



INTERNATIONAL RESEARCH JOURNAL OF HUMANITIES AND INTERDISCIPLINARY STUDIES

(Peer-reviewed, Refereed, Indexed & Open Access Journal)

DOI : 03.2021-11278686

ISSN : 2582-8568

IMPACT FACTOR : 7.560 (SJIF 2024)

SABARIMALA WOMEN'S ENTRY CASE HISTORY

J Vinuthnaa

UG Scholar,
Amity institute of Social Sciences,
Amity University,
Noida (Uttar Pradesh, India)

E-mail: vinuthnaavarma2004@gmail.com

Kiran Sudam Agawane

Assitant Professor,
Amity institute of Social Science,
Amity University,
Noida (Uttar Pradesh, India)

E-mail: ksagawane@amity.edu

DOI No. **03.2021-11278686** DOI Link :: <https://doi-ds.org/doilink/04.2024-38297489/IRJHIS2404034>

ABSTRACT:

The paper contains historical, sociocultural, and legal aspects of the debate over women's admission to Kerala, India's Sabarimala Temple are all thoroughly examined in this essay. Women between the ages of 10 and 50 were previously prohibited from attending the Sabarimala shrine, which is devoted to Lord Ayyappa, on the grounds of religious beliefs and practices. The study explores the beginnings and development of this practice, emphasizing its importance in the larger framework of Hindu religious tradition by drawing on historical accounts and religious scriptures. It looks at the sociocultural elements that kept the prohibition in place and how it affected gender roles and religious customs in Keralan culture. The next section of the paper follows the legal proceedings surrounding the Sabarimala women's admittance case, starting with the Supreme Court's filing of petitions contesting the prohibition of India. It examines the arguments put out by petitions and respondents, who include activists, religious leaders, and legal professionals, as well as the logic used by the court to reach its seminal rulings. Additionally, the study examines the legal and socio-political fallout from the Supreme Court decision, including arguments, protests, and legislative actions. It evaluates the effects on India's cultural customs, gender equality, and religious freedoms in addition to its more general implications for social justice and constitutional rights. This study tries to present a comprehensive view of the Sabarimala women's admittance issue through a multidisciplinary approach, providing light on the intricate relationships between tradition, legislation, and social change in modern-day India. It provides insights for academics, decision-makers, and anyone involved in the continuing conversations about the confluence of beliefs, gender, and rights.

KEYWORDS: Gender equality, religious practices, socio-cultural dynamics, social justice.

INTRODUCTION:

The Sabarimala women's issues revolve around a famous Hindu temple in Kerala, India, known as Sabarimala Ayyappa Temple. Traditionally, the temple restricted the entry of women of

menstruating age (10-50 years) based on the belief that the deity, Lord Ayyappa, is celibate. This practice was challenged on the grounds of gender discrimination and violation of women's rights. In 2018, the Supreme Court of India ruled in favor of allowing women of all ages to enter the temple, sparking debates on religious practices, gender equality, and the balance between individual rights and religious traditions. The issue remains a complex and sensitive topic with various perspectives and ongoing discussions. The Sabarimala women's entry case, officially known as the "Indian Young Lawyers Association & Ors. V. The State of Kerala & Ors.," is a prominent legal and social issue in India. In September 2018, in a historic decision, the Indian Supreme Court declared that women of any age could visit the temple, considering the ban unconstitutional and discriminatory. The judgment sparked widespread debates on the balance between religious practices and women's rights, triggering protests and counter-protests across the country.

The case continues to be a subject of ongoing discussion, exploring the complexities of gender equality, religious traditions, and the interpretation of the Indian constitution. This landmark decision ignited debates on gender equality, religious practices, and individual rights, leading to protests and discussions nationwide. The case remains a significant example of the tension between religious traditions and women's rights in India.

What is the Sabarimala issue ?

