Indian Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJOMR)
(Yearly, Blind Peer-Reviewed, Multidisciplinary Journal)
Home Page: https://ijomr.org

ISSN: 3048-8036 ***(Online)***
July, 2026 Vol. 3 Issue 1
Page No: 36-45

Whether The Jewish Community in India Requires a Separate Personal Law Board

Akshay Rajput
Advocate, High Court of Gujarat & LL.M. Scholar, Gokul Global University

Received:
29.05.2026

Accepted:
25.06.2026

Published:
09.07.2026

Abstract

India features a highly distinctive, pluralistic framework for personal laws, allowing different religious communities to follow their own distinct rules for marriage, divorce, inheritance, and guardianship. While Hindus, Muslims, Christians, and Parsis possess legally codified personal laws or state-recognized community boards, the Jewish community- one of India's oldest religious minorities- remains completely omitted from this regime. Settled in India for over two millennia and constitutionally recognized as a religious minority, Indian Jews observe Halakha (traditional Jewish law) in family matters. However, due to the lack of an official statutory framework or a personal law board, civil courts routinely apply default rules originally enacted for Christians, such as the Indian Succession Act, 1925 and the Divorce Act, 1869. Proving an independent customary exception is prohibitively expensive and legally volatile, forcing families to acquiesce to laws conflicting with their faith. This paper conducts a comprehensive doctrinal and comparative legal analysis, evaluating whether this legal vacuum violates minority cultural guarantees under Article 29(1) of the Indian Constitution, and assesses the feasibility of establishing a Jewish Personal Law Board vis-à-vis the Directive Principle of a Uniform Civil Code (Article 44). Incorporating legal models from Israel, the United Kingdom, and the United States, this paper argues that a voluntary, rights-compliant, and progressive Jewish Personal Law Board is constitutionally viable and essential to preserving religious liberty and legal certainty.

Keywords: *Jewish Personal Law, Halakha, Indian Constitution, Minority Rights, Personal Law Board, Legal Pluralism, Bene Israel, Cochin Jews, Baghdadi Jews, Uniform Civil Code, Gender Equality, Article 25, Article 26, Article 29, Article 14*

Introduction

Unlike many Western secular jurisdictions that advocate for a strict separation between state affairs and religious practices, the Republic of India maintains a doctrine of 'principled distance' from religion. Under this unique arrangement, the state permits major religious denominations to be governed by their respective traditional or statutory laws regarding personal and familial matters. Currently, four prominent communities possess tailored, legally recognized personal law frameworks. The Hindu community is regulated by a quartet of mid-century statutes: the Hindu Marriage Act of 1955, the Hindu Succession Act of 1956, the Hindu Adoption and Maintenance Act of 1956, and the Hindu Minority and Guardianship Act of 1956 (Hindu Marriage Act, 1955; Hindu Succession Act, 1956; Hindu Adoption and Maintenance Act, 1956; Hindu Minority and Guardianship Act, 1956). Muslims are governed under the statutory aegis of the Muslim Personal

Law (Shariat) Application Act of 1937 (Muslim Personal Law [Shariat] Application Act, 1937). Christians are subject to the Indian Christian Marriage Act of 1872 and the Divorce Act of 1869 (Indian Christian Marriage Act, 1872; Divorce Act, 1869), while the Parsi Zoroastrian community is governed by the Parsi Marriage and Divorce Act of 1936 (Parsi Marriage and Divorce Act, 1936).

Crucially, the Jewish communitydespite maintaining an unblemished, peaceful presence on the subcontinent for more than two thousand yearshas been entirely excluded from this comprehensive legal architecture. While explicitly recognized as a religious minority entitled to fundamental liberties under Articles 25 through 30 of the Constitution of India (Constitution of India, 1950, arts. 25–30), no independent statute or state-sanctioned board recognizes or administers their religious legal system, known as Halakha. This institutional vacuum produces systemic legal issues. As early as 1931, in the landmark case of In re Sarah Ezra, the Calcutta High Court definitively held that in the absence of codified legislation, Indian Jews are governed by default by the Indian Succession Act of 1925 (In re Sarah Ezra, 1931). The court clarified that special personal laws do not automatically apply to Jews in India; hence, intestate succession remains bound to Part V of the 1925 Act.

