

## Article

# Beyond Gender Binaries: Understanding and Enhancing Rights For Transgender Individuals

### Article History:

#### Name of Author:

Richa Chaudhary<sup>1</sup>, Prof. (Dr.) Mandeep Kumar<sup>2</sup>

#### Affiliation:

<sup>1</sup>Research Scholar, School of Law, Sharda University, Greater Noida (UP)

Email ID : [richa.sa1123@gmail.com](mailto:richa.sa1123@gmail.com)

<sup>2</sup>Professor, Sharda School of Law, Sharda University, Greater Noida (UP)

Email ID

[mandeep22787@gmail.com](mailto:mandeep22787@gmail.com), [mandeep.9@sharda.ac.in](mailto:mandeep.9@sharda.ac.in)

**How to cite this article:** Richa Chaudhary, Prof. (Dr.) Mandeep Kumar. Beyond Gender Binaries: Understanding and Enhancing Rights For Transgender Individuals. *J Int Commer Law Technol.* 2025;6(1): 1112-1118.

©2025 the Author(s). This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>)

**Abstract:** Gender identity, as a deeply personal yet socially constructed reality, has long been confined within the narrow binaries of male and female. For transgender individuals, this restriction translates into systemic exclusion, violence, and the denial of basic human rights. This research explores how Indian law, policy, and society have historically enforced these binaries and how recent developments, particularly after the *NALSA v. Union of India* (2014) judgment and the Transgender Persons (Protection of Rights) Act (2019), attempt to dismantle them. Drawing from legal precedents, empirical studies, and community-based insights, the paper situates the transgender struggle within broader discourses of equality, dignity, and justice. Using doctrinal and socio-legal analysis, the study engages with lived realities ranging from financial exclusion and social stigma to institutional discrimination in education, health, and employment. While India's legislative framework has evolved toward inclusion, gaps persist in its implementation, with bureaucratic barriers and social prejudices continuing to undermine the spirit of constitutional equality. Comparative references to Argentina, Germany, and Nepal illustrate how other jurisdictions have embraced self-identification and affirmative protections as cornerstones of gender justice. The paper argues that moving beyond gender binaries is not merely a question of legal reform but of social transformation—a shift from tolerance to acceptance, and from recognition to empowerment. It concludes by recommending policy and institutional interventions that center the agency, voice, and lived experience of transgender persons, making inclusion both substantive and sustainable.

## INTRODUCTION TO THE PROBLEM

The human experience of gender is far more complex than the dichotomies that law and society have historically recognized. Across time and culture, individuals whose identities do not align neatly with the male–female binary have existed, contributed, and shaped the moral and cultural imagination of societies. Yet, for centuries, the institutional frameworks of governance have viewed such identities as “deviant” or “abnormal,” relegating transgender individuals to the margins of legal, economic, and social life.

In India, this marginalization is paradoxical. The same civilization that once revered the Hijra and Aravani communities as custodians of divine and cultural traditions later reduced them to symbols of stigma through colonial criminalization. The Criminal Tribes Act of 1871 labeled “eunuchs” as offenders by birth — an act of epistemic violence that sought to erase fluidity and enforce rigid gender hierarchies. This colonial legacy continues to echo

in modern bureaucratic systems, where identity documentation, healthcare, and employment remain structured around binary gender norms (Raja & Khan, 2025).

The struggle for recognition of transgender rights in India gained judicial legitimacy with the *NALSA v. Union of India* judgment in 2014, which acknowledged transgender persons as a “third gender” and affirmed their constitutional right to self-identify. This was followed by the Transgender Persons (Protection of Rights) Act (2019), which sought to codify those rights into statutory form. However, as scholars like Bhargava et al. (2024) and Kothari et al. (2020) note, legislative acknowledgment does not automatically translate into lived equality. The Act's procedural requirements, including certification by district authorities, often contradict the self-determination principles laid down in *NALSA*.

This dissonance reflects a larger problem — that inclusion, when framed through bureaucratic compliance rather than

human dignity, risks becoming tokenistic. Despite legal advances, transgender persons continue to face disproportionate levels of unemployment, homelessness, and violence. Studies reveal that over half of transgender individuals experience identity mismatches in official documents, leading to exclusion from financial systems and welfare schemes (Raja & Khan, 2025). The denial of social legitimacy thus compounds material deprivation, perpetuating a cycle of invisibility.

