

The Legal and the Lived: A Comparative Study of Legal Exclusion and Literary Representation in the Works of R. Raj Rao and Rahul Mehta

Divya Rani^{1*} | Dr. Suchitra²

¹Department of English and Foreign Languages, Maharshi Dayanand University, Rohtak, Haryana, India.

²Department of English and Foreign Languages, Maharshi Dayanand University, Rohtak, Haryana, India.

*Corresponding Author: divyagoyal3597@gmail.com

Citation: Rani, D., & Suchitra, S. (2025). The Legal and the Lived: A Comparative Study of Legal Exclusion and Literary Representation in the Works of R. Raj Rao and Rahul Mehta. International Journal of Education, Modern Management, Applied Science & Social Science, 07(03(II)), 90–94. [https://doi.org/10.62823/ijemmasss/7.3\(ii\).8003](https://doi.org/10.62823/ijemmasss/7.3(ii).8003)

ABSTRACT

This paper examines the profound relationship between legal frameworks and literary representation by conducting a comparative study of two seminal authors in queer Indian and diasporic literature: R. Raj Rao and Rahul Mehta. It argues that the legal status of queer individuals directly shapes the narrative conflicts and themes in their work. The analysis first focuses on Rao's fiction, which emerged during a period defined by the criminalizing threat of Section 377 of the Indian Penal Code. His works depict a world of "subterfuge" and external struggle against a hostile state, with narratives set in public, clandestine spaces. The paper then juxtaposes this with Mehta's works, which, operating within a different legal landscape, shift the site of conflict from an external, state-sanctioned threat to an internal, psychological state of being "quarantined" within family and community. By contrasting these two authors, the paper demonstrates how the literary imagination evolves in direct response to legal realities, moving from a focus on physical and public liberation to a more intimate and private quest for psychological and social integration.

Keywords: Queer Diaspora, Postcolonial Studies, Intersectionality, Legal Exclusion, Lived Experience.

Introduction

The Intersections of Law, Identity, and Narrative

The relationship between legal frameworks and the lived experiences of marginalized communities is a critical area of inquiry, one that finds a particularly rich and poignant expression in literature. Legal codes, often presented as objective and neutral, in fact shape societal perceptions, institutional practices, and personal identities. For queer individuals, this dynamic is particularly pronounced, as legislative acts have historically defined, policed, and criminalized their very existence. This paper posits that the legal status of queer individuals is a fundamental determinant of their literary representation, directly influencing the nature of their conflicts and the spaces they inhabit in narrative. A comparative study of R. Raj Rao, a pioneer of Indian queer fiction, and Rahul Mehta, a contemporary diasporic author, reveals a profound shift in the site of queer struggle. While Rao's work portrays a world defined by an external, state-sanctioned threat, a product of the colonial-era Section 377 of the Indian Penal Code, Mehta's narratives explore an internalized, psychological conflict, reflecting a post-decriminalization reality.

The history of queer life and literature in India is not a linear progression but a complex tapestry of acceptance, suppression, and resurgence. Ancient Indian texts, such as the *Padma Purana*, *Markandeya Purana*, and the *Kama Sutra*, hint at gender fluidity and same-sex desire, with the concept of *Tritiya Prakriti* or the "third nature" being a notable feature of ancient Hindu and Buddhist thought.

However, this "gentle rhythm of acceptance" was severely disrupted by the arrival of British colonialism and the imposition of Victorian morals (Purple Pencil Project). The introduction of Section 377 of the Indian Penal Code in 1860, which criminalized "carnal intercourse against the order of nature," marked a turning point, transforming same-sex desire from a socially ambiguous phenomenon into a legal crime (Indian Penal Code, 1860, s. 377). This legal framework became a primary obstacle for literary representation, as early twentieth-century works, such as Pandey Bechan Sharma 'Ugra's *Chocolate*, were forced to portray queer relationships ending tragically, and Ismat Chughtai's *Lihaaf* faced an infamous obscenity trial (Purple Pencil Project).

