



DOI: <https://doi.org/10.53032/tvcr/2023.v5n1.04>

A Comparative Study of Hindu Women's Property Rights before and after the Hindu Succession Act with Muslim Women's Property Rights under Personal Law

An Exhaustive Jurisprudential Analysis of Coparcenary Dynamics, Absolute Ownership, Statutory Evolution, and Parental Inheritance in the Ascending Line

Viji. S

Assistant Professor of Law
Government Law College,
Thiruvananthapuram, Kerala

Abstract

This study provides a comprehensive comparative analysis of property rights available to Hindu and Muslim women in India across historical, statutory, and personal law paradigms. Historically, Hindu law under the Mitakshara system denied women coparcenary membership and restricted their property rights to a lifetime 'Limited Estate'. In contrast, Islamic law granted Muslim women absolute ownership and guaranteed Quranic inheritance shares. The enactment of the Hindu Succession Act (HSA) of 1956 transformed Hindu women's ownership into absolute title under Section 14, while the landmark HSA (Amendment) Act of 2005 statutorily elevated daughters to equal coparceners under Section 6. This paper examines coparcenary dynamics, statutory reforms, the judicial trajectory leading to *Vineeta Sharma v. Rakesh Sharma* (2020), and parental inheritance in the ascending line. It contrasts the structural asymmetry of Hindu law (where mothers are Class I heirs while fathers are Class II) with the non-excludable Quranic sharer status enjoyed by both parents in Islamic jurisprudence.

Keywords: Hindu Law, Muslim Personal Law, Coparcenary Rights, Quranic Sharers, Uniform Civil Code

The Voice of Creative Research

<https://www.thevoiceofcreativeresearch.com/index.php/vcr>

1. Introduction and Historical Context

The legal architecture governing property ownership, succession, and inheritance in India has historically been shaped by religious personal laws. A comparative assessment of women's economic rights within Hindu and Islamic traditions reveals fundamental divergence in philosophical foundations, social family organization, and statutory evolution.

Prior to 1956, classical Hindu law derived its principles from ancient Smritis, Commentaries, and Nibandhas, primarily bifurcated into the Mitakshara and Dayabhaga schools. The Mitakshara school—predominant across most of India—was structured around the patriarchal joint family and the doctrine of coparcenary. Under this framework, women were systematically excluded from ownership of ancestral property, enjoying only rights to maintenance and marriage expenses. Conversely, Islamic law—codified in India via the Muslim Personal Law (Shariat) Application Act of 1937—recognized women as individual legal entities from its inception, granting them fixed inheritance rights and absolute ownership over property.

This paper examines the evolution of women's property rights from classical personal law regimes through statutory interventions, culminating in the Hindu Succession (Amendment) Act of 2005 and pivotal judicial rulings. Special emphasis is devoted to coparcenary rights, the conversion of limited estates into absolute ownership, and the statutory schemes governing succession in the ascending line.

2. Pre-1956 Hindu Women's Property Rights

2.1 The Mitakshara Coparcenary and Male Monopoly

Under Mitakshara law, the joint family property was managed under the concept of coparcenary—a narrow inner body within the larger joint family consisting solely of male lineal descendants within four generations from a common ancestor (father, son, grandson, and great-grandson). Coparcenary property was held under two key doctrines:

- **Janmaswatavada (Right by Birth):** Male coparceners acquired an equal, undivided interest in ancestral property automatically upon birth.
- **Apratibandha Daya (Unobstructed Heritage):** The property devolved by survivorship among surviving male coparceners, dynamically expanding or contracting individual shares, rather than passing by succession.

Women—whether daughters, wives, or mothers—were strictly excluded from coparcenary membership. A woman could never be a coparcener, could not demand partition, and could not hold joint family property.

2.2 Stridhana vs. Women's Estate

Classical Hindu jurisprudence recognized two distinct forms of property held by women:

- **Stridhana (Woman's Absolute Property):** Property acquired through gifts, affection, ornaments, or ceremonial presents from relatives. Over Stridhana, a Hindu woman maintained complete control, power of disposal, and uninhibited alienability.