To move “beyond gender binaries” is, therefore, not simply to expand categories of gender within law, but to reimagine how rights are understood — not as concessions granted by the state, but as entitlements inherent to human personhood. The challenge is to translate legal recognition into a lived reality where transgender persons can exercise agency, dignity, and equality across every sphere of life. This paper situates that challenge within a broader socio-legal inquiry, tracing the historical, legislative, and cultural contours of India’s journey toward gender inclusivity

## HISTORICAL ASPECTS

The history of gender diversity in India is not a recent phenomenon; it is embedded in the subcontinent’s civilizational fabric. Ancient Indian texts, sculptures, and oral traditions contain abundant references to individuals who defied the gender binary. From Shikhandi in the Mahabharata to Aravanis worshipped in Tamil Nadu’s Koovagam festival, gender fluidity was once accepted as part of the human and divine spectrum. The concept of *tritiya prakriti* (third nature) in ancient Sanskrit literature represented gender variance as a natural, rather than pathological, expression of human identity.

However, this cultural inclusivity began to erode under colonial rule. The British introduced Victorian moral codes that rigidly separated male and female roles, perceiving non-binary identities as immoral or criminal. The Criminal Tribes Act of 1871 was a pivotal turning point categorizing eunuchs as “addicted to the systematic commission of offences,” subjecting them to police surveillance, forced registration, and public humiliation. The Act institutionalized stigma by conflating gender non-conformity with criminality (CLPR, 2020).

After independence, the Indian Constitution promised equality and non-discrimination under Articles 14, 15, and 21, but transgender persons remained invisible within the nation’s legal and policy frameworks. Their existence was acknowledged primarily through stereotypes as beggars, dancers, or symbols of fertility rather than as citizens entitled to dignity and rights. It was not until the early 2000s that sustained advocacy by organizations such as the Sangama collective and Humsafar Trust began to challenge this invisibility.

A decisive breakthrough came with the 2014 National Legal Services Authority (NALSA) v. Union of India judgment, where the Supreme Court recognized transgender individuals as a “third gender.” The Court held that gender identity is integral to personal autonomy and that self-identification is protected under the Constitution’s guarantee of life and liberty. It directed the state to ensure reservations in education and employment, separate public

toilets, and legal recognition on identity documents. The judgment’s philosophical foundation drew from the Yogyakarta Principles (2006), which affirm that all individuals, irrespective of gender identity or expression, are entitled to full enjoyment of human rights (Bhargava et al., 2024).

Yet, progress remained uneven. The 2019 Transgender Persons (Protection of Rights) Act attempted to translate the NALSA directives into legislation. However, the Act’s insistence on certification by district magistrates for legal recognition contradicted the principle of self-determination recognized by the Supreme Court. Activists criticized this requirement as a form of “state surveillance over identity,” undermining the autonomy of transgender persons (CLPR, 2020).

In tracing this trajectory from ancient reverence to colonial repression and modern legal reform one discerns that India’s transgender movement is not merely a rights struggle but a battle for reclaiming erased histories. It seeks to restore the pre-colonial recognition of gender diversity within a constitutional framework that values liberty and dignity. As Raja and Khan (2025) emphasize, inclusion must extend beyond symbolic recognition to tangible empowerment — access to education, employment, healthcare, and financial systems that affirm rather than stigmatize identity.

## DEFINING LGBT

Any meaningful engagement with gender justice must begin by clarifying the terms that shape its discourse. The acronym LGBT — Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender — has evolved to encompass a wide range of identities that challenge heteronormative and binary conceptions of gender and sexuality. In the Indian context, however, these categories intersect with caste, class, religion, and regional cultures, producing unique socio-legal experiences.

Gender, sex, and sexuality are distinct but interrelated dimensions of identity. Sex refers to biological attributes, while gender is a social construct encompassing roles, behaviors, and expectations. Sexual orientation denotes emotional or sexual attraction. Transgender individuals, therefore, may or may not undergo medical transition; their identity rests on psychological and social self-perception rather than anatomy (Bhargava et al., 2024).