This paper will analyse the dialectical relationship between law and literature by examining the distinct worlds of Rao and Mehta. The following sections will first establish the legal and social context of Section 377. It will then analyse how this legal threat manifests in Rao's work as a narrative of external conflict and physical subterfuge. Subsequently, it will explore how Mehta's works, operating in a new legal and cultural landscape, shift the focus to a more internal, psychological struggle. The analysis will culminate in a comparative synthesis of the two authors' thematic and stylistic divergences, demonstrating how literary imagination directly responds to and reflects the legal reality of its time.

The Spectre of the State: The Legal and Social History of Section 377 IPC

Understanding the narratives of queer life in India requires a firm grasp of the legal apparatus that defined it for over 150 years. Section 377 of the Indian Penal Code, a law introduced by the British in 1860, criminalized "carnal intercourse against the order of nature with any man, woman, or animal" (Indian Penal Code, 1860, s. 377). This provision, rooted in Victorian morality and English common law, was a colonial imposition that had little to do with traditional Indian cultural values. For decades, the law provided a basis for state-sanctioned harassment and abuse, with police, government officials, and local leaders using it to extort and persecute queer and transgender individuals. The case of Arif Jafar, a health counselor who spent 47 days in jail and faced continuous court appearances for an act related to his work with a queer community, exemplifies the profound and debilitating impact of the law on personal lives and public health efforts (UAB Institute for Human Rights). The law's very existence, regardless of actual conviction rates, created an atmosphere of fear and institutionalized stigma, impacting everything from employment to healthcare.

The legal battle against Section 377 was marked by significant victories and frustrating setbacks. In a landmark ruling on July 2, 2009, the Delhi High Court declared the law unconstitutional as it applied to consensual sexual conduct between adults in private. This decision was heralded as a major victory for human rights, with the court recognizing that the law violated fundamental rights to life, liberty, dignity, privacy, and equality. This period of decriminalization led to a tangible increase in self-confidence and self-acceptance within the LGBTQ+ community, as well as a reduction in harassment from state actors. However, this legal progress was short-lived. In a regressive move on December 11, 2013, the Supreme Court of India overturned the Delhi High Court's ruling, a decision that plunged the community back into legal precarity. This reversal highlighted the fragility of legal victories and the enduring influence of conservative ideologies, which viewed the law as a reflection of "Indian culture and values," despite its colonial origins.

The final and definitive legal triumph came on September 6, 2018, with the Supreme Court's historic decision in *Navtej Singh Johar v. Union of India* (UAB Institute for Human Rights). A five-judge constitutional bench unanimously read down the law, decriminalizing same-sex relationships between consenting adults. The court condemned Section 377 for its infringement on fundamental freedoms and its role in "stigmatising and discriminating against" LGBTQI individuals (Centre for Law and Policy Research). The court's decision was a watershed moment, affirming the constitutional protection of sexual orientation and recognizing same-sex sexuality as a "normal variant of human sexuality". (Centre for Law and Policy Research) The ruling declared that the law, in its original form, violated the right to equality, personal liberty, and freedom of expression.

Despite this monumental legal victory, the gap between law and lived reality persists. The 2018 ruling only "read down" the law, leaving it active for non-consensual sexual acts, bestiality, and sexual acts with minors. Furthermore, decriminalization did not automatically translate into full societal acceptance or a complete end to discrimination. As of recent times, India lacks a complete anti-discrimination law, and same-sex marriage or civil unions are not recognized. The struggle, as the research indicates, has now shifted from a battle against a specific legal statute to a broader, ongoing fight for full social integration and equality. This complex legal and social history provides the essential backdrop for a literary analysis of the two authors.

A World of Subterfuge: R. Raj Rao's Pre-Decriminalization Literary Landscape

R. Raj Rao occupies a seminal position in the landscape of Indian queer literature. His novel *The Boyfriend* (2003) is considered a ground-breaking work, celebrating as the first work of fiction from India "to be fully pivoted around homosexuality" (Bakshi). Written just a few years after the turn of the millennium and set in Bombay (Mumbai) in the early 1990s, the novel serves as a crucial documentation of queer life in a time when Section 377 was an active, defining threat. Rao's narrative is a direct response to this legal reality, portraying a world where queer lives are lived in a state of constant "subterfuge" against "hostile surveillance" (Bakshi).

