma and pressure to conform to traditional expectations remain substantial obstacles. Transgender persons, in particular, may face visible and structural forms of exclusion despite the existence of statutory protection.

The Transgender Persons (Protection of Rights) Act, 2019 is an important legislative step, but the effectiveness of any protective statute depends upon implementation, institutional accountability and

meaningful participation by the community concerned. Legal safeguards must be accessible in practice, and public authorities must be equipped to respond to discrimination and violence effectively.

India's future approach to LGBTQ+ equality should therefore move beyond the question of criminalization and address the broader conditions necessary for equal citizenship. Comprehensive anti-discrimination protection, fair access to public services, inclusive educational practices, appropriate healthcare, family support and effective remedies for violations can contribute to this objective. Questions concerning recognition of same-sex relationships and family rights also remain central to the wider equality debate.

Ultimately, legal reform and social change must operate together. Education and sensitization can challenge stereotypes, while public institutions can establish practices that respect diverse identities. A genuinely inclusive society is one in which sexual orientation or gender identity does not determine a person's access to dignity, opportunity, security or equal treatment under law.

SUGGESTIONS:

First, India should consider developing a comprehensive anti-discrimination framework that clearly protects LGBTQ+ persons in employment, education, housing, healthcare and public services. Such protection should be supported by accessible complaint and enforcement mechanisms.

Second, educational institutions should incorporate age-appropriate and constitutionally grounded awareness concerning sexual orientation, gender identity, equality and dignity. Teachers, administrators and support staff should receive sensitization training so that bullying and discriminatory conduct can be addressed effectively.

Third, healthcare institutions should strengthen LGBTQ+-affirming services. Healthcare professionals should receive appropriate training, and transgender persons should be able to access necessary gender-affirming and mental-health services without unnecessary stigma or exclusion. Confidentiality and respectful treatment should be treated as essential elements of care.

Fourth, specialised mental-health and community support services should be encouraged. Counselling, peer-support groups and safe community spaces can reduce isolation and provide assistance to individuals dealing with family rejection, discrimination or social pressure.

Fifth, public and private institutions should develop inclusive policies and safe reporting mechanisms. LGBTQ+ persons should have practical avenues through which discrimination, harassment and violence can be reported and addressed without fear of retaliation.

Sixth, accurate and positive representation of LGBTQ+ persons in media, literature and the arts should be encouraged. Responsible representation can reduce stereotypes and help society understand the diversity of LGBTQ+ experiences.

Seventh, LGBTQ+ persons and community organizations should be supported through training, capacity-building opportunities, leadership programmes and access to resources. Their participation in policy development is particularly important because effective reform should respond to lived experiences rather than rely only on institutional assumptions.

Finally, collaboration among government agencies, educational institutions, healthcare providers, civil-society organizations, legal professionals and allies should be strengthened. Sustained cooperation can help convert constitutional ideals into practical equality and social inclusion.

REFERENCES:

1. https://www.ijlmh.com/paper/rights-of-lgbtq-in-india-and-the-struggle-for-societal-acceptance./
2. https://www.legalserviceindia.com/legal/article-9407-rights-of-the-lgbt-community-in-india.html.
3. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC5100112/
4. https://www.equaldex.com/region/india.
5. https://www.reuters.com/world/india/india-consider-more-lgbtq-rights-not-legalising-same-sexmarriage-sources-2023-10-20/.
6. https://www.worldwidejournals.com/paripex/recent_issues_pdf/2022/March/legal-acceptance-oflgbt-in-india-review-on-its-implications-on-having-equal-opportunities-family-acceptance-and-bettermental-health_March_2022_2211697941_7605265.pdf.
7. https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/Delivery.cfm/SSRN_ID3866184_code4698147.pdf?abstractid=3866184
8. https://journalppw.com/index.php/jpsp/article/view/5528.
9. https://burnishedlawjournal.in/wp-content/uploads/2021/07/Article-on-LGBTQ-Rights-in-IndiabyNikita-Panwar.pdf.
10. https://indiankanoon.org/doc/168671544/.
11. https://globalfreedomofexpression.columbia.edu/cases/navtej-singh-johar-v-union-india/.