Demographically, the 2011 Census indicates that the contemporary Indian Jewish population numbers between four and five thousand individuals (Office of the Registrar General & Census Commissioner, 2011). The community is split into distinct historical, linguistic, and regional subgroups: the Bene Israel of Maharashtra (forming the largest cohort), the Baghdadi Jews of Kolkata and Mumbai, the ancient Cochin Jews of Kerala, and a smaller concentration of Bnei Menashe in Northeast India. Despite their minute population, their legal needs are profound. Because there is no official community apparatus or written code recognized by Indian courts, judicial benches uniformly fall back on Christian or general civil defaults to adjudicate family disputes (Indian Succession Act, 1925; Divorce Act, 1869).

This reliance prompts severe constitutional questions. First, does the failure to provide a separate personal law framework violate the right of a minority to conserve its distinct culture under Article 29(1)? Second, would the introduction of a new personal law board run counter to the state's directive under Article 44 to secure a Uniform Civil Code? Third, what organizational insights can India glean from the legal landscapes of Israel, the United Kingdom, and the United States, where Jewish tribunals operate seamlessly alongside secular courts?

Extant legal scholarship on personal laws in India has long suffered from a structural duopoly, focusing almost exclusively on the majority Hindu statutes and the sociopolitical dynamics of Muslim personal law, particularly post-Shah Bano and recent triple talaq disputes (Sarla Mudgal v. Union of India, 1995). Academic evaluation of smaller minorities remains relegated to the periphery. Legal scholar Flavia Agnes observes that India's personal law discourse historically marginalizes micro-minorities, treating them as mere statutory 'footnotes' rather than subjects of rigorous constitutional analysis (Agnes, 2011). Marc Galanter similarly identifies systemic judicial inconsistencies in how courts apply religious versus territorial succession laws to communities that fall outside the Hindu-Muslim binary, inducing profound legal unpredictability (Galanter, 1989).

ISSN: 3048-8036 *(Online)*
July, 2026 Vol. 3 Issue 1
Page No: 36-45

Historical Background and Traditional Legal Practices

Waves of Migration and Regional Subgroups

The history of the Jewish diaspora in India is uniquely characterized by a total absence of anti-Semitism; unlike their European counterparts who suffered systemic persecution, forced conversions, pogroms, and expulsion, Indian Jews thrived under the patronage of local rulers (Katz, 2016). This secure environment fundamentally influenced their legal evolution. Free from defensive insularity, their legal traditions grew naturally through organic interaction with the surrounding socio-cultural environment. The population comprises four primary sub-groups:

- **The Bene Israel:** Settled along the Konkan coast of Maharashtra around 175 BCE following a historic shipwreck (Isenberg, 1988). Over generations, they integrated deeply into local structures, adopting the Marathi language and assimilating certain cultural traits, yet strictly preserving fundamental tenets of Judaism such as the Sabbath, male circumcision (Brit Milah), and dietary laws (Kashrut) (Solomon, 2014).
- **The Cochin Jews:** Established in Kerala around the first century CE, with traditions linking their origin to King Solomon's mercantile expeditions (Sassoon, 1932). The Hindu Maharajas of Cochin granted them royal copper plates (charters) that bestowed extensive autonomous administrative and judicial privileges, permitting them to resolve internal civil and marital disputes according to Jewish law (Sassoon, 1932). They later bifurcated into Malabari, Paradesi, and Meshuchrarim factions.
- **The Baghdadi Jews:** Arriving in the 18th and 19th centuries from Iraq, Syria, and Iran, they established vibrant mercantile hubs in Bombay and Calcutta. Highly anglicized under British colonial administration, they routinely favored English-medium education and corporate structures, and increasingly brought their family disputes directly before British civil courts rather than rabbinical authorities.
- **The Bnei Menashe:** Residing in Manipur and Mizoram, they identify as descendants of the Lost Tribe of Menashe and began formalizing their return to normative Orthodox Jewish religious and legal practices during the late 20th century.