The omnipresence of legal threat dictates the very geography of Rao's narrative. His characters, like the protagonist Yudi, exist within a "hidden gay subculture" that is an active rebellion against a repressive state (Das). The novel meticulously maps out "queer spaces" that function as sites of both refuge and danger. The public loos at Churchgate station, cruising parks, and specific gay bars become the clandestine arenas where homosexual intimacy can materialize. These spaces are not incidental settings; they are a direct narrative consequence of Section 377, a response to a legal system that criminalized private acts and forced queer life into the shadows. The characters' movements are not a matter of choice but of necessity, driven by a search for places where they can "unsettle the heterosexual/homosexual binary" (Das).

The conflict in Rao's work is fundamentally an external one, a struggle against the legal and social apparatus of the hostile nation-state. The law's "condemnation" of homosexuality coerces homosexual liaisons into a life of "lies and doubleness" (Bakshi). The novel explicitly links the "lie of the gay subculture" to the "lie of the nation-state" itself, which views heterosexual marriage as the only legitimate form of sexuality.

The narrative shows how the postcolonial nation is complicit with its former colonial master in its persecution of queer individuals. The novel's love plot between Yudi and Milind is set against the backdrop of the 1992 Hindu-Muslim riots in Bombay. The police use the "rhetoric of national security" to persecute homosexuals, revealing a chilling phenomenon where a nationalist ideology paradoxically prolongs a colonial-era law. The shift from the city's colonial name, Bombay, to its postcolonial name, Mumbai, in the novel symbolizes the transition from colonial to postcolonial rule, yet the persecution remains, suggesting that homophobia, far from being a Western import, was perpetuated by nationalist frameworks that branded queerness as "not Indian" (Jindal Global Law School).

This external conflict is not a monolithic experience. Rao's work demonstrates that legal exclusion is profoundly shaped by intersectionality. The central relationship between Yudi, an upper-class journalist, and Milind, a working-class Dalit boy, highlights the "impossibility of a union based on same-sex and cross-caste love". Milind is aware that Yudi can manage his gay lifestyle due to his class privilege, while for him, "indecent behaviour is a crime" (Bakshi). This class and caste chasm, a direct outcome of living under the oppressive Section 377, creates a "fractured resistance" against a system that marginalizes individuals differently based on their social standing. For Rao's characters, survival is not a given; it is a constant battle against a legally and socially hostile world.

The Internal Quarantine: Rahul Mehta's Post-Decriminalization Diasporic Experience

In contrast to Rao's pre-decriminalization landscape, Rahul Mehta's works, particularly his award-winning short story collection *Quarantine* (2011), inhabit a different legal and cultural context. As an American author, Mehta focuses on the experience of being "queer and South Asian" in the diaspora, a setting where the direct legal threat of a law like Section 377 is largely absent. This shift in legal context precipitates a corresponding shift in the nature of the queer struggle, which transitions from an external, state-sanctioned battle to an internal, psychological, and familial one.

The title story, "Quarantine," serves as a powerful metaphor for this new mode of conflict. When the protagonist's white boyfriend, Jeremy, visits his Indian American family home, the couple is forced to share a room in the basement. This seemingly innocuous spatial choice carries immense symbolic weight. The basement is the same space where the protagonist's grandfather was accommodated upon his arrival from India. The parallel between the otherized status of both the queer and the immigrant subjects is explicit and profound. The threat is no longer a legal one from the state, but an internalized sense of being segregated and "quarantined" within one's own family and community. The stigma associated with homosexuality, once enforced by laws like Section 377, has now become a psychological residue, a powerful force that dictates relationships and identity from within the domestic sphere.