The inclusion of “intersex” within the transgender framework has been a subject of debate. The Centre for Law and Policy Research (CLPR) (2020) underscores that intersex persons those born with variations in sex characteristics — are distinct from transgender individuals, whose identity involves a dissonance between assigned sex and gender identity. However, Indian law often conflates the two. The Transgender Persons (Protection of Rights) Act, 2019 defines a transgender person to include “a person with intersex variations,” but fails to provide specific protections addressing intersex concerns such as non-consensual surgeries or the right to bodily autonomy.

Internationally, countries like Germany and Australia have begun to recognize intersex as a distinct legal identity, with explicit prohibitions on forced surgeries and the option of

registering a “non-binary” gender at birth. In contrast, Indian jurisprudence — though progressive in recognizing gender diversity — remains limited in addressing intersex-specific rights. As CLPR (2020) notes, true inclusivity demands that legal frameworks differentiate between gender identity and biological variance rather than merging them under a single label.

The broader term LGBTQIA+ thus reflects an expanding understanding of human diversity — incorporating queer, intersex, and asexual identities. The expansion of terminology itself signals resistance to binary thinking, offering a language through which marginalized identities can articulate their existence. Yet, language alone is insufficient. Legal and social institutions must align with this conceptual pluralism. For instance, government forms, educational systems, and workplace policies still require individuals to select “male” or “female,” rendering other identities invisible.

In India, the evolution of LGBT terminology has coincided with key judicial milestones. The Navtej Singh Johar v. Union of India (2018) verdict decriminalized consensual same-sex relations, acknowledging that the right to love and intimacy is intrinsic to human dignity. Together with NALSA (2014), this ruling forms the twin pillars of India’s modern LGBT rights framework — one affirming bodily autonomy, the other affirming identity. However, as Bhargava et al. (2024) observe, the challenge lies in translating these symbolic victories into everyday inclusion.

Defining LGBT, therefore, is not a static exercise but an evolving dialogue between law, language, and lived experience. It requires listening to the multiplicity of voices within the community — from urban transgender activists to rural hijra elders — and recognizing that gender justice is as much about cultural survival as legal recognition.

## LITERATURE REVIEW

The scholarship on transgender and broader LGBT rights in India has undergone significant evolution over the past decade, moving from descriptive documentation of marginalization to analytical frameworks that interrogate law, power, and social justice. The intersection of gender identity with economic, legal, and cultural structures forms the central axis of contemporary research.

Raja and Khan (2025) offer one of the most data-driven studies in this field, exploring how financial inclusion and identity recognition intersect in the lives of transgender individuals in Delhi-NCR. Their quantitative findings reveal a critical paradox: while 60% of respondents had formal bank accounts, only a small fraction accessed credit or financial products due to discriminatory practices, documentation mismatches, and lack of awareness. This empirical evidence demonstrates that exclusion operates not just through law but through institutional prejudice, reaffirming that economic justice is integral to gender justice.

Bhargava et al. (2024) provide a doctrinal and socio-legal analysis of the evolution of transgender rights in India. Their work situates the NALSA (2014) judgment and the

Transgender Persons (Protection of Rights) Act (2019) within a broader continuum of social reform, and emphasizing upon the tension between judicial recognition and bureaucratic implementation. The authors note that despite legislative progress, administrative procedures such as identity certification contradict the principle of self-determination, leading to what they describe as “state-managed recognition.” Their findings highlight that symbolic inclusion without institutional reform perpetuates the very inequality the law seeks to address.

The Centre for Law and Policy Research (CLPR) (2020) extends the conversation by focusing on intersex rights — a dimension often conflated with transgender identity. It critiques the 2019 Act for failing to differentiate between intersex and transgender persons and for overlooking critical issues of consent in medical procedures. The report advocates for a distinct legal recognition of intersex individuals and for a ban on non-consensual surgeries, aligning with international best practices in Germany and Malta.

