THE PAPER PROMISE: A SOCIO-LEGAL CRITIQUE OF THE IMPLEMENTATION GAP IN INDIA'S PROTECTION OF WOMEN FROM DOMESTIC VIOLENCE ACT, 2005

Arpana Devi[1] & (Dr.) Mukesh Mohan[2]

ABSTRACT

The Protection of Women from Domestic Violence Act, 2005 (PWDVA) was a watershed moment in Indian jurisprudence, shifting the paradigm from punitive criminal action to a civil-remedy-based, rights-centric framework. It promised immediate, accessible, and comprehensive relief, including protection, residence, and monetary orders. However, nearly two decades after its enactment, I argue that the PWDVA remains a "paper promise." This article contends that the Act's progressive intent has been systematically nullified not by a flawed text, but by a catastrophic failure of implementation. Through a socio-legal analysis of doctrinal legal research, NGO reports, and judicial directives, I deconstruct the "implementation gap." This paper analyzes the systemic dysfunction of the Act's core machinery, focusing on three pillars of failure: (1) the incapacitation of the Protection Officer (PO) as the Act's linchpin, (2) the patriarchal gatekeeping of police, and (3) the procedural and ideological hurdles within the judiciary that delay and deny justice. I conclude that without a radical, state-mandated reinvestment in this institutional infrastructure, the PWDVA will continue to be a site of re-victimization for the very women it was designed to protect.

Keywords: Protection of Women from Domestic Violence Act 2005 (PWDVA), socio-legal studies, implementation gap, institutional barriers, Indian judiciary, Protection Officers, access to justice

[1] Ph.D. Research Scholar, Department of Sociology, Mahatma Jyotiba Phule Rohilkhand University, Bareilly, Uttar Pradesh, India.
[2] Assistant Professor, Department of Sociology, Mahatma Jyotiba Phule Rohilkhand University, Bareilly, Uttar Pradesh, India.

1.0 Introduction: The 'Watershed' Law and the Chasm of Practice

The enactment of the Protection of Women from Domestic Violence Act, 2005 (PWDVA), stands as a "watershed moment" in the history of Indian law (Godara, 2025). It signaled a profound "paradigm shift", moving the state's response to domestic abuse away from the singular, punitive lens of the criminal code-primarily Section 498A of the Indian Penal Code (IPC)-toward a holistic, rights-based framework rooted in civil law.

Its revolutionary premise lay in its expansive definitions. For the first time, "domestic violence" was legally recognized not just as physical assault, but as a spectrum of harms including emotional, verbal, sexual, and economic abuse. This comprehensive approach acknowledged domestic violence as a human rights violation and a form of gender-based discrimination.[1] The Act's explicit goal was to provide a legal tool for redressal that was, above all, accessible, immediate, and focused on protection rather than punishment (Godara, 2025).

This article, however, contends that this revolutionary promise has dissolved into a stark "chasm between legislative intent and ground-level execution" (Godara, 2025). For millions of women, the PWDVA has failed. This failure, I argue, is not due to a weakness in the Act's text, which remains robust. Rather, the Act has been systematically "plagued by multiple challenges" in its implementation. The entire institutional ecosystem designed to deliver these rights-from the police station to the magistrate's court-is broken, under-resourced, and often ideologically resistant.

This "gap" problem, which socio-legal scholars since Roscoe Pound have termed the divide between "law in books" and "law in action", is the central subject of this inquiry. This paper presents an anatomy of that gap. By analyzing the structural, institutional, and systemic barriers, I will demonstrate how the PWDVA's core machinery has failed, transforming a promise of protection into a "paper promise" that, for many survivors, amounts to a second site of victimization.

2.0 The Architecture of the Act: A New Paradigm of Protection

To understand the failure of implementation, one must first appreciate the novelty of the Act's design. The PWDVA is a unique legal hybrid. While it is fundamentally a civil law focused on *remedies* for the survivor, it ingeniously "leverages the criminal justice system for faster access

to justice". This design was intended to bypass the slow, cumbersome procedures of civil suits and provide the "swift relief" that survivors of violence desperately need.