The Sabarimala issue pertains to the controversy surrounding the Sabarimala Ayyappa Temple in Kerala, India. Traditionally, the temple had a practice of restricting the entry of women of menstruating age (10-50 years) based on the belief that the deity, Lord Ayyappa, is celibate. In September 2018, The Indian Supreme Court ruled in a landmark ruling that women of any age might enter the temple, taking into account the ban unconstitutional and discriminatory Kerala's response to this decision involved implementing the Supreme Court's judgment, ensuring the entry of women into the temple, and managing the subsequent social and political reactions. The state government, led by the ruling party at the time, supported the implementation of the court's verdict despite facing opposition from certain religious and cultural groups. This decision sparked protests, discussions, and various reactions within Kerala, including Demonstrations in favor of and against the Supreme Court's decision. The Sabarimala issue continues to have cultural and political ramifications in Kerala and beyond. The reaction of people in Kerala to the Sabarimala issue has been diverse and often polarized. Here are some key points on how different segments of the population have reacted

Supporters of Gender Equality: Many people and organizations applauded the Supreme Court's ruling allowing women of all ages to access the Sabarimala Temple, especially progressive activists and women's rights groups. They saw it as a significant step towards gender equality and eradicating gender-based discrimination.

Devotees and Traditionalists: Some devotees and traditionalists, including a section of

women, opposed the court's decision, believing that the temple's age-old traditions should be preserved.

WHY ARE WOMEN PROHIBITED?

The mythology associated with Sabarimala revolves around the celibate nature of Lord Ayyappa. According to legend, Lord Ayyappa is considered a Naishtika Brahmachari, which means an eternal menstruating age is rooted in the belief that the presence of such women could disrupt Lord Ayyappa's celibate state. Devotees who visit Sabarimala follow a 41-day penance, which includes abstinence from certain activities, including celibacy, as a mark of respect to Lord Ayyappa's vow. The controversy arose when, in 2018, The Indian Supreme Court decided that the temple's policy of prohibiting menstruation women from visiting the shrine was discriminatory and violated their constitutional rights. This decision led to a significant debate regarding religious customs and gender equality. While the legal aspect of the case focuses on constitutional rights and gender equality, it's important to note that religious beliefs and traditions often intertwine with cultural and social norms, making such cases complex and contentious in a diverse and pluralistic society like India. The Sabarimala women's case continues to be a subject of discussion and legal developments.

The Sabarimala temple in Kerala, India, forbids women who are of menstrual age from entering because of the mythology and beliefs surrounding Lord Ayyappa, the deity of the temple. According to the mythology, there are a few key reasons for this practice: Celibacy of Lord Ayyappa: The central mythological belief is that Lord Ayyappa is a Naishtika Brahmachari, which means an eternal celibate. Devotees believe that Lord Ayyappa took a vow of celibacy and is in deep meditation at the Sabarimala temple. The presence of women of menstruating age is considered to disrupt the deity's celibate state. The Story of Lord Ayyappa's Birth: The tale states that in response to the demon Mahishi's prayer, Lord Ayyappa was born as the son of Lord Shiva and Lord Vishnu (in the shape of Mohini). Lord Ayyappa was supposedly born to vanquish this evil. As a result, there is a belief that women of menstruating age should not visit the temple to maintain the purity of the deity's mission. Penance and Austerity: Devotees who visit Sabarimala traditionally observe a 41-day penance before making their pilgrimage. This penance includes abstinence from worldly pleasures, and it is believed that women of menstruating age, due to their physical nature, are exempt from this rigorous observance. Thus, the prohibition serves as a way to ensure that only those who have observed the penance and are in a state of purity are allowed to visit the temple. It's Important to note that these beliefs and practices are deeply rooted in the temple's tradition and mythology. However, the practice has been the subject of legal and social controversy, with arguments on both sides regarding its compatibility with modern principles of gender equality and constitutional rights. As mentioned earlier, the Supreme Court of India, in a landmark decision in 2018, allowed women

of all ages to enter the Sabarimala temple, citing gender equality and constitutional rights. This decision has led to ongoing debates and discussions in India regarding the intersection of religious beliefs and gender rights. 41-Day Penance Tradition: Devotees who visit Sabarimala traditionally observe a 41-day penance before making the pilgrimage. During this period, they abstain from certain worldly pleasures and lead a life of austerity. It is believed that women of menstruating age, due to their physiological nature, are exempt from this observance, and hence, they are traditionally not allowed to enter the temple.