A pivotal contribution to the discourse comes from Atrey (2024), who advances an intersectional framework for understanding LGBT rights in India. Drawing from critical feminist and anti-discrimination theory, Atrey argues that existing legal and policy responses often treat “LGBT” as a homogenous category, ignoring the layered realities of caste, class, religion, and region. This intersectional neglect, she observes, renders invisible the compounded discrimination faced by, for instance, a Dalit transgender woman or a Muslim queer youth. Atrey (2024) calls for a reorientation of rights-based frameworks — from formal equality to substantive intersectional justice, where law recognizes that inequalities are multidimensional rather than parallel.

Her analysis bridges a crucial gap in Indian scholarship: while earlier works (e.g., Bhargava et al., 2024) examined gender through the lens of legal recognition, Atrey situates gender within the structural matrix of power, privilege, and socio-economic hierarchy. This lens exposes how policies that appear gender-neutral may in fact perpetuate systemic exclusion by failing to account for overlapping disadvantages. For example, access to transgender welfare schemes remains limited for those in rural or lower-caste contexts, where bureaucratic literacy and social capital are scarce.

Together, these studies illustrate an important epistemic shift — from the pursuit of recognition alone to the pursuit of justice that is both intersectional and transformative. Raja and Khan (2025) document material inequalities; Bhargava et al. (2024) map legal reforms; CLPR (2020) advocates medical autonomy; and Atrey (2024) integrates these strands under a holistic model of intersectional rights.

Despite this progress, gaps remain. Few studies empirically measure how intersectionality affects access to legal remedies, education, or employment. Moreover, while NALSA and subsequent jurisprudence provide a constitutional foundation, implementation at the grassroots remains fragmented. Future research must, therefore, not only document inequality but also examine how intersecting social markers mediate the effectiveness of legal protections.



In sum, the existing literature collectively suggests that transgender and LGBT inclusion in India cannot be achieved through law alone. It requires a reconceptualization of justice that acknowledges how identity, power, and poverty interact — precisely the intersectional insight that Atrey (2024) positions as the next frontier of human rights scholarship.

## SOCIAL STIGMA

Stigma remains the most enduring obstacle to transgender equality in India. Despite progressive court rulings and statutory reforms, the lived realities of transgender individuals are still marked by exclusion, discrimination, and invisibility. Prejudice often begins within the family, where non-conformity is perceived as dishonor, forcing many transgender youth into early displacement. This familial rejection pushes them toward *Hijra gharanas*, which, though providing safety and community, also reinforce social segregation.

Raja and Khan (2025) found that 52% of transgender respondents reported identity mismatches in official documents, while nearly one-fifth faced direct discrimination in financial institutions. Such exclusion is systemic, not incidental. It reflects what Atrey (2024) terms *intersectional discrimination* — a phenomenon where multiple identities (gender, caste, class, religion) overlap to create distinct forms of disadvantage. For instance, a Dalit transgender woman experiences compounded marginalization — not merely as a transgender person but also as a member of a historically oppressed caste.

Atrey (2024) argues that mainstream legal frameworks often isolate gender identity from other social determinants, overlooking how layered inequalities reinforce vulnerability. This intersectional invisibility explains why transgender persons from lower socio-economic backgrounds face greater barriers to education, healthcare, and justice than their upper-caste counterparts.

In healthcare, many transgender persons continue to face denial of treatment or are coerced into undergoing “corrective” procedures. Even where hospitals claim inclusivity, binary data systems and untrained personnel undermine accessibility (Bhargava et al., 2024). Similarly, in education, rigid uniform codes, gendered restrooms, and bullying lead to dropout rates exceeding 50%.

Atrey (2024) underscores that dismantling stigma requires dismantling hierarchies not only gender-based but also caste-based and class-based. Without intersectional recognition, inclusion remains superficial. The law may proclaim equality, but inequality thrives in the shadows of social structure.

## OVERVIEW OF THE TRANSGENDER PROTECTION ACT, 2019

The Transgender Persons (Protection of Rights) Act, 2019 was enacted to operationalize the rights recognized in NALSA. It prohibits discrimination in education,

employment, healthcare, and public services. It mandates the establishment of the National Council for Transgender Persons and directs governments to provide welfare schemes, vocational training, and social security.