Halakha in Family Matters: Marriage, Divorce, and Succession

Halakha represents a totalizing legal system comprising biblical commandments (Torah), rabbinic interpretations (Talmud), and compiled legal codes (Elon, 1994). In family matters, it institutes precise requirements. A valid Jewish marriage requires a bilateral civil contract and a religious ritual performed under a canopy (chuppah), where the groom delivers an object of value to the bride (Biale, 2001). The terms are codified in a prenuptial deed known as the ketubah, which delineates the husband's financial obligations toward his wife during the marriage and stipulates monetary protection upon divorce or widowhood.

Conversely, classical Halakhic divorce contains structural gender asymmetries that present modern constitutional challenges. A marriage can only be dissolved under Jewish law when the husband voluntarily issues a bill of divorce, known as a 'get', to the wife (Irshai, 2006). Without the execution of a get, the woman is deemed an agunah (a chained woman), preventing her from legally contractually re-marrying within the faith. Should she form a subsequent union without a get, any offspring are labeled 'mamzerim' (illegitimate) and face extensive religious and marital exclusions (Broyde, 2009). While global Jewish communities have designed innovative mechanismssuch as financial penalties embedded in prenuptial agreements and retroactive

rabbinical annulmentsthe agunah dilemma remains a central concern in traditional Orthodox jurisprudence (The Holy Bible, Book of Numbers).

In matters of succession, biblical laws outlined in the Book of Numbers structurally prioritize agnatic lines, decreeing that an estate descends primarily to sons, failing which it passes to daughters, and subsequently to male collateral relatives (Solomon, 2016). A widow does not possess automatic intestate inheritance rights, but holds a prioritized charge against the estate for maintenance and her ketubah value. To circumvent these rigid biblical defaults, global and Indian Jewish communities historically adopted the tzava'ah (a religious will) or relied on local variations. Among the Bene Israel, for example, customary practices emerged that permitted daughters to receive an equitable portion of parental property alongside sons, demonstrating the adaptive capacity of Jewish custom when operating in a pluralistic milieu (Elon, 1994).

Research Objectives

1. To examine the existing legal framework of personal laws in India and identify the statutory vacuum concerning the Indian Jewish community.
2. To analyze the historical evolution, sub-groups, and traditional applications of Halakha (Jewish Law) regarding family matters within the Indian diaspora.
3. To evaluate the constitutional validity of establishing a separate Jewish Personal Law Board under the guarantees of minority rights (Articles 14, 25, 26, and 29) vis-à-vis the Directive Principle of a Uniform Civil Code (Article 44).
4. To analyze international models of religious adjudication (Israel, the United Kingdom, and the United States) to determine a viable legal framework for India.
5. To propose a structured, rights-compliant, and voluntary arbitration-based model for a Jewish Personal Law Board under the Indian legal system.

Legal Framework: Colonial Legacy and Constitutional Developments

Position Under Colonial Law

The British East India Company and the subsequent imperial administration instituted a system of adducing personal laws based on religious identity. However, while substantial statutory energy was expended on codifying Hindu and Muslim rules, the colonial judiciary faced an analytical hurdle regarding micro-minorities. Ultimately, the British courts adopted a residual approach: any religious community lacking a distinct, comprehensive code recognized by the State would be grouped under the general civil default laws applicable to Europeans, Christians, and other non-Hindus. Consequently, the Indian Succession Act of 1925 became the default statutory mechanism governing Jewish inheritance (Indian Succession Act, 1925).

