

The Transgender Persons (Protection of Rights) Amendment Bill, 2026

Section 3 of the Transgender Persons (Protection of Rights) Bill, 2019 (No. 17 of 2019) is hereby amended to read as follows:—

“(1) Every transgender person who is a citizen of India shall be entitled to the same rights and privileges as are enjoyed by the citizens of India, and shall not be subjected to any discrimination on the basis of gender identity.”

“(2) The State shall ensure that every transgender person has access to the same opportunities as are available to the citizens of India, and shall not be subjected to any discrimination on the basis of gender identity.”

“(3) The State shall ensure that every transgender person has access to the same opportunities as are available to the citizens of India, and shall not be subjected to any discrimination on the basis of gender identity.”

“(4) The State shall ensure that every transgender person has access to the same opportunities as are available to the citizens of India, and shall not be subjected to any discrimination on the basis of gender identity.”

“(5) The State shall ensure that every transgender person has access to the same opportunities as are available to the citizens of India, and shall not be subjected to any discrimination on the basis of gender identity.”

[illegible]

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

□□□□□□ □□□□□□ : □□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□ □□□□ :

?
)
 , 2019
 ?

SUSHRI S. JOTHIMANI (KARUR): Thank you, Madam, Chairperson. I stand here today to oppose the Transgender Persons (Protection of Rights) Amendment Bill, 2026. I stand as a representative of the Congress party, the party which is committed to justice, dignity and constitutional morality. The hon. Minister for Parliamentary Affairs and Minister of Social Justice and Empowerment said that the Bill is very important.

But when they are saying that the Bill is important, how come this Bill is coming to the Parliament without due consultation with the transgender persons and other stakeholders. This itself shows the callous attitude of the Government, how unimportant this Bill is to them.

It ousts the people which the Bill represents. The Government is not willing to listen to the transgender people. But the Congress Party, the Leader of the Opposition, Shri Rahul Gandhi ji, Miss Priyanka Gandhi ji and we listen to the transgender people concerned. We are also deeply concerned about the issues that they are raising.

We would like to stand by them on record. We fully support their sentiments and their emotions. We deeply understand what they are going through, and how their lives will change after this Bill.

Let us be very clear that this Bill is not a reform. This Bill is a regression. It takes away what the Constitution and the Supreme Court of India have already guaranteed. This is not just a legal issue. This is about real people, real lives and daily struggle of citizens, who are only asking to be seen, to be recognised and to live with dignity.

Hon. Madam, Chairperson, in the landmark judgement of the Supreme Court, famously known as NALSA, it was recognised that gender identity is a matter of self-determination. It is deeply personal, deeply human. It is affirmed that dignity, bodily autonomy

and identity are protected under Articles 14, 15, 19 and 21 of the Constitution. But what does this Bill do? It deletes the right of self-determination. It tells citizens, 'You are not who you say you are until the State approves you?.'

Hon. Madam Chairperson, identity is not a certificate. Dignity is not subject to verification. For most of us in this House, identity has never come under question. We have never had to stand before an authority or a Medical Board or a District Collector or a Magistrate to prove who we are. But for a transgender person, even existence becomes a process of scrutiny. This Bill deepens that injustice.

This Bill introduces a Medical Board and a multi-layer process for a person to be legally recognised as themselves. Nobody can be recognised as a transgender person without a physical examination of the Medical Board and then, a certificate from the District Collector or a Magistrate. In doing so, it fundamentally alters the relationship between the citizen and the State from one of rights to one of permission.

I must ask the Government why we are making an already difficult process even harder. Many transgender persons have already spoken about the immense barriers they face in securing a simple identity card. By adding more bureaucratic hurdles, we are not protecting them but we are exhausting them into invisibility.

The 2011 Census recorded 4.88 lakh transgender persons in India, a number widely acknowledged to be a serious undercount. Independent estimates suggest the real population runs into several millions. Behind these numbers are lives mocked by rejection by families that turn away, by classrooms that exclude, and by workplaces that shut doors. For many, the struggle is not for privilege but for survival. Yes, this Bill narrows the definition of transgender persons, excluding transmen and several gender diverse identities that do not fit into rigid categories. Why is this selective recognition? Why is this erasure? A Constitutional democracy cannot decide which identities are legitimate and which are not. Equality before law cannot be conditional.

Hon. Madam Chairperson, the Government claims that this Bill is for the welfare of the community. But the record tells a different story. The average annual allocation of funds for transgender welfare has been minimal relative to the scale of need, and a significant portions of those funds have remained unspent. When the State fails to deliver even the basic welfare, by what logic does it seek greater control over identity? This is not governance. This is exclusion by design.