While progressive in spirit, the Act has faced widespread criticism. Its most contentious provision requires transgender persons to obtain a “certificate of identity” from a district magistrate to be legally recognized. This bureaucratic gatekeeping undermines the principle of self-identification affirmed in NALSA and the Yogyakarta Principles (2006).

The Act’s punishment for offenses against transgender persons imprisonment up to two years is disproportionately lenient compared to penalties for similar crimes against cisgender women. It also fails to address critical issues such as access to healthcare, gender-affirming surgery, and protection from police violence (Bhargava et al., 2024).

Nevertheless, the Act has enabled some administrative progress. The *SMILE* program (2022) and *Garima Greh* initiative have provided shelter and livelihood training to transgender individuals. Yet, without systemic reform, these remain isolated efforts rather than transformative policy. For the Act to fulfill its promise, implementation must align with constitutional morality prioritizing autonomy and dignity over administrative control.

## LEGAL STATUTES AND JUDICIAL PRECEDENTS

The Indian constitutional and legal system has undergone a significant shift in its approach to gender and sexuality moving from silence and moralistic control to recognition and protection. This transformation has been driven largely by the judiciary, which has emerged as the moral custodian of equality and dignity when the legislature and executive have faltered.

### 7.1 NALSA v. Union of India (2014): The Foundational Shift

The National Legal Services Authority (NALSA) v. Union of India judgment was revolutionary because it recognized, for the first time, that gender identity is integral to human dignity and personal autonomy. The Supreme Court declared that transgender persons are entitled to constitutional protections under Articles 14 (equality before law), 15 (non-discrimination), 19 (freedom of expression), and 21 (right to life and personal liberty).

The Court acknowledged that biological sex is not determinative of gender and emphasized self-identification as a core aspect of individual freedom. Justice K.S. Radhakrishnan observed that “gender identity is one of the most fundamental aspects of life, which refers to a person’s intrinsic sense of being male, female, or transgender.” Importantly, the Court drew upon international human rights standards such as the Yogyakarta Principles (2006) and the UN Human Rights Council Resolution 17/19 (2011).

The judgment directed both the Union and State

Governments to recognize transgender persons as a “third gender” and implement measures for their socio-economic inclusion — including reservations in education and employment, and access to separate public toilets. NALSA thus laid the constitutional foundation for transgender rights, reframing the discourse from pathology to personhood.

### 7.2 Navtej Singh Johar v. Union of India (2018): Sexual Autonomy and Dignity

While NALSA established the right to gender identity, Navtej Singh Johar v. Union of India (2018) expanded the framework of sexual autonomy. By decriminalizing consensual same-sex relations, the Supreme Court struck down Section 377 of the Indian Penal Code, calling it “irrational, indefensible, and manifestly arbitrary.”

The Court’s reasoning was grounded in constitutional morality — the principle that the Constitution, not social prejudice, must guide governance. Justice D.Y. Chandrachud eloquently stated that “societal morality cannot dictate constitutional rights.” Together, NALSA and Navtej Johar create a holistic understanding of identity: NALSA affirms the right to define oneself; Navtej Johar affirms the right to love whom one chooses.

### 7.3 Arunkumar and Sreeja v. Inspector General of Registration (2019): Marriage and Personhood

The Madras High Court’s judgment in Arunkumar and Sreeja v. Inspector General of Registration (2019) broke new ground by recognizing the right of a transgender woman to marry under the Hindu Marriage Act. The Court interpreted the term “bride” to include a trans woman, asserting that “any interpretation of the term which excludes transgender persons would violate constitutional morality.” This case is significant not only for its affirmation of marital rights but also for extending the scope of personal laws to include gender minorities.

### 7.4 Legislative Framework: The Transgender Persons (Protection of Rights) Act, 2019

Enacted to operationalize NALSA, the Transgender Persons (Protection of Rights) Act, 2019 was intended as a statutory milestone. It prohibits discrimination in education, employment, healthcare, housing, and public services. The Act establishes the National Council for Transgender Persons and mandates welfare schemes for inclusion.

However, it has been criticized for contradicting NALSA’s principle of self-identification. The requirement of a “certificate of identity” from a district magistrate creates bureaucratic gatekeeping and subjects individuals to state scrutiny. The Act’s definition of “transgender person” also conflates gender identity with intersex variation, blurring crucial distinctions (CLPR, 2020).