The Voice of Creative Research

<https://www.thevoiceofcreativeresearch.com/index.php/vcr>

- **Women's Estate (Limited Interest):** Property inherited by a woman from male relatives (e.g., as a widow or daughter). Over this property, her rights were severely circumscribed:

- a) Limited Power of Alienation: She could not sell, gift, or mortgage the property except for 'legal necessity' (e.g., payment of debts, medical care) or spiritual benefit of her deceased husband.

- b) Reversionary Doctrine: Upon her death, the property did not pass to her legal heirs, but reverted to the 'reversioners'—the next living male heir of the last full male owner.

2.3 The Hindu Women's Rights to Property Act, 1937

The first legislative attempt to ameliorate the condition of Hindu widows was the Hindu Women's Rights to Property Act (Act XVIII of 1937). It allowed a Hindu widow to step into the shoes of her deceased husband and claim his undivided share in coparcenary property upon partition. However, the Act explicitly clarified that the interest acquired by the widow was a 'limited interest' known as a Hindu Woman's Estate, retaining the reversionary framework and stopping short of making her a coparcener.

3. Muslim Women's Property Rights Under Personal Law

3.1 Absence of Coparcenary and Rejection of Survivorship

Islamic jurisprudence does not recognize the concepts of joint family property, undivided ancestral estates, or coparcenary. Under Islamic law:

- All property is held as individual property; there is no legal distinction between self-acquired and ancestral property.
- No person acquires a right in property by birth (*spes successionis*—a mere chance of succession). Inheritance rights arise exclusively upon the death of the property owner.

3.2 Absolute Ownership (Absolute Estate)

Unlike the pre-1956 Hindu legal scheme, a Muslim woman who inherits property acquires an absolute estate. She becomes the absolute owner of her share, enjoying unrestricted rights to sell, gift, lease, or mortgage her property during her lifetime. Upon her death, her property passes directly to her own statutory heirs under Islamic succession rules, without reverting to any former male owner.

3.3 The Quranic Scheme of Inheritance

Under Islamic law (primarily the Hanafi and Shia schemes of inheritance statutorily recognized by the Shariat Act, 1937), women are recognized as primary, non-excludable statutory heirs (Ashab-ul-Furud / Sharers):

- **Daughter:** A single daughter inherits a fixed $\frac{1}{2}$ share of the estate; two or more daughters collectively share $\frac{2}{3}$. When inheriting alongside a brother, she inherits as a residuary (Asabah), receiving a share equal to half of the brother's share (a 1:2 ratio).
- **Wife:** Inherits $\frac{1}{4}$ of the deceased husband's estate if there are no children, or $\frac{1}{8}$ if children exist.

The Voice of Creative Research

<https://www.thevoiceofcreativeresearch.com/index.php/vcr>

- **Mother:** Inherits 1/6 of the child's estate if children or multiple siblings exist, or 1/3 if no children exist.

3.4 Financial Protections: Mahr and Maintenance

In addition to inheritance, Islamic law builds mandatory financial protections for women:

- **Mahr (Dower):** A mandatory financial obligation or asset pledged by the groom to the bride at marriage. It is her exclusive property, acting as a financial buffer and a priority debt recoverable from the husband's estate.
- **Nafqah (Maintenance):** An absolute duty imposed on the husband to provide shelter, food, and maintenance to his wife throughout the subsistence of marriage, regardless of her personal wealth.

4. Comparative Synthesis: Pre-1956 Hindu Law vs. Muslim Law

The following matrix summarizes the fundamental structural differences prior to the statutory reforms of 1956:

Legal Parameter	Pre-1956 Hindu Law	Muslim Personal Law
Coparcenary Rights	Strictly excluded. Women could not be coparceners or hold ancestral property.	Concept does not exist. All property is individually owned.
Nature of Estate	Limited Estate (Women's Estate). Property reverted to reversioners upon death.	Absolute Estate. Full rights of ownership, sale, gift, and inheritance transmission.
Right by Birth	Male coparceners acquired rights at birth (Janmaswatavada).	No rights by birth. Right arises solely upon owner's death.
Inheritance Share	Excluded if male issues existed. Limited rights under 1937 Act.	Fixed Quranic statutory shares (Daughter 1/2 or 2/3; Wife 1/4 or 1/8).