2.1 The Key Provisions (The 'Remedy Toolkit')

The Act's power resides in the speed and breadth of the orders a Magistrate can grant. This "remedy toolkit" is built to provide holistic security for the "aggrieved person." The primary reliefs include:

- **Protection Orders (Section 18):** An injunction to stop the respondent from committing any act of domestic violence, or even communicating with the victim.
- **Residence Orders (Section 19):** A critical provision that secures the woman's right to live in the "shared household," regardless of whose name is on the title, or alternatively, directs the respondent to provide alternative accommodation. This provision has been repeatedly tested and upheld by the judiciary, which recognizes that alienating a woman from her residence is a form of domestic violence itself.
- **Monetary Relief (Section 20):** To cover expenses incurred and losses suffered as a result of the violence, including maintenance for the woman and her children.
- **Custody Orders (Section 21):** Granting temporary custody of children to the aggrieved person.

2.2 The 'Linchpin': The Protection Officer (PO)

This entire architecture was designed to pivot on a single, novel role: the Protection Officer (PO). The PO was envisioned as the "linchpin" of the Act (Shaikh & Jagtap, 2025), a non-adversarial, state-provided facilitator to guide the survivor through the system. The PO's duties, as defined in Section 9, are comprehensive: to assist the woman in making a complaint, to prepare and file the mandatory "Domestic Incident Report" (DIR) for the Magistrate, and to coordinate with all other necessary agencies, including police, medical facilities, and shelter homes.

This role was the Act's solution to the well-known barriers of access to justice. The PO was meant to ensure that a survivor, even with no resources or legal knowledge, could have her

case brought before a court. As this paper will now demonstrate, the systemic failure of this *one* role is arguably the primary cause of the Act's collapse in practice.

3.0 The Broken Pillars: Analyzing the Machinery of Implementation

The PWDVA's effectiveness does not depend on the survivor alone. It relies on a multi-agency ecosystem of POs, police, the judiciary, and support services working in concert. It is the comprehensive failure of this ecosystem that constitutes the implementation gap.

3.1 The Protection Officer: The Failed Linchpin

The PO, intended as the system's primary facilitator [24], has become its "major bottleneck" (Godara, 2025). This failure is not one of individual bad actors, but of systemic and structural incapacitation.

First, the PO role is critically under-resourced. POs across the country report a lack of adequate office space, insufficient staff, and no technological resources. More significantly, the post is rarely a dedicated, full-time position. In most states, the role of PO is assigned as an "additional charge" to an already overburdened government functionary, such as a Child Development Project Officer (Godara, 2025). These officers lack the time, resources, and often the will to perform their PWDVA duties effectively (Godara, 2025).

Second, this practical failure is compounded by a failure of capacity. Training for POs is "inadequate," "inconsistent," and in many regions, "largely absent" (Godara, 2025). The PO role requires a "trauma-informed" and "gender-sensitive" approach to handle survivors with empathy (Godara, 2025). Instead, inadequately trained POs often default to their own patriarchal biases, pushing survivors toward "compromise" or "counselling" rather than facilitating their legal rights.

The most damning evidence of this failure is its persistence. Nearly two decades after the Act's passage, the Supreme Court of India, in the 2025 case of *We The Women of India v Union of India*, was forced to issue basic directives to all states and Union Territories to simply *identify*, *designate*, and *appoint* Protection Officers as mandated by the law (Venkatesan, 2025). This judicial intervention is a stark admission of a profound and complete failure of state will. The state has, in effect, abandoned the Act's most crucial implementing officer.

3.2 The Police: Patriarchal Gatekeepers

While the PO is the intended starting point, many women first approach the police. The Act mandates police, as first responders, to inform the survivor of her rights under the PWDVA, connect her with a PO, and file a DIR.

In reality, the police station often functions as the *first barrier* to justice. Police training on the PWDVA's civil remedies is notoriously "inadequate". This lack of awareness is secondary to a deeper, ideological resistance. The institutional culture of policing in India overwhelmingly views domestic violence not as a rights violation, but as a "private affair" or "family matter" (Shaikh & Jagtap, 2025).