Mehta's narratives are not concerned with survival against a hostile police force but with the nuanced and often painful struggle for familial belonging and reconciliation. Stories like "The Better Person" and "The Cure" focus on the protagonists' attempts to navigate their sexuality and find a sense of home. The narrator of "The Better Person" "juggles between conversations about his sexuality with his Indian mother and his polygamous experiment with his White boyfriend," highlighting the complexity of "queer reshaping of the family construct" in a diasporic setting. In "The Cure," a queer couple's struggle to "raise a plant as a child of their own" symbolizes the longing for a legitimate and recognized family construct that transcends cultural norms and generational gaps.

The characters in Mehta's works are caught between two worlds, struggling to reconcile their queer identity with their cultural heritage. The protagonist of *No Other World* "just wants to fit in. Not quite American enough for the kids at school, not quite Indian enough for his family overseas". This conflict, an internal one, is about finding a place for the self when external legal threats have been removed or never existed. The challenge for Mehta's characters is not one of physical safety but of achieving full psychological and social integration, of finding a home within their own identities and within their families, a struggle that persists long after the legal battles have been won.

A Tale of Two Eras: Thematic and Stylistic Divergence in Queer Representation

The juxtaposition of R. Raj Rao's and Rahul Mehta's works illustrates a fundamental shift in the literary representation of queer lives, one directly correlated with the changing legal landscape. This comparative analysis reveals a transformation in the nature of conflict, the geography of narrative spaces, and the core psychological struggles of their characters. The most pronounced divergence is the primary site of conflict. In Rao's narratives, the conflict is external and physical, a direct consequence of the pre-2018 legal context in which Section 377 actively criminalized homosexuality. His characters' lives are defined by the state's "hostile surveillance" and the need for "subterfuge" against the active criminalization of same-sex desire. In contrast, Mehta's narratives operate in a post-decriminalization landscape where the external legal threat has been removed. While acknowledging the broader context of homophobia, his focus shifts to a more internal and psychological struggle against familial expectations, cultural identity, and internalized stigma. This shift in conflict is mirrored by a change in narrative spaces. Rao's stories are rooted in the public, semi-clandestine spaces of urban India—the loos, parks, and city streets that form the "hidden gay subculture" necessary for survival under a punitive law. Mehta's narratives, on the other hand, are predominantly set within the private, domestic sphere of the diasporic American family home. This transition from public to private space is a powerful signifier of the evolution of the queer struggle, moving from a fight for physical freedom to a search for psychological and emotional integration. The core psychological struggle of Rao's characters is defined by their resistance and survival against external forces, while Mehta's characters are defined by their search for belonging and reconciliation within a world where they feel like outsiders.

The distinct literary worlds of Rao and Mehta demonstrate that the legal status of queer individuals is a direct and powerful determinant of how their lives are imagined and narrated. The shift from a narrative of external conflict to one of internal struggle is a testament to the community's journey from a fight for bare survival to a quest for full acceptance and psychological peace.

Conclusion: From Hostile Surveillance to Internal Consciousness

The comparative analysis of R. Raj Rao's and Rahul Mehta's works underscores a central argument: legal frameworks are not merely abstract statutes but foundational structures that directly inform the lived experiences and, by extension, the literary representation of queer individuals. Rao's novels, emerging from a time when Section 377 of the Indian Penal Code actively criminalized queer existence, paint a picture of a world defined by external threat, physical subterfuge, and a constant negotiation of hostile public spaces. In this context, the literary struggle is one of physical survival and resistance against an oppressive state apparatus.

Conversely, Mehta's narratives, set in a post-decriminalization and diasporic landscape, demonstrate a profound shift. With the external legal threat largely removed, the conflict moves inward, centering on psychological struggles, familial expectations, and the search for belonging. The "quarantine" metaphor becomes a powerful symbol for an internalized sense of otherness and segregation, a lasting psychological residue of a society and culture that has long viewed queerness as an aberration.