This position was absolute. In the defining case of In re Sarah Ezra (1931), the Calcutta High Court was tasked with distributing the estate of a Jewish woman who died intestate. The propounders argued for the application of Halakhic rules. Rejecting this plea, the High Court ruled that Indian Jews are strictly governed by Part V of the Indian Succession Act, 1925 (In re Sarah Ezra, 1931). The bench underscored that unless a litigant could satisfy a high standard of proof showing a continuous, ancient, and certain custom that superseded territorial law, the statutory civil default would prevail. Similarly, in matrimonial disputes, colonial judges routinely applied the provisions of the Divorce Act of 1869 to Jewish couples, notwithstanding its explicitly Christian origins and

ISSN: 3048-8036 *(Online)*
July, 2026 Vol. 3 Issue 1
Page No: 36-45

terminology (Derrett, 1970).

Position Under the Indian Constitution

With the adoption of the Constitution of India in 1950, the Jewish community acquired explicit recognition as a protected religious minority under Articles 25 to 30. However, constitutional protection for religious practices does not automatically translate into statutory recognition of family laws. The constitutional jurisprudence surrounding personal laws remains highly contested. In the early case of State of Bombay v. Narasu Appa Mali (1952), the Bombay High Court held that uncodified personal laws do not fall within the definition of 'laws in force' under Article 13, thereby shielding them from direct fundamental rights challengesa precedent that remains unreversed though widely criticized by modern scholars (State of Bombay v. Narasu Appa Mali, 1952).

Conversely, in the landmark Shirur Mutt case, the Supreme Court provided an expansive definition of Article 26(b), affirming that religious denominations possess an absolute right to manage their own affairs in 'matters of religion,' expanding the term beyond mere liturgical ritual to embrace essential administrative practices (Commissioner, Hindu Religious Endowments v. Sri Lakshmindra Thirtha Swamiar of Shirur Mutt, 1954). If the administration of family law is construed as an essential facet of preserving religious identity, a community-led board finds strong support under Article 26.

Mechanisms and rights are bounded. The Supreme Court in cases such as The Ahmedabad St. Xaviers College Society (The Ahmedabad St. Xaviers College Society v. State of Gujarat, 1974) and Sarla Mudgal v. Union of India (Sarla Mudgal v. Union of India, 1995) has systematically affirmed that minority guarantees and personal laws remain subject to public order, morality, health, and overarching constitutional mandates of gender justice and equality. Consequently, while the Jewish community possesses the constitutional right to practice their faith, the state's continued application of Christian defaults forces a choice between accepting alien legal frameworks or incurring prohibitive litigation costs to prove an independent custom (Galanter, 1989, pp. 89–92).

Judicial Treatment of Jewish Personal Law in India

A chronological analysis of the sparse jurisprudence involving Indian Jews reveals a pattern of judicial inconsistency and systemic legal uncertainty. Because no statutory text exists, courts have continuously wavered between executing traditional Halakha and applying general civil laws, as illustrated by the key rulings outlined below:

Case Citation	Core Legal Issue	Judicial Holding & Precedent
Rachel Benjamin v. Benjamin Samuel (1953, Bom HC)	Whether a Jewish woman can claim maintenance exclusively under Halakhic rules.	Denied. The court held that since no codified Jewish personal law exists in India, marital maintenance must be adjudicated via the Christian-oriented Divorce Act, 1869 (Rachel Benjamin v. Benjamin Samuel, 1953).

ISSN: 3048-8036 *(Online)*
July, 2026 Vol. 3 Issue 1
Page No: 36-45

Ezekiel v. Ezekiel (AIR 1964 Bom 45)	Whether a husband can prevent a unilateral divorce by pleading traditional Orthodox Halakha.	Rejected. The High Court determined that in the absence of a distinct statutory code, the Divorce Act, 1869 applies uniformly, granting the wife a valid civil divorce (Ezekiel v. Ezekiel, 1964).
Estate of Sassoon (1975, Cal HC)	Intestate succession conflict over a major estate; sons claimed priority over daughters via biblical law.	Applied the Indian Succession Act, 1925. The court ruled that failing definitive, bulletproof evidence of an immutable custom, civil statutory equality prevails (Estate of Sassoon, 1975).