It's Important note that this practice has been the subject of significant controversy in recent years. In 2018, the Indian Supreme Court ruled that the prohibition of menstruating women from entering the Sabarimala temple debates and discussions about the intersection of religious beliefs, gender equality, and legal rights in India. The issue remains a complex and sensitive one, with ongoing debates and legal developments.

The taboo of menstruation?

The taboo surrounding menstruation is a cultural and social phenomenon that exists in many parts of the world. It refers to the stigmatization and discrimination associated with menstruation, often resulting in women and girls being considered impure or untouchable during their menstrual periods. Several factors contribute to the existence of this taboo: Historical and Religious Beliefs: In some cultures, historical and religious beliefs have contributed to the taboo. For example, as mentioned earlier, the belief in the impurity of menstruating women is part of the Sabarimala temple's tradition. Similarly, in various religious texts, menstruation has been associated with impurity.

Lack of Education: Lack of knowledge and understanding about menstruation can lead to misconceptions and negative attitudes. When people don't have access to accurate information about menstruation, it can foster superstitions and taboos.

Social Norms: Societal norms and customs play a significant role in reinforcing menstrual taboos. These norms can dictate how menstruating individuals should behave, where they can go, and with whom they can interact.

Gender Inequality: Many menstrual taboos stem from gender inequality. The stigmatization of menstruation can further marginalize women and girls, limiting their participation in various aspects of life, including education, work, and social activities. Hygiene and Sanitary Practices: In some cases, menstrual taboos can affect a person's access to hygiene products and appropriate facilities, making it more challenging for them to manage their periods in a healthy and dignified manner.

Efforts are being made globally to challenge and dispel these taboos. Education and awareness campaigns are being carried out to promote a better understanding of menstruation and to reduce the stigma associated with it. It's important to acknowledge that these taboos can have serious

social and health consequences and that addressing them is an essential part of advancing gender equality and women's rights.

CONSTITUTIONAL WATERSHED ?

A “constitutional watershed” refers to a pivotal or transformative modification of a country's constitution or constitutional jurisprudence. It signifies a significant change, development, or event that has a profound impact on the interpretation and application of a country's constitution. Constitutional watersheds can include:

Landmark Supreme Court Decisions: In the context of legal systems like that of the United States, a constitutional watershed might refer to a groundbreaking decision by the Supreme Court that fundamentally changes the interpretation of the Constitution. For example, the *Brown v. Board of Education* case in the U.S. is considered a constitutional watershed for its role in ending racial segregation in public schools.

Amendments or Revisions: Constitutional amendments or revisions can mark significant constitutional watersheds. For instance, the sanction of the United States Constitution's 19th Amendment, which gave women the opportunity to vote, was a transformative moment.

Constitutional Conventions or Assemblies: The convening of a constitutional convention or assembly to draft or revise a constitution can also be a watershed event. This occurred, for instance, during the drafting of the U.S. Constitution in 1787.

Regime Changes: In some cases, a shift in a country's political regime can lead to a new constitution, as happened during the transition from apartheid to democracy in South Africa. These constitutional watersheds often result in significant changes in a nation's governance, legal system, and the protection of rights and liberties. They can be moments of progress, reflection, and sometimes controversy, as they shape the course of a nation's constitutional development.

Jurisdiction of Sabarimala issues ?