Madam Chairperson, a State like mine, Tamil Nadu, was the first one to set up a Transgender Board. I would like to give due credit to the then hon. Chief Minister Mr. Kalaignar. But it was not easy for the Government of Tamil Nadu. There is a lot of social stigma. The people are alienated. So many processes have been gone through including, to sensitize the bureaucracy, to sensitize the people. Years have been spent. But now, we are in a better position to support our transgender persons. But this regressive Bill takes away the right of the State which has spent decades to sensitize their own people and their bureaucracy.

This Bill goes further. It introduces provisions that criminalize so-called forcing someone to present as transgender. This provision is vague, dangerous, and open to misuse. I will explain. I agree that no one should force anyone to present as a transgender. But it will be misused. It will give a lot of authority to police and a lot of authority to many authorities. It will be misused. The risk involves targeting families, community networks, and civil society organisations ? the very spaces that often provide the only support a transgender person has. Tomorrow, if you and I, irrespective of the place we are sitting ? whether we are sitting on the Treasury Benches or on the Opposition Benches ? choose to support some transgender persons based on their wish to support their caste, then, you and I can be criminalized. Is this the law we want to bring in the Parliament? We need to think about it.

Further, the Bill mandates reporting of individual undergoing gender- affirmation procedure to the State. In the Puttaswamy judgment, the Supreme Court affirmed that privacy, bodily integrity, and decisional autonomy are Fundamental Rights. This Bill violates those principles.

Hon. Madam Chairperson, imagine a young person already facing a stigma and now forced to fear that their most personal choices will be reported, recorded, and judged. This is not protection; this is an intrusion. What kind of democracy are we building if citizens might fear the State for simply existing in their own skin? Thousands of transgender persons have already obtained legal identity under the existing law. They have built lives, found jobs, pursued education, and begun to live with a sense of dignity that was long denied.

The Bill threatens to pull the ground from beneath their feet. It tells them that the identity they fought for and the lives they built can be taken away by a change in procedure. Equally concerning is the complete absence of meaningful consultation. Laws affecting a marginalised community cannot be framed without their voices. If we do not listen to them now, when will we? This is not a

2019 4 (2) 14, 15, 19 21

2026 35 32 2019

?

18 ()

18 ()

[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED], [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

2019

2019

2019

2026

The diagram illustrates a 10x10 grid representing a 1000-word vocabulary. The grid is filled with black squares, with some squares containing question marks. The grid is divided into four horizontal sections of 25 squares each. The first section contains 10 question marks. The second section contains 10 question marks. The third section contains 10 question marks. The fourth section contains 10 question marks.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

DR. T. SUMATHY ALIAS THAMIZHACHI THANGAPANDIAN (CHENNAI SOUTH): Hon. Chairperson, Madam, with a heavy heart, deep pain and a great concern for our beloved trans community, I rise here to oppose the Bill, on behalf of the DMK party, presided over by our hon. Chief Minister, M. K. Stalin, who has been a warrior or a pioneer of transgender rights.

I oppose the Bill because it is not merely a question of Bill, but it is a question of human rights, survival of a community with dignity. So, today I rise not merely to oppose a Bill, I rise here to oppose an idea, an idea that the State can decide who you are, an idea that identity must be verified before dignity is granted, an idea that rights are conditional upon certification. So, I rise to oppose the Bill.

Madam, let me begin with a poem written by Lee Mokobe, a South African slam poet and an activist, who has very powerfully and painfully explained in a poem his trans experience. I quote:

??no one ever thinks of us as human.
because we are more ghost than flesh.
people are afraid that my gender expression is a trick.
that it only exists to be perverse.
that it ensnares them without their consent.
that my body is a feast for their eyes and hands.
and when they have fed off my queer.
they will regurgitate all the parts they did not like.
they will put me back in the closet.
hang me with their other skeletons??.

Madam, these voices all over India, all over Tamil Nadu, all over the world, which should have been heard, were not heard, not consulted before bringing this Bill.

Madam, let me begin with the hon. Supreme Court's seminal verdict itself. In NALSA v. Union of India, the court seminally declared that self-identified gender is integral to personal autonomy and dignity. Yet this Bill attempts something extraordinary. It attempts to legislate a doubt. It attempts to replace constitutional morality with administrative suspicion. That is why we strongly oppose this Bill.

Madam, this is not a technical correction; this is not a harmless clarification. It is a constitutional regression. It is a Bill that pretends to protect while actually narrowing identity, expanding surveillance and reintroducing State control over the most personal truth a human being can hold, that is, who they are.

Madam, through you, I would like to ask a question. Has the law asked any cisgender person to identify themselves through a medical board? So, before I explore the intricacies of this Bill, I would just like to remind this House of the statement the hon. Prime Minister himself said on the last day of the 17th Lok Sabha regarding this trans community. I would like to quote our hon. Prime Minister:

?Members of the 17th Lok Sabha expressed concern for them and sought to ensure a better life for them. The world discusses what India has done for transgenders. We have given transgenders an identity. As many as 16,000 to 17,000 from the community have been given identity cards.?