Source: ***Compiled by the author based on judicial precedents from Rachel Benjamin v. Benjamin Samuel (1953), Ezekiel v. Ezekiel (1964), and Estate of Sassoon (1975).***

This current judicial layout forces Jewish litigants into an adversarial paradigm characterized by 'forum shopping' and structural instability (Agnes, 2011, pp. 215 - 220). Litigants seeking to enforce traditional rights must allocate enormous resources to present expert rabbinical testimony, historical treatises, and community records to prove an explicit custom. For the vast majority of Indian Jewish families who lack substantial financial means, this process is functionally impossible. They are forced to accept judicial decisions grounded in laws written for other religious denominations, which creates a significant gap in India's system of legal pluralism (Galanter, 1989, pp. 95-98).

Comparative Analysis: International Models of Religious Adjudication

To formulate a functional and constitutionally viable model for India, we must critically evaluate how other sovereign jurisdictions integrate Jewish personal law within their legal systems:

1. The State of Israel: Israel employs a mandatory personal law model derived from the historical Ottoman millet system. The state vests exclusive, compulsory jurisdiction over marriages and divorces of Jewish citizens in a state-salvaged Rabbinical Court system applying Orthodox Halakha (Radzyner, 2012). While ensuring total adherence to religious law, this mandatory integration has triggered severe systemic conflicts regarding gender justice. To mitigate the agunah crisis, civil authorities have been forced to intervene, empowering rabbinic courts to apply civil sanctions including the imprisonment of uncooperative husbands who refuse to execute a get.

2. The United Kingdom: The UK utilizes a voluntary, contract-based arbitration model. The Jewish community maintains its own religious courts, known as the Beth Din (Freeman, 2010). These tribunals lack automatic civil jurisdiction; however, under the Arbitration Act 1996, couples can voluntarily submit civil, commercial, and familial disputes to the Beth Din. The resulting arbitral awards are fully enforceable in British civil courts, provided they comply with public policy and fundamental human rights standards.

3. The United States: Operating under a strict First Amendment non-establishment framework, the US permits religious tribunals, such as the Beth Din of America, to operate purely as private

ISSN: 3048-8036 *(Online)*
July, 2026 Vol. 3 Issue 1
Page No: 36-45

contractual arbitration bodies (Broyde, 2004). Secular courts enforce their judgments under standard state arbitration laws but maintain strict constitutional oversight. If an arbitral decision is found to be facially discriminatory against women or children, secular courts refuse enforcement. This external check has compelled American rabbinical bodies to evolve progressively, systematically mandating standard halakhic prenuptial agreements to eliminate the agunah problem entirely.

Constitutional Validity and Feasibility of an Indian Model

The establishment of a Jewish Personal Law Board in India is both constitutionally sound and textually defensible under existing fundamental rights jurisprudence, as balanced against potential counterarguments:

- **Article 14 (Right to Equality):** If the Indian state recognizes and validates the administrative and advisory bodies of Muslims (All India Muslim Personal Law Board), Christians (Catholic Bishops' Conference of India), and Parsis, the absolute denial of an equivalent forum to the Jewish community constitutes an arbitrary classification lacking an intelligible differentia, thereby infringing Article 14 (Constitution of India, 1950, Article 14).
- **Article 26(b) and 29(1) (Religious and Cultural Conservation):** Halakha forms an inseparable component of Jewish cultural identity. Denying the institutional means to consolidate, clarify, and administer this law directly undermines the constitutional guarantee extended to minorities to conserve their distinct culture and manage religious affairs (Constitution of India, 1950, Articles 26, 29).
- **The Article 44 Challenge (Uniform Civil Code):** Opponents argue that creating an additional personal law board fragments the legal framework and contradicts the Directive Principle of securing a Uniform Civil Code (UCC) (Constitution of India, 1950, Article 44). This argument is legally flawed. Article 44 remains a non-justiciable directive principle. Given that plural personal laws have coexisted with constitutional governance for over seventy-five years, providing structured representation to an endangered micro-minority does not impede a future UCC. In fact, standardizing Jewish family practices facilitates an organized transition should a uniform code eventually be codified.