5. Statutory Transformation under the Hindu Succession Act, 1956

5.1 Section 14: Conversion of Limited Estate into Absolute Ownership

The enactment of the Hindu Succession Act, 1956 marked a revolutionary shift in Hindu jurisprudence. Section 14(1) enacted that any property possessed by a female Hindu, whether acquired before or after the commencement of the Act, shall be held by her as full owner thereof and not as a limited owner.

In the landmark decision *V. Tulasamma v. Sesha Reddy* (1977) [10], the Supreme Court of India held that Section 14(1) must be construed broadly. If a Hindu woman acquires property in lieu of maintenance, her pre-existing right crystallizes into absolute ownership under Section 14(1). Section 14(2) applies only as an exception when property is acquired as a fresh grant under a deed, gift, or decree with explicit restricted covenants.

The Voice of Creative Research

<https://www.thevoiceofcreativeresearch.com/index.php/vcr>

5.2 The Hindu Succession (Amendment) Act, 2005: Equal Coparcenary Rights

While the 1956 Act granted absolute ownership over self-acquired and inherited property, it left the Mitakshara coparcenary intact under Section 6, preserving male monopoly over ancestral joint family property. This statutory inequality was abolished by the Hindu Succession (Amendment) Act, 2005.

Amended Section 6 substituted the old coparcenary rules, establishing that:

- The daughter of a coparcener shall by birth become a coparcener in her own right in the same manner as the son.
- The daughter shall have the same rights in the coparcenary property as she would have had if she had been a son.
- She shall be subject to the same liabilities in respect of the said coparcenary property.

5.3 Resolution of Judicial Ambiguity: Vineeta Sharma v. Rakesh Sharma (2020)

Following the 2005 Amendment, conflicting judicial interpretations arose regarding whether the father coparcener had to be alive on September 9, 2005 (the date of amendment) for the daughter to claim coparcenary rights (Prakash v. Phulavati, 2016 [6] vs. Danamma v. Amar, 2018 [5]).

A 3-judge Bench of the Supreme Court in Vineeta Sharma v. Rakesh Sharma (2020) [11] conclusively settled the law:

- **Unobstructed Right by Birth:** Coparcenary rights are conferred on daughters by birth under amended Section 6. It is not necessary that the living daughter's father be alive on September 9, 2005.
- **Retroactive Operation:** The statute operates retroactively, conferring rights based on an antecedent event (birth).
- **Partition Exception:** Only registered partition deeds or court decrees finalized prior to December 20, 2004 remain unaffected.

6. Comparative Analysis of Succession in the Ascending Line

An essential dimension of comparative property law concerns rights in the ascending line—specifically, the rights of surviving parents to the property of their deceased child.

6.1 Succession Under Hindu Law (HSA 1956)

Under Sections 8, 9, and 10 of the Hindu Succession Act, 1956, the rules governing intestate succession for a male Hindu establish a clear structural asymmetry between surviving parents:

- **The Mother as a Primary Class I Heir:** The mother is designated as a Class I heir. She inherits simultaneously and equally alongside the deceased son's widow, children, and branches of predeceased children. Her share is absolute and cannot be excluded by the presence of a wife or children.
- **Relegation of the Father to Class II:** In stark contrast, the father is relegated to Class II, Entry I. Under Section 9, Class I heirs completely exclude Class II heirs.

The Voice of Creative Research

<https://www.thevoiceofcreativeresearch.com/index.php/vcr>

Consequently, if the deceased leaves behind a mother, widow, or child, the father receives nothing. He inherits only if no Class I heir survives.

For a female Hindu dying intestate (Sections 15 & 16), property inherited from her parents reverts to her father's heirs in the absence of children, whereas property inherited from her husband/father-in-law reverts to the husband's heirs.

6.2 Succession Under Muslim Personal Law

In contrast to Hindu law's parental asymmetry, Islamic law treats both parents as primary Quranic Sharers (Ashab-ul-Furud) who can never be excluded by any relative, spouse, or child:

- **Mother's Rights:** The mother inherits a fixed 1/6 share if the deceased child leaves behind children or two or more siblings. If no children or multiple siblings exist, her share increases to 1/3.

- **Father's Dual Status:** The father occupies a powerful dual position in Islamic inheritance:

- a) As a Sharer: He receives a mandatory 1/6 share if the deceased child leaves surviving male issues (sons/grandsons).