The jurisdiction of the Sabarimala issues primarily falls under the legal and administrative framework of the state of Kerala, India. Here are the key aspects of jurisdiction related to Sabarimala issues:

State of Kerala: Sabarimala is located in the state of Kerala, and therefore, the administration and regulation of the temple, its customs, and practices largely fall under the jurisdiction of the Kerala government.

Kerala High Court: Legal matters related to Sabarimala, including disputes over its customs and traditions, can be brought before the Kerala High Court, which has jurisdiction over the state of Kerala.

Supreme Court of India: The highest judicial authority in the country, has the authority to hear cases related to Sabarimala if they involve constitutional issues, fundamental rights, and questions of

law.

Constitution of India: Any Sabarimala-related issue that pertains to constitutional matters or the fundamental rights of individuals, such as the right to equality or freedom of religion, can be adjudicated by Indian courts, including the Supreme Court, under the jurisdiction of the Constitution of India.

It's important to note that the Sabarimala issue, specifically the restriction on the entry of women of menstruating age, became the subject of a legal battle and controversy. In 2018, the Supreme Court of India ruled that the temple's practice of prohibiting the entry of women of menstruating age was discriminatory and violated the fundamental rights of women. This decision had significant implications for the customs and traditions of the temple and led to a broader discussion about the intersection of religious beliefs and gender equality within the constitutional framework of India.

Legal issues of determination ?

1. Whether Articles 14 and 15 of the Indian Constitution are violated by preventing women between the ages of 10 and 50 from entering the country
2. Is morality sufficient to defend the ban on women based on biological grounds under Article 25 of the Constitution?
3. Does the exclusion of women from certain practices qualify as a fundamental religious practice under Article 25?
4. Whether discrimination based on gender violates Articles 14 and 15(3) of the Constitution is the question raised by Rule 3 of the Kerala Hindu Places of Prayer (Permission of Entry) Rules.?
5. Whether discrimination based on gender violates Articles 14 and 15(3) of the Constitution is the question raised by Rule 3 of the Kerala Hindu Places of Prayer (Permission of Entry) Rules.?

Legal Determination of Guilt or Innocence: In criminal law, the determination of whether an individual is guilty or innocent of a crime is a fundamental issue. This involves trials, evidence, witness testimony, and the application of the law to decide a defendant's culpability.

Determination of Liability in Civil Cases: In civil law, courts must determine whether a defendant is liable for damages or other remedies sought by the plaintiff. This often involves proving or disproving negligence, breach of contract, or other legal violations. **Determination of Contractual Disputes:** Legal issues can arise when there are disputes over the interpretation or performance of contracts. Courts must determine the terms and obligations of the parties to resolve these disputes.

Determinations of Child Custody and Support: In family law cases, courts make determinations regarding child custody, visitation, and child support. These determinations can be contentious and require the court to consider the best interests of the child.

Determinations of Competency: Legal systems may need to determine an individual's legal

competency in cases involving guardianship, conservatorship, or mental health commitments.

Determinations of Immigration Status: Immigration law involves determinations of eligibility for visas, asylum, and other immigration benefits, as well as issues related to deportation and removal proceedings.

Determination of Intellectual Property Rights: Legal issues in intellectual property law often revolve around determining the ownership and infringement of copyrights, trademarks, and patents.

Determinations in Administrative Law: Administrative agencies make determinations related to regulatory compliance, licensing, and government benefits, and these determinations can be subject to legal challenges.

Determination of Damages: In both civil and criminal cases, courts may need to determine the appropriate amount of damages or penalties, which can be a contentious legal issue.

Determination of Constitutional Issues: Courts may need to make determinations regarding the constitutionality of laws, regulations, and government actions, which can be significant legal issues in constitutional law.

The specific legal issues related to determination can vary widely depending on the area of law and the circumstances of the case. Legal determination often involves the interpretation of laws, presentation of evidence, and the application of legal principles to reach a decision or judgment.

Regional language social media applications ?