### 7.5 Comparative Jurisdictions

India’s progress mirrors — yet diverges from — other jurisdictions:

Argentina’s Gender Identity Law (2012) allows

individuals to change gender on official documents through self-declaration, without medical or judicial approval (Aristegui et al., 2017).

Nepal (2015) constitutionally recognized “third gender” persons and extended them full citizenship rights.

Germany and Malta have adopted explicit protections for intersex persons, banning non-consensual surgeries on infants.

Compared to these, India’s framework remains transitional — progressive in vision but hesitant in execution. The legal milestones exist; what remains is faithful implementation and societal transformation.

## SUGGESTIONS AND MEASURES

Ensuring that transgender rights transcend the paper promise of law requires sustained, multi-dimensional interventions that bridge policy, culture, and everyday governance. The following measures, grounded in constitutional values and international best practices, seek to make equality tangible and lived.

### 8.1 Legislative and Administrative Reforms

*Adopt Self-Identification as Legal Standard:* Amend the Transgender Persons Act to remove the certification requirement and allow individuals to self-declare gender identity on all official documents.

*Uniform Policy Framework:* Create a national policy to harmonize state-level rules, ensuring uniform access to education, healthcare, and welfare benefits.

*Reservation Policy:* Operationalize NALSA’s directive for reservations in public employment and education for transgender persons, recognizing their historical disadvantage.

*Gender-Neutral Drafting:* Amend laws such as the Indian Penal Code, Code of Criminal Procedure, and Evidence Act to replace gendered terms like “man” and “woman” with inclusive terminology (“person” or “individual”).

### 8.2 Education and Awareness

*Curricular Inclusion:* Integrate gender and sexuality studies into school and university curricula.

*Teacher Sensitization:* Establish training programs for teachers to handle gender diversity sensitively and prevent bullying of transgender students.

*Scholarships and Hostels:* Expand the Ministry of Social Justice’s Garima Greh program into educational scholarships, hostels, and mentoring networks for transgender students.

### 8.3 Healthcare Reforms

*Dedicated Gender Clinics:* Each state should establish gender-affirming healthcare centers staffed by trained professionals in endocrinology, psychology, and surgery.

*Insurance Inclusion:* Mandate that all government and private insurance schemes cover gender-affirming procedures and hormonal therapy.

*Medical Ethics Reform:* Ban non-consensual surgeries on intersex infants and institute medical ethics guidelines emphasizing bodily autonomy.

#### 8.4 Economic Empowerment

*Targeted Financial Inclusion:* Simplify KYC norms for transgender individuals by allowing self-declared gender identity.

*Skill Development:* Integrate transgender persons into government skill development programs such as PM Kaushal Vikas Yojana.

*Corporate Inclusion:* Mandate diversity hiring targets for public and private enterprises, akin to gender and disability quotas.

*Entrepreneurship Support:* Provide microfinance loans and incubation support for transgender-led startups, as recommended by Raja & Khan (2025).

#### 8.5 Law Enforcement and Justice Access

*Sensitization Training:* Introduce compulsory gender-sensitivity modules for police, judiciary, and administrative officers.

*Legal Aid Cells:* Establish dedicated transgender legal aid centers under the National Legal Services Authority (NALSA).

*Stronger Punitive Measures:* Enhance penalties for hate crimes and gender-based violence against transgender persons, ensuring parity with those against cisgender women.

#### 8.6 Media and Cultural Transformation

*Responsible Representation:* Encourage inclusive media portrayals that depict transgender individuals as professionals, leaders, and citizens, not stereotypes.

*Public Awareness Campaigns:* Launch national campaigns — similar to *Beti Bachao, Beti Padhao* — focusing on transgender dignity and equality.

*Community Dialogues:* Facilitate conversations between religious leaders, educators, and community elders to align social morality with constitutional morality.

#### 8.7 Participatory Governance

True empowerment requires representation. Transgender persons should be part of decision-making at every level — from municipal committees to parliamentary consultative groups. Civil society organizations and

government must collaborate as equal partners, not as benefactors and beneficiaries.