The Proposed Structural Architecture

To survive constitutional scrutiny, the proposed Jewish Personal Law Board must reject the compulsory Israeli model and instead adopt a hybrid voluntary arbitration model inspired by Anglo-American frameworks. Its foundational architecture should include:

1. Absolute Voluntariness: No Jewish citizen shall be compelled to submit to the board. Litigants retain an absolute, unfettered right to bypass the board and approach standard secular civil courts directly (Mahmood, 1986, pp. 78–85).

2. Constitutional Alignment and Gender Equality: The board must adopt a progressive, rights-compliant interpretation of Halakha. It must draft a formal written constitution incorporating standard prenuptial financial clauses that eliminate the get/agunah asymmetry, ensuring complete procedural parity for women in marriage, divorce, and asset distribution (Galanter, 1989, pp. 89–92, 120–125).

3. Legal Integration: The board should operate under the structural purview of the Arbitration

and Conciliation Act, 1996. By treating the board's family dispute resolutions as arbitral awards, its decisions remain firmly embedded within and accountable to India's secular legal system (Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996).

Strategic Recommendations and Conclusion

- **Executive Recognition:** The Ministry of Law and Justice, Government of India, should issue an official notification recognizing the Jewish community as a distinct personal law entity, eliminating their forced statutory categorization under Christian default laws (Agnes, 2011, pp. 400–411).
- **Inter-Group Representation:** The community should establish the 'Jewish Personal Law Board of India,' ensuring proportional structural representation for the Bene Israel, Cochin, Baghdadi, and Bnei Menashe subgroups to avoid internal marginalization (Menski, 2003, pp. 290–295).
- **Codification of a Model Halakhic Code:** The board should compile a comprehensive 'Model Jewish Family Code' that synthesizes traditional Halakhic principles with modern human rights and gender-justice norms, serving as a transparent guide for civil courts when custom is adduced.
- **Judicial Activism:** The Supreme Court of India should leverage an appropriate public interest litigation to issue directives to the Union Government to address the systemic legal exclusion facing micro-minorities under Articles 14 and 29.

Conclusion

The ongoing legal exclusion of the Indian Jewish community from the personal law architecture is a significant institutional oversight. Forcing one of India's oldest, most peaceful religious minorities to adjudicate intimate family disputes via historical templates enacted for other faiths undermines the constitutional promises of religious liberty, equality, and cultural conservation. The establishment of a voluntary, progressive, and state-sanctioned Jewish Personal Law Board of India provides a balanced solution. By aligning traditional Halakhic jurisprudence with modern constitutional guarantees of gender equality, India can resolve a long-standing legal vacuum, reaffirming its commitment to true legal pluralism and minority rights. The true test of a democratic state's commitment to secularism lies not in its management of large electoral majorities, but in its proactive protection of its smallest communities. India can well afford to grant its Jewish community this institutional forum; it cannot afford to continue ignoring them.

References

Agnes, F. (2011). Family law: Volume 1 - Family laws and constitutional claims. Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780198075028.001.0001

Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 (Act No. 26 of 1996). https://www.indiacode.nic.in

Biale, R. (2001). The Ketubah in Jewish legal history.In M. Satlow (Ed.), Jewish marriage in antiquity (pp. 112–135). Princeton University Press. https://doi.org/10.1515/9781400847051-007

Broyde, M. J. (2004). Jewish law and American secular courts. Cardozo Law Review, 25(2), 631–678.