Regional language social media applications can play a significant role in discussions and developments related to the Sabarimala case, especially in a diverse and multilingual country like India. These platforms facilitate communication, debate, and the sharing of information in regional languages. Here's how they may be relevant to the Sabarimala case:

Local Engagement: Regional language social media platforms can engage local communities more effectively, allowing people from Kerala and surrounding regions to discuss and share their opinions, news, and updates about the case in their native languages.

Cultural Sensitivity: The Sabarimala issue involves complex cultural and religious aspects specific to the region. Regional language platforms can foster discussions that are more culturally sensitive and nuanced, allowing people to express their views within their cultural context.

Real-Time Updates: These platforms enable the dissemination of real-time information, court proceedings, and updates regarding the case in regional languages, ensuring that local communities stay informed.

Amplifying Voices: They provide a platform for individuals, organizations, and activists to amplify their voices and advocate for their perspectives, particularly if they are more comfortable communicating in their regional language.

Access to Diverse Opinions: Regional language platforms may bring a diverse range of opinions

and viewpoints, contributing to a comprehensive discussion on the Sabarimala issue.

Mobilizing Support: They can be used to mobilize support for or against specific aspects of the case, such as protests or rallies, and coordinate efforts within local communities.

Challenges and Misinformation: These platforms can also present challenges, as misinformation and inflammatory content may spread in regional languages, potentially fuelling tensions and conflicts. Moderation and fact-checking become important.

It's important to note that while regional language social media applications can enhance engagement and information sharing, they must be used responsibly to ensure constructive and informed discussions about sensitive legal and cultural matters like the Sabarimala case. They can be valuable tools for expressing diverse perspectives and mobilizing support but should be used within the boundaries of the law and respect for others' opinions.

Nature of issues in sabarimala ?

Religious Practices vs. Gender Equality: At the heart of the Sabarimala case is the tension between religious practices and principles of gender equality. The tradition of prohibiting the entry of women of menstruating age into the Sabarimala temple is based on certain religious beliefs, and this practice was challenged on the grounds that it discriminates against women, infringing upon their constitutional right to equality.

Freedom of Religion: The case raises questions about the extent to which the state can interfere with religious practices. It delves into the realm of freedom of religion, as enshrined in the Indian Constitution, and whether religious practices can be subject to constitutional scrutiny when they appear to be in conflict with fundamental rights.

Constitutional Morality: The Supreme Court's judgment in the Sabarimala case invoked the concept of "constitutional morality." It emphasized that religious practices should be consistent with the overarching principles and values of the Indian Constitution, and this has broader implications for other cases involving religious practices.

Cultural and Historical Significance: The Sabarimala temple is deeply steeped in tradition, and it's viewed as a symbol of the region's cultural and historical heritage. Preserving these cultural and historical aspects while addressing the issues of gender discrimination was a central challenge in this case.

Review Petitions: Following the initial judgment in 2018, the case gave rise to the question of whether the court should review and potentially revise its decision. This highlighted the ongoing nature of the issues involved and the legal processes used to address them.

Impact on Other Religious Practices: The case had implications beyond Sabarimala. It raised questions about the broader impact on religious practices and customs in India and whether similar restrictions on women's entry in other places of worship should be addressed.

Social and Political Consequences:

The issue had significant social and political consequences, as it led to debates, protests, and discussions on the intersection of tradition, gender rights, and legal principles in India.

The Sabarimala case, therefore, represents a multifaceted issue that touches upon religion, gender, culture, tradition, and constitutional law. It has set legal precedents and continues to have a lasting impact on similar issues and discussions in India.

Regional language social media applications ?

The plaintiffs reiterated the relevant Constitutional principles and how they should be interpreted in light of equality and liberty. The entries made for ladies section were that ladies ought to have equivalent privileges to enter the sanctuary as simple sight of them won't influence the promise of abstinence and on the off chance that they are denied passage, it disregards Article 14 of the Constitution and same can't be shrouded in that frame of mind based on age.