- b) As a Residuary (Asabah): If no male issue survives, the father inherits the mandatory 1/6 share plus the entire remaining balance of the estate after other Quranic sharers (such as the mother or widow) take their shares.

In the special Umariyyatan (or Omar's) cases, when the surviving relatives are only the spouse and both parents, the mother receives 1/3 of the remainder after the spouse's share is deducted, ensuring the father receives twice the mother's share in accordance with Islamic residue principles.

7. Modern Jurisprudential Evaluation and Uniform Civil Code

The statutory journey of Hindu law from complete coparcenary exclusion to equal coparcenary rights under the 2005 Amendment demonstrates progressive alignment with Constitutional guarantees of equality under Articles 14 and 15 of the Constitution of India.

However, comparative evaluation reveals distinct remaining issues across both personal law systems:

- **In Hindu Law:** While coparcenary equality is codified, the gendered scheme of intestate succession for female Hindus under Section 15 continues to prioritize the husband's heirs over the woman's own natal parents when she dies childless.

- **In Muslim Law:** Muslim women continue to receive a 1:2 ratio relative to male counterparts when inheriting as residuaries alongside brothers, reflecting classical socio-economic assumptions regarding male financial maintenance duties.

These persistent disparities fuel the ongoing constitutional debate under Article 44 surrounding a Uniform Civil Code (UCC). Judicial directives in cases such as Shah Bano (1985) [8], Sarla Mudgal (1995) [7], and Shayara Bano (2017) [9] emphasize that reform must

The Voice of Creative Research

<https://www.thevoiceofcreativeresearch.com/index.php/vcr>

reconcile religious freedom with non-negotiable standards of gender justice and non-discrimination.

8. Conclusion

The historical trajectory of women's property rights in India illustrates two fundamentally different legal paradigms that have gradually evolved toward statutory equality. Prior to 1956, Islamic personal law provided a significantly superior framework of property ownership for women, granting absolute ownership, non-excludable inheritance rights, and independent financial security via Mahr. Conversely, pre-1956 Hindu law subjected women to severe structural disabilities, denying coparcenary status and restricting inherited property to a limited lifetime estate. The statutory enactment of the Hindu Succession Act in 1956 and the landmark 2005 Amendment revolutionized Hindu legal architecture. By abolishing limited estates under Section 14 and conferring equal coparcenary rights by birth under Section 6 (as affirmed in Vineeta Sharma [11]), Hindu law achieved statutory parity in ancestral property. Furthermore, while Hindu law elevates the mother to a Class I heir while relegating the father, Muslim law maintains a balanced, non-excludable parental inheritance system for both mother and father. Ultimately, true economic empowerment for women across all communities requires eliminating remaining statutory anomalies and ensuring that property rights are grounded in the constitutional mandate of gender equality.

Works Cited

- [1] Diwan, Paras. Modern Hindu Law. 24th ed., Allahabad Law Agency, 2019.
- [2] Fyzee, Asaf A.A. Outlines of Muhammadan Law. Edited by Tahir Mahmood, 5th ed., Oxford University Press, 2008.
- [3] Mulla, Dinshah Fardunji. Principles of Hindu Law. Edited by Satyajeet A. Desai, 23rd ed., LexisNexis, 2018.
- [4] Mulla, Dinshah Fardunji. Principles of Mahomedan Law. 22nd ed., LexisNexis, 2021.
- [5] Supreme Court of India. Danamma Suman Surpur v. Amar, (2018) 3 SCC 343.
- [6] Supreme Court of India. Prakash v. Phulavati, (2016) 2 SCC 36.
- [7] Supreme Court of India. Sarla Mudgal v. Union of India, (1995) 3 SCC 635.
- [8] Supreme Court of India. Shah Bano Begum, Mohd. Ahmed Khan v., (1985) 2 SCC 556.
- [9] Supreme Court of India. Shayara Bano v. Union of India, (2017) 9 SCC 1.
- [10] Supreme Court of India. V. Tulasamma v. Sesha Reddy, (1977) 3 SCC 99.
- [11] Supreme Court of India. Vineeta Sharma v. Rakesh Sharma, (2020) 9 SCC 1.