This literary trajectory provides a crucial lesson for queer theory and postcolonial studies. It demonstrates that the path to full liberation is not a simple, linear one that ends with a single legal victory. While the decriminalization of homosexuality was a monumental step forward, as evidenced by the increased self-confidence and reduced harassment experienced by the community, it did not erase decades of internalized stigma and societal prejudice. The battle for queer equality is, therefore, a multi-front campaign: a legal fight for rights, and a cultural and psychological one for acceptance and integration. The fact that queer literature has moved its focus from the city streets to the private home indicates that the next phase of the struggle is less about what the state can do to you, and more about what the culture has done to the self. The narrative frontier has shifted from the public fight for liberation to the intimate quest for unconditional love and belonging, a quest that continues to unfold both in India and its global diaspora.

References

1. Bakshi, Sandeep. "Fractured Resistance: Queer Negotiations of the Postcolonial in R. Raj Rao's the Boyfriend." *South Asian Review*, vol. 33, no. 2, 2012, pp. 37–55, <https://doi.org/10.1080/02759527.2012.11932877>.
2. Centre for Law and Policy Research (CLPR). "Navtej Singh Johar vs. Union of India: Section 377." *CLPR*, 2018, <https://translaw.clpr.org.in/case-law/navtej-singh-johar-vs-union-of-india-section-377/>.
3. Chakraborty, Kaustav, and Anup Shekhar Chakraborty, editors. *The Queer and the Vernacular Languages in India: Studies in Contemporary Texts and Cultures*. Routledge, 2024, <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003440536>.
4. Chughtai, Ismat. *The Quilt & Other Stories*. Translated by Tahira Naqvi, Sheep Meadow Press, 1994.
5. Das, Sriya. "Gay Subculture and the Cities in India: A Critical Reading of Select Works of R Raj Rao." *Rupkatha Journal on Interdisciplinary Studies in Humanities*, vol. 13, no. 3, 2021, <https://doi.org/10.21659/rupkatha.v13n3.40>.
6. Hazarika, Anupom Kumar. "Interrogating cityscape: Alternative sexuality versus Male homophobia in R. Raj Rao's The Boyfriend." *Quest Journals*, vol. 7, no. 7, 2019, <https://www.questjournals.org/jrhss/papers/vol7-issue7/Ser-1/E0707011720.pdf>.
7. Human Dignity Trust. "Indian Supreme Court overturns landmark decriminalisation ruling." *Human Dignity Trust*, 11 Dec. 2013, <https://www.humandignitytrust.org/news/indian-supreme-court-overturns-landmark-decriminalisation-ruling/>.
8. India, Imperial Legislative Council. *The Indian Penal Code, 1860*. Act No. 45 of 1860, enacted 6 Oct. 1860. *India Code*, <https://www.indiacode.nic.in/handle/123456789/12850?locale=en>.
9. Indug. "Section 377 Is Overturned, But Now What?" *UAB Institute for Human Rights*, 24 Oct. 2018, <https://sites.uab.edu/humanrights/2018/10/24/section-377-is-overturned-but-now-what/>.
10. Jindal Global Law School. "Impact of the decriminalization of homosexuality in Delhi: An empirical study." *Jindal Global Law School*, 13 Jan. 2013, <https://ualr.edu/socialchange/2013/01/13/impact-of-the-decriminalization-of-homosexuality-in-delhi-an-empirical-study/>.
11. Lindsey. "No Other World." *Read with Lindsey*, 3 June 2025, <https://readwithlindsey.com/2025/06/03/no-other-world/>.
12. Mehta, Rahul. *No Other World: A Novel*. Harper, 2017.
13. Mehta, Rahul. *Quarantine: Stories*. Harper Perennial, 2011.
14. Purple Pencil Project. "History of Queer Literature in India." *The Purple Pencil Project*, 2023, <https://www.purplepencilproject.com/history-of-queer-literature-in-india/>.
15. Rao, R. Raj. *The Boyfriend: A Novel*. Penguin Books Ltd, 2003.
16. Sharma, Pandey Bechan. *Chocolate and Other Writings on Male Homoeroticism*. Translated by Ruth Vanita, Duke University Press, 2009.