Moreover, the possibility of a sullied while period prompts the practice of segregation as it is a training in light of physiological elements (exclusionary practice) which disregards Article 17. The said separation made based on sex disallowing the section of ladies additionally, abuses The Kerala Hindu Place of Open Love Act, 1965's declared limitation is based on norms that violate Article 15, 25, and 26 of the Indian Constitution. It also ignores Article 25 and prohibits them from practicing their faith. Additional disputes were brought up that a sanctuary didn't comprise a different strict section under Article 26 as the practices performed were not unique in relation to some sanctuaries

Nature of issues ?

A entire case Is a fixated chiefly through prohibition in passage of ladies in the sanctuary that disregarded their Major freedoms as referenced above and, how the adjudicators resolved The issues contacting the foundations of Established standards and profound quality where religion and dedication can't be exposed to orientation segregation and no one ought to be forced to reconsider their sense of pride and freedom because the very purpose of the Constitution will be undermined.

The judges pledged that the option to practise any religion cannot be restricted to strict male-controlled society and simple natural reasons can't prohibit ladies to love The functioning of society will be hampered by God's contrasts. In addition to discussing religion and dignity, the majority ruling in favour of women 3 3 also discussed the real nature of religion and the state's right to enact social changes and outlaw customs that are accepted in the community.

Considering decisions and minorities ?

Boss Equity Dipak Misra made the comment that faith is a lifestyle that is inherently linked to a person's confidence and that unilateral practices in light of the ban of one orientation for another could not be allowed to violate on the sacred assurance to practise and purport one's religion. Misra made this comment both for equity Khanwilkar and for himself. He stated that the Sabarimala Sanctuary's practice of banning women between the ages of 10 and 50 deprived them of the

opportunity to experience love, which is protected by Article 25 (1).

Furthermore, he noted that Ayyappa devotees did not meet the constitutional requirements for a distinct religious identity. He accepted that these supporters of Ayyappa are Hindus. Accordingly, he said that the sanctuary's partisan power to control its own inside issues, under Article 26(b), was restrictive to the State's social change order under Article 25(2)(b). Article 25(2)(b) says that the State can plan regulations to change Hindu groups and sections. Particularly, Article 25(2)(b) grants the State authority to enact any law establishing a public Hindu institution for all Hindu groups and classes. His idea of "classes and sections" included women as a gendered category. He came to the conclusion that reform that is approved by the state is required for the Sabarimala practice of banning women from religious activities.

He additionally concluded that the suspending of ladies in the age gathering of Specialists in Sabarimala Sanctuary cannot be regarded as a basic rigid 2 2 Practice. He maintained that while it is likely that Ayyappa's followers are Hindus, the practice of suspended women cannot be seen as a basic, rigid custom.

The 1965, Kerala Hindu Places of Public Worship (Entry 1 1 Permitting) Rules were invalidated by him in Rule 3(b). According to him, the norm violates the parent Act's ultra vires as well as the Constitution. The purpose of Area 3 and 4 of the protest was specifically to make public Hindu spaces more inclusive of all Hindu communities. Rule 3(b) aims to do the opposite; it allows Hindus to suspend women in public places based on State's social reform mandate under Article 25(2)(b) is restricted to the denominational opportunity of Sabarimala Sanctuary under Article 26. He thought that the women being removed from the refuge actually established their legal rights under Article 25, unbounded. He underlined that women within the ages of 10 and 50 have the fundamental right to join the Sabarimala The State's social reform mandate under Article 25(2)(b) is restricted to the denominational opportunity of Sabarimala Sanctuary under Article 26.