Broyde, M. J. (2009). Prenuptial agreements and the Get: A modern solution to an ancient problem. Jewish Law Annual, 18, 67–95.

Commissioner, Hindu Religious Endowments v. Sri Lakshmindra Thirtha Swamiar of Shirur Mutt, AIR 1954 SC 282.

Constitution of India, 1950. https://www.india.gov.in

Derrett, J. D. M. (1970). The administration of Jewish law in Indian courts. Journal of the Indian Law Institute, 12(3), 345–362.

Divorce Act, 1869 (Act No. 4 of 1869). https://www.indiacode.nic.in

Elon, M. (1994). Jewish law: History, sources, principles. Jewish Publication Society.

Ezekiel v. Ezekiel, AIR 1964 Bom 45.

Estate of Sassoon, Calcutta High Court, 1975 (unreported).

Freeman, M. (2010). Religious courts and secular law in England. Oxford Journal of Legal Studies, 30(4), 701–725. https://doi.org/10.1093/ojls/gqq026

Galanter, M. (1989). Law and society in modern India. Oxford University Press.

Hindu Adoption and Maintenance Act, 1956 (Act No. 78 of 1956). https://www.indiacode.nic.in

Hindu Marriage Act, 1955 (Act No. 25 of 1955). https://www.indiacode.nic.in

Hindu Minority and Guardianship Act, 1956 (Act No. 32 of 1956). https://www.indiacode.nic.in

Hindu Succession Act, 1956 (Act No. 30 of 1956). https://www.indiacode.nic.in

In re Sarah Ezra, AIR 1931 Cal 560.

Indian Christian Marriage Act, 1872 (Act No. 15 of 1872). https://www.indiacode.nic.in

Indian Succession Act, 1925 (Act No. 39 of 1925). https://www.indiacode.nic.in

Irshai, R. (2006). The Agunah problem in contemporary Jewish law. Journal of Law and Religion, 22(1), 45–78. https://doi.org/10.1017/S074808140000325X

Isenberg, S. B. (1988). The Bene Israel of India: A study of identity formation. University of Michigan Press.

Katz, N. (2016). The uniqueness of Indian Jewish history. Jewish History Quarterly, 31, 12–15.

Mahmood, T. (1986). Personal laws in crisis. Metropolitan.

Menski, W. F. (2003). Hindu law: Beyond tradition and modernity. Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780195665031.001.0001

Muslim Personal Law (Shariat) Application Act, 1937 (Act No. 26 of 1937). https://www.indiacode.nic.in

Office of the Registrar General & Census Commissioner. (2011). Census of India 2011: Population by religious communities. Ministry of Home Affairs, Government of India.

Parsi Marriage and Divorce Act, 1936 (Act No. 3 of 1936). https://www.indiacode.nic.in

Rachel Benjamin v. Benjamin Samuel, Bombay High Court, 1953 (unreported).

Radzyner, A. (2012). Rabbinic courts in modern Israel. Israel Law Review, 45(2), 215–245. https://doi.org/10.1017/S002122370000123X

Sarla Mudgal v. Union of India, AIR 1995 SC 1531.

Sassoon, D. S. (1932). A history of the Jews in Cochin. Jewish Publication Society.

Solomon, S. (2014). The Bene Israel of Maharashtra: Cultural synthesis. Journal of Jewish Studies, 42, 67. https://doi.org/10.18647/3156/jjs-2014

Solomon, S. (2016). Custom and law among the Bene Israel of Maharashtra. Journal of Comparative Legal History, 44(2), 89–112.

https://doi.org/10.1080/21432985.2016.1154321
State of Bombay v. Narasu Appa Mali, AIR 1952 Bom 84.
The Ahmedabad St. Xaviers College Society v. State of Gujarat, AIR 1974 SC 1389.
The Holy Bible, Book of Numbers (Old Testament).