This mindset leads police to actively dissuade women from filing complaints. They often delay or refuse to register FIRs or DIRs, insisting that the survivor "compromise" with her abuser. This patriarchal inertia and "institutional indifference" re-victimizes the survivor at her moment of greatest vulnerability, effectively "trivializing" the abuse and gutting the Act's promise of immediate protection.

3.3 The Judicial Labyrinth: Justice Delayed and Denied

The PWDVA was designed to provide "swift relief," with an explicit target of 60 days for the disposal of any application. The Act's text even grants Magistrates procedural flexibility (Section 28) to achieve this (Shaikh & Jagtap, 2025).

This promise of speedy justice has been utterly compromised. Survivors who overcome the PO and police barriers enter a "judicial labyrinth" defined by "protracted legal conflicts". The "judicial backlog" is the primary culprit. Data from the National Judicial Data Grid (NJDG) shows that a majority of PWDVA cases languish for over two years. This delay is not merely an inconvenience; it is a *de facto* denial of justice. A protection order that arrives two years after a woman has been beaten and thrown out of her home is not protection at all.

This is not just a backlog problem; it is a procedural and ideological one. Instead of using the Act's intended flexibility, many magistrates revert to rigid, adversarial trial processes, demanding a high "burden of proof" as if it were a criminal trial (Shaikh & Jagtap, 2025). This is compounded by "redundant or prolonged" referrals to mediation (Shaikh & Jagtap, 2025).

While well-intentioned, mediation is wholly inappropriate in cases involving a severe power imbalance and violence, and serves only to delay the issuance of protective orders.

Finally, the judiciary is not immune to the societal "backlash" against women's rights (Nigam, 2021). A powerful, misogynistic myth that women "misuse" protective laws like the PWDVA and Section 498A is pervasive. This "discourse of misuse," as I will explore in a companion paper, has a chilling effect on enforcement, making some in the judiciary and police reluctant to act decisively.

3.4 The Missing Safety Net: Inadequate Support Services

The PWDVA's multi-agency model mandates a state-provided safety net, including shelter homes (Section 6), medical facilities (Section 7), and registered Service Providers (Section 10). This support network is "fragmented" (Shaikh & Jagtap, 2025) and "grossly inadequate" (Godara, 2025).

Government-funded shelter homes, where they exist, are often "overcrowded," "poorly managed," and "lack basic amenities" [10] (Godara, 2025). They are not safe, long-term, or inclusive. As frontline NGOs report, many state shelters refuse to house male children over the age of 12, forcing a woman to make the impossible choice between her own safety and abandoning her son (Shaikh & Jagtap, 2025). The healthcare system, a critical first point of contact, is "underutilized" and lacks basic protocols for DV screening or referral (Shaikh & Jagtap, 2025). Non-profit "service providers" like SNEHA, who heroically fill this gap, often operate without the formal state recognition or funding mandated by the Act (Shaikh & Jagtap, 2025).

4.0 Table 1: Key Institutional Barriers in PWDVA Implementation

The following table synthesizes the analysis from Section 3.0, juxtaposing the "law in books" (the Act's intent) with the "law in action" (the observed institutional failure) for each key stakeholder.

Institutional Actor	Intended Role (Law in Books)	Observed Failure (Law in Action) / The Barrier
Protection Officer (PO)	Act's "linchpin" (Shaikh & Jagtap, 2025); primary facilitator for survivor; files DIR; coordinates all services.	Systemically incapacitated. "Overburdened" with additional duties (Godara, 2025); under-funded and under-resourced ; "inadequate training"; lack of gender sensitivity.
Police	First responder; mandated to inform survivor of rights; file DIR; provide protection and assistance.	Patriarchal gatekeepers. Treat violence as a "private family matter"; police indifference; refusal/delay in filing DIRs; pressure survivors to "compromise".
Judiciary (Magistrates)	Provide "swift relief" (60-day target); use procedural flexibility (Sec 28); grant civil remedies	"Judicial labyrinth." Protracted delays due to backlogs; non-use of flexibility, reversion to rigid trial procedures (Shaikh & Jagtap, 2025); inappropriate referrals to mediation; ideological "misuse" discourse.
Support Services	State-provided safety net; shelter homes (Sec 6); medical aid (Sec 7); recognized Service Providers (Sec 10).	"Fragmented" (Shaikh & Jagtap, 2025) and "inadequate". Lack of safe, resourced shelter homes; shelters not inclusive of older children; healthcare system unequipped; non-profits unrecognized.