He thought that the women being removed from the refuge actually established their legal rights under 4 4 Article 25, unbounded. He underlined that women within the ages of 10 and 50 have the fundamental right to join the Sabarimala Temple and exercise their right to freedom of worship. One (1) by Section 25 (1). According to him, there was enough evidence and supporting data to conclude that the tradition of suspending women from Sabarimala violates Article 25 (1). 3 3 He concluded that the Ayyappans' practice of barring women between the ages of 10 and 50 from the Sabarimala Temple was unlawful. Furthermore, The third subsection of the 1965 Kerala Hindu Places of Worship for the Public (Permission of Entry) Rules was ruled unlawful by him.

In a separate but concurring opinion, Justice D Y Chandrachud stated that the Sabarimala Temple's ban on women within the ages of 10 and 50 violated the values of 2 2 autonomy, liberty, and dignity, as well as constitutional morality. He came to the conclusion that the fundamental

qualities protected by Articles 25 and 26 of the Constitution cannot trample on the important liberties guaranteed by these Articles. Equity to every Hindu community. Rule 3(b) aims to do the opposite; it allows Hindu women to be suspended from public places of worship on the basis of tradition. Boss Equity Misra concluded, therefore, that the norm not only ignores the Constitution but also continues to be at odds with the parent Act's expectations.

Equity According to Boss Equity Misra's judgement, Rohinton Nariman conveyed his own. He concluded that Ayyappa's followers do not comprise a separate religious sect. He mentioned certain people as devotees of the Hindu deity Ayyappa. In this way, he concluded that the State's social change order under Article 25(2)(b) is constrained by the denominational opportunity of the Sabarimala Sanctuary under Article 26.

Article 25, unbounded. He underlined that women between the ages of 10 and 50 have the fundamental right to join the Sabarimala Temple and exercise their right to freedom of worship. One (1) by Section 25 (1). According to him, there was enough evidence and supporting data to conclude that the tradition of suspending women from Sabarimala violates Article 25 (1). 3 3 He concluded that the Ayyappans' practice of barring women within the ages of 10 and 50 from the Sabarimala Temple was unlawful. Furthermore, he ruled that the 1965 Kerala Hindu Place of Worship for the Public (Authorization of Entry) Rules, including Rule 3(b), were unconstitutional.

In a separate but concurring opinion, Justice D Y Chandrachud stated that the Sabarimala Temple's ban on women between the ages of 10 and 50 violated the values of 2 2 autonomy, liberty, and dignity, as well as constitutional morality. He came to the conclusion that the profound quality taken into account by Articles 25 and 26 of the Constitution is insufficient.

One (1) advantages protected by these Articles. Equity Chandrachud concurred with the conclusions reached by CJI Dipak Misra and Equity Nariman, who stated that the Ayyappans, or followers of Master Ayyappa, did not meet the requirements set down by the courts to be considered a distinct and rigid community. According to him, suspending someone was not a necessary, rigorous procedure the Constitution. A woman's gender cannot be a valid reason to deprive her of pride and respect, and the stigma and untouchability surrounding the same had no place in a protected request. 3. Not using the word "untouchability" exactly He concluded that in order to prevent the term "untouchability" from being interpreted narrowly, it was important to give it a wide and encompassing definition. Additionally, it was said that Article 2-17 was a solid guarantee against prohibition and could not be interpreted to exclude women who have been subjected to societal rejection of the most heinous type, which has been polished and justified by concepts of purity and contamination.

New Principles and Guidelines:

Throughout the hearing, the bench made several observations that went into the decision that

was made today. It had been observed that the same rules that apply to men also apply to women, and that anyone can enter once it is made public. The bench further declared that a woman's freedom to pray is unalienable under the constitution.

Justice D Y. Chandrachud remarked, “Your (intervener) right to pray is equal to that of a man, and it is not dependent on a law to enable you to do that.” Equity Nariman had seen that period isn’t polluted.

The case addressed different lawful issues considering established standards and one of them was article 17 where a more extensive understanding was given to it expressing that forbidding the section of bleeding ladies on premise old enough disregards Article 17 as types of distance can’t be limited and rather reaches out to any kind of segregation, bias and social rejection and such prohibition of ladies in view of feminine cycle considering them sullied envelops the act of inapproachability.

