

# Review of: "Legal Pluralism, Familial Honour and Shariat: A Case of Alternative Dispute Resolution within a Muslim Clan, Uttar Pradesh, India"

Erond L. Damanik<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Universitas Negeri Medan

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

In substance, articles on legal pluralism that link religion and kinship with formal state law are always interesting to study. If this study focuses on practical aspects, what academic contribution is made to knowledge. Especially with this author's statement; "the existing normative system acts as an important alternative for individuals who make rational choices to pursue their goals."

In fact, this article seeks to "show how Sharia courts and kinship-based judicial bodies form a complex whole which is in a state of paradox with formal-state-of-law courts, sharing conflicting, complementary and competing relationships with one another." Wherever and in any country that implements legal pluralism, it is always trapped in confusion, and India is no exception. However, in explanation, analysis and interpretation, it seems lacking depth. This should be more focused again!.

In the introductory description, it should have moved from existing global studies, furthermore, focused on India and the location of the study. This means, regarding the latest references that are being or have been done to determine the state of the arts. However, this manuscript is poor in literature review, so it is difficult to consider the newness or novelty that will be produced. Subsequently, most reference libraries are not up-to-date, but old studies. I am sure that similar studies have emerged and it is important to analyze them for the positioning of this study. I hope, the author can explain this! However, this study was conducted to refute or complement previous studies.

In the last paragraph of the conclusion, the author emphasizes: "In a society like India, people are wary of seeking material gain from inheritance, especially women, who are afraid to bargain for family ties with material gain. Despite the Quranic provisions for the daughter's share in the parents' property, daughters rarely ask for it. 'It is not proper for the daughters of the Sharif family to ask for their share', such a warning is often raised whenever a situation arises where girls can claim theirs. It cannot be denied, then, that differences do exist between the textual and the living, between the ideal and the real and such differences are created and maintained by ever-evolving legal norms." My comment is that this situation is actually the reason why the state has to make standard regulations (positive law), even though the three, religious, kinship and state laws are often contradictory or complementary. However, the third synthesis is often confusing. The results of this study have not yet arrived at that synthesis.

This comment concludes that the author has not optimally synthesized how legal pluralism is applied in resolving disputes.

Thank you for trusting me to review this interesting article.