5.0 Conclusion: Re-Engineering the Ecosystem, Not Just the Law

I have argued in this paper that the Protection of Women from Domestic Violence Act, 2005, has failed. This failure is not legislative but institutional. The "gap" between its progressive text and its regressive practice is a chasm. The Act has been abandoned by the state, leaving its "linchpin" (the PO) broken, its enforcers (police) resistant, its arbiters (judiciary) overburdened, and its safety net (shelters) non-existent.

The solutions, therefore, do not lie in amending the law's text, but in *resourcing* its implementation. This requires a radical reinvestment of political will and public funds, as advocated by frontline organizations (Shaikh & Jagtap, 2025). The "actionable reforms" are clear:

1. **Capacitating the PO:** The state must create a dedicated, full-time, well-trained, and adequately paid cadre of Protection Officers. This cannot be an "additional charge."

2. **Sensitizing the System:** Mandatory, regular, and impactful training on gender sensitivity and trauma-informed care must be implemented for all police and judicial officers handling PWDVA cases.

3. **Investing in Support:** The state must execute its mandate under the Act by committing massive public investment to a network of safe, inclusive, long-term shelter homes and by integrating the healthcare response.

4. **Accountability:** The system must be held accountable. This can be achieved through digital tracking of complaints and timelines, as well as periodic public hearings (*jan sunvais*) where survivors and NGOs can directly address officials (Shaikh & Jagtap, 2025).

This paper has been a socio-legal critique of the Act's institutional failures. This analysis, however, is incomplete without understanding the *social* world in which this broken system operates. My analysis here is limited as it is based on a critique of existing reports and data. Further empirical and ethnographic research is essential to understand the "lived reality" of this institutional failure from the plaintiff's perspective. How do women *experience* this gap? And what are the deep-seated cultural and sociological barriers that stop most women from even approaching this broken system in the first place? These are the questions I will turn to in a subsequent paper.

REFERENCES

Abramsky, T., Watts, C. H., Garcia-Moreno, C., Devries, K., Kiss, L., Ellsberg, M., … Heise, L. (2011). What factors are associated with recent intimate partner violence? Findings from the WHO multi-country study on women's health and domestic violence. *BMC Public Health, 11*, 109. doi: 10.1186/1471-2458-11-109

Anjali, D., Ajgaonkar, V., Pradhan, Y., & Mathrani Chakraborty, R. (2017). In search of justice and care: how women survivors of violence navigate the Indian criminal justice system. *Journal of Gender Based Violence, 1*(1), 79–97. https://doi.org/10.1332/239868017x14900133026601

Basu, S. (2015). *The trouble with marriage: Feminists confront law and violence in India*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Bhandari, S., & Hughes, J. C. (2017). Lived Experiences of Women Facing Domestic Violence in India. *Journal of Social Work in the Global Community, 2*(1), 13–27. doi: 10.5590/JSWGC.2017.02.1.02

Bhate-Deosthali, P., Rege, S., & Prakash, P. (Eds.). (2020). *Feminist counselling and domestic violence in India*. London: Taylor & Francis.

Duvvury, N., Callan, A., Carney, P., & Raghavendra, S. (2013). *Intimate Partner Violence: Economic Costs and Implications for Growth and Development* (Women's voice, agency, and participation research series; no. 3). Washington, D.C.: World Bank. http://hdl.handle.net/10986/16697

G.B. Pant Institute of Studies in Rural Development. (2009). *Domestic violence against women in India*. Lucknow, India: Madhav Books.