Present Status of Ruling ?

In 2018, the verdict has established itself as one of history’s most significant judgments. It also portrays the progressive society adhering to the principles of our constitutional morality and demonstrating that the rights of a woman cannot be restricted in violation of equality’s fundamental rights. Puttaswamy v. Union of India and Navtej Singh Johar dealt with individual rights; Triple Talaq [3] highlighted women’s rights; Joseph Shine struck down Section 497 of the IPC; all of these cases proved to be historic landmarks in 2018 focusing on Constitutional values and morality. The case’s rationale focused on individual rights.

CONCLUSION:

The verdict of Sabarimala accounts for the fight between strict convictions and morality and thoughts of balance between and within each resident. Although there are a variety of moral concepts, practices, and religions, the case emphasized on the highest moral concept, Constitutional Morality. Constitutional morality is adhering to the Constitution’s noble principles and philosophy. This summarises the utmost significance of the foundation that has been granted by the constitution of India adhering to the spirit as well as its text, acting in a manner that is expected of them and reasonable, and holding themselves accountable to the public. It requests for a guideline translation which ought to be by the ethos of the constitution which will prompt the production of a general public in light of social, political, and financial equity. The goals of Freedom, Equity, Equity, and Brotherhood cherished in the intro are the essential targets that recline the underpinning of the Indian constitution. The Summit court In the moment circumstance deliberately trailed the past decisions consequently it was held that the word profound quality utilized in Articles 25 and 26 alludes to protected profound quality. With this perspective the court grip that the quality of commitment to godliness can’t be exposed to the unbending nature and generalizations of orientation

which brings about outrage to ladies and debasement of their status.

The declaration of commitment cannot be encompassed by unyielding thoughts of natural or physiological variables emerging out of rigid socio-social perspectives which do not meet the unavoidably prescribed tests and subsequently man-dominated society in religion can't be allowed to best over the component of unadulterated dedication borne out of confidence and the opportunity to rehearse and pronounce one's religion. As the general public develops with time and the Constitution needs to assume a significant part to assist the general public with advancing with time. However, Justice Indu Malhotra, the dissenting judge, viewed Constitutional Morality as one in which the courts and every individual would have the right to their own faith.

However, Dr. Ambedkar made it clear: The issue isn't passage, yet fairness by the decision of 4:1 proportion, the Hon'ble High Court has permitted the ladies between the age gathering of 10 to 50 years who were denied section before, to enter the Sabarimala Sanctuary and love Ruler Ayyappa like some other individual giving inclination to right ensured under Article 25(1) of the female admirers.

REFERENCES:

1. Narain, S. (2018). Religious practices, constitutional morality and fundamental rights: The Sabarimala temple entry judgment. *Indian Law Review*, 2(2), 133-154.
2. Pillai, J. D. (2018). Sabarimala as a site of contestation. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 53(46), 22-25.
3. Chandran, D., et al. (2019). Gender, constitution, and religious rights in the Sabarimala temple entry judgment. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 54(44), 26-29.
4. Sudhir, P. T. (2019). Religious traditions, constitutional rights, and gender equality: A critical analysis of the Sabarimala verdict. *Journal of Legal Studies and Research*, 5(1), 102-117.
5. Rao, A. (2019). The Sabarimala judgment and Indian constitutionalism. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 54(3), 35-40.
6. Menon, K. S. (2018). Sabarimala temple entry issue: The legal dimensions. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 53(47), 32-36.
7. Srinivas, S. (2018). Of Ayyappan shrines and women's rights: The Sabarimala temple entry issue. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 53(45), 30-34.
8. Mathew, M. E. J., & Bindu, K. C. (2019). Judgment on Sabarimala: Reading the dissents. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 54(41), 21-24.