As Bhargava et al. (2024) note, policies designed for transgender people must be informed by transgender voices. Consultation ensures that reforms address lived realities rather than bureaucratic assumptions.

## CONCLUSION

India's transgender movement is not merely a legal or political struggle — it is a moral awakening. The arc of history, from ancient recognition to colonial criminalization and modern rights-based restoration, reveals both the resilience of the community and the inertia of institutions.

While the judiciary has taken bold steps to affirm constitutional morality, the translation of these judgments into policy and practice remains uneven. The Transgender Persons (Protection of Rights) Act, 2019, despite its symbolic importance, still carries the remnants of paternalism — reflecting a state that recognizes difference but struggles to trust it. The ongoing challenge is to transform legal recognition into social normalization.

Dismantling gender binaries requires three concurrent transformations:

*Legal Transformation:* to ensure laws align with self-identification and substantive equality.

*Institutional Transformation:* to reform bureaucracies, police, schools, and hospitals so they treat transgender individuals with respect and fairness.

*Cultural Transformation:* to challenge the prejudices that sustain exclusion and to foster empathy across social divides.

The journey beyond binaries is ultimately a journey toward human wholeness. It calls for society to see identity not as deviation but as diversity, not as threat but as truth.

As India aspires to global leadership in democracy and human rights, its moral standing will depend on how it treats its most marginalized citizens. The promise of equality enshrined in the Constitution can only be fulfilled when every individual regardless of gender identity can live without fear, stigma, or erasure.

Beyond gender binaries lies not chaos, but possibility a more just, humane, and inclusive India where dignity is not conditional and freedom is not gendered.

## REFERENCES

1. Arístegui, I., et al. (2017). Gender identity law in Argentina: A model for self-determination. *Journal of Human Rights*, 16(2), 156–170.
2. Atrey, I. (2024, December 6). Navigating the intersectionality of LGBT rights: Perspectives from gender, race, and socioeconomic status in India

(SSRN Scholarly Paper No. 5046204). Social Science Research Network. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.5046204>

3. Bhargava, D. C., Meshram, V. P., Shekhawat, R. S., & Kanchan, T. (2024). Evolution of transgender rights in India: Better late than never. *Behavioral Sciences & the Law*, 42(6), 653–661.
4. Centre for Law and Policy Research (CLPR). (2020). *Beyond the Binary: Advocating Legal Recognition for Intersex Persons in India*. CLPR &

- Solidarity Foundation.
5. Government of India. (2019). *The Transgender Persons (Protection of Rights) Act*.
  6. Government of India. (2022). *Support for Marginalized Individuals for Livelihood and Enterprise (SMILE) Program*. Ministry of Social Justice and Empowerment.
  7. Madras High Court. (2019). *Arunkumar & Sreeja v. Inspector General of Registration, W.P. (MD) No. 4125/2019*.
  8. Raja, R., & Khan, M. A. (2025). Beyond binaries: Determinants and impediments of financial inclusion among transgender individuals in Delhi-NCR, India. *Social Sciences & Humanities Open*, 12(101878).
  9. Supreme Court of India. (2014). *National Legal Services Authority v. Union of India, W.P. (Civil) No. 400/2012*.
  10. Supreme Court of India. (2018). *Navtej Singh Johar v. Union of India, W.P. (Criminal) No. 76/2016*.
  11. Yogyakarta Principles. (2006). *Principles on the application of international human rights law in relation to sexual orientation and gender identity*.
  12. Bhattacharya, S. (2022). 'Transgender Persons (Protection of Rights) Act' of India: Achievements and Failures. *Journal of Law and Social Policy*, 15(2), 45–67. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.9555747>
  13. Goitiandia, S. W. (2024). Beyond the Bench: LGBTQ+ Health Equity after India's 'No' to Same-Sex Marriage. *Journal of Health Policy and Law*, 47(2), 123–145. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhl.2024.07.001>.
  14. Bakshi, A. (2024). Promoting LGBTQIA+ Rights in India: A Public Health Perspective. *The Lancet Psychiatry*, 11(5), 345–347. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S2215-0366\(24\)00135-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2215-0366(24)00135-4)