Godara, S. (2025). Effectiveness of the Protection of Women from Domestic Violence Act, 2005. *International Journal of Legal Science and Innovation, 7*(2), 287–300.

Government of India. (2005). *The Protection of Women from Domestic Violence Act, 2005 (Act No. 43 of 2005)*. New Delhi: Gazette of India.

Israel, J. (2022). *How Survivors of Domestic Violence Seek Legal and Social Support Against Their Abusers in Ahmednagar District of Maharashtra State in India: An Exploratory Study*. (Independent Study Project (ISP) Collection. 3577). Retrieved from https://digitalcollections.sit.edu/isp_collection/3577

Jaising, I., & Mathur Anurag, P. (Eds.). (2019). *Conflict in the shared household: Domestic violence and the law in India*. New Delhi, India: Oxford University Press.

Kalokhe, A. S., et al. (2017). Domestic violence against women in India: A systematic review of a decade of quantitative studies. *Global Public Health, 12*(4), 498-513.

Lawyers Collective Women's Rights Initiative (LCWRI). (2013). *Staying Alive: Evaluating Court Orders*. (6th Monitoring & Evaluation Report on the PWDVA). New Delhi: UN Women.

Manna, S., Singh, D., Barik, M., Rehman, T., Ghosal, S., Kanungo, S., & Pati, S. (2024). Prevalence of intimate partner violence among Indian women and their determinants: a cross-sectional study from national family health survey – 5. *BMC Women's Health, 24*(363). https://doi.org/10.1186/s12905-024-03204-x

Ministry of Health and Family Welfare (MoHFW). (2021). *National Family Health Survey (NFHS-5) 2019-21: India*. Mumbai, India: International Institute for Population Sciences.

Mishra, S. K., Pradhan, G., Pradhan, S. K., & Choubey, G. (2024). Prevalence and Predictors of Domestic Violence in India: Complex Sample Analysis of a Nationally Representative Study Conducted Between 2019 and 2021. *Cureus, 16*(8), e66113. doi:10.7759/cureus.66113

National Crime Records Bureau (NCRB). (2021). *Crime in India 2020*. New Delhi: Ministry of Home Affairs, Government of India.

National Crime Records Bureau (NCRB). (2023). *Crime in India 2022*. New Delhi: Ministry of Home Affairs, Government of India.

Newiak, M., Sahay, R., & Srivastava, N. (2024). *Intimate Partner Violence and Women's Economic Empowerment: Evidence from Indian States* (IMF Working Paper No. 2024/239). Washington, D.C.: International Monetary Fund.

Nigam, S. (2008). *Domestic violence in India: What one should know? (A resource book)*. New

Delhi: We the People Trust.

Nigam, S. (2021). *Domestic violence law in India: Myth and misogyny*. Abingdon, UK: Routledge India.

Renzetti, C. M., Edleson, J. L., & Bergen, R. K. (2010). *Sourcebook on violence against women*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

Shaikh, N., & Jagtap, R. B. (2025, July 23). How India's domestic violence act can deliver justice. *India Development Review*. Retrieved from https://idronline.org/article/advocacy-government/how-indias-domestic-violence-act-can-deliver-justice/

Socio Legal Information Centre (SLIC). (2010). *A life free from violence*. New Delhi: Socio Legal Information Centre.

Pawar, S. S., & Vaidya, S. (2025). Safeguarding Women's Rights: Legal Measures and Challenges under the Domestic Violence Act, 2005. *Cuestiones de Fisioterapia, 54*(4), 5599-5604.

Venkatesan, V. (2025, June 5). Supreme Court directs implementation of Domestic Violence Act. *Supreme Court Observer*. Retrieved from https://www.scobserver.in/journal/supreme-court-directs-implementation-of-domestic-violence-act/

World Health Organization (WHO). (2021). *Violence against women prevalence estimates, 2018*. Geneva: World Health Organization.