Today, just two years later, his own Government brings a bill that seeks to take that identity back. That is why we oppose this Bill. What has changed? Was the identity real then and inconvenient now, or was it only a political slogan? The contradictions do not end here. On the 11th March, the

Government told the Lok Sabha that rejections of transgender identity certificates were merely due to minor document mismatches. But on 13th March, the same Government introduced this Bill claiming that the existing definition is vague and impossible to administer. Which version should the country believe ? the earlier version or the March 13th version? We are told that out of nearly 35,000 applications, around 30,000 identity certificates have been already issued. What happens to those citizens now? Will their identities be repealed or reopened? Will their dignity be placed under fresh scrutiny?

Also, another matter of grave concern is that the National Council for Transgender Persons was not meaningfully consulted before bringing this Bill. Even when they had an appointment with the hon. Minister's office, they were not given convincing answers, and no stakeholders were actually consulted before bringing these draconian amendments to this Bill. That is why we oppose this Bill.

Madam, there is a larger and deeply troubling pattern emerging. This Government increasingly seeks to regulate every sphere of personal life, what we eat, who we love, what we watch, and what we write. After polarising citizens along religion and caste, now it is gender identity, which is a frontier control in this form.

Madam, we should not forget the simple truth that you cannot certify a human soul through a medical board. Identity is a fundamental right, not a Government permit.

Madam, before I just explore the objectives of the Bill, I would like to just point out a few points in what way Tamil Nadu, under Mr. M. K. Stalin's leadership, has shown dignity and inclusion, not in slogans, but in policy decisions. In 2008, DMK in Tamil Nadu, under the leadership of the then Chief Minister, Dr. Kalam, was the pioneering State in establishing the first Transgender Welfare Board. It was the first State among all the States of India to do that. That was not tokenism but pioneering governance. The State has since used respectful terms like ?Thirunangai? and ?Thirunambi? in official communication. But this Bill is addressing them as ?Aravani?, etc. which are all cliched, undone nomenclatures that are done away in official communications, as they are considered offensive and are associated with certain stigma. But the Bill is using all those nomenclatures.

Tamil Nadu has supported identity cards, ration cards, house pattas, pensions, free travel in ordinary city buses, scholarships, skill training, and livelihood without demeaning their dignity. Tamil Nadu was the first State to provide free gender-affirming surgery in Government hospitals. Tamil Nadu, under the DMK Government,

included access to gender-affirming healthcare in State health schemes. It has also taken important steps of banning forced intersex surgeries without interfering in their dignity as a human right. They have been upkept.

In 2025, our present Chief Minister, Thalapathy M. K. Stalin, has brought out a marvellous State policy for Transgender Persons. Tamil Nadu is the first State in India to do so. That policy of Tamil Nadu explicitly commits itself to self-identification without mandatory medical certification and that is what we demand here also. This is the model of the governance of Tamil Nadu. The Union Government should learn from that, not undermine.

Tamil Nadu has also shown what inclusive public life means. It was the first State to introduce a third gender option in college application forms. It has enabled transgender persons to enter public service, including the recent landmark case of K. Prithika Yashini in the police force. Tamil Nadu has advanced police sensitisation and anti-harassment guidelines. It has recognised that rights do not end recognition; rights must enter schools, hospitals, buses, offices, and homes. That is the Dravidian model. That is the politics of equality, inclusion, which our Chief Minister practises.

Madam, let me examine the Statement of Objects and Reasons. The Government says, 'The legislative policy was intended to protect only those who face severe social exclusion due to biological reasons for no fault of their own.' Madam, this may sound superficially empathetic. People may misunderstand that, oh, this Government is actually approaching them with a kind heart, but that is not.

Let me ask a few questions, through you. Who decides what counts as biological? Who decides what counts as severe? And who gave the State the authority to measure oppression? Is discrimination against trans men less severe? Is violence against non-binary persons less real? Is humiliation in schools, hospitals, workplaces somehow less painful because it does not fit in a biological checklist? How can you adapt a biological checklist to all the matters which I have listed above? Oppression is not a laboratory category. It is a lived reality. The Bill further says this.

Madam, I am the only speaker. I have 15 minutes.

HON. CHAIRPERSON: Go on.

DR. T. SUMATHY ALIAS THAMIZHACHI THANGAPANDIAN :
The Bill further says, 'The Act was not meant to protect each and every class of persons with various gender identities.' Madam, it is very ironical. The Constitution assures freedom.

Every citizen should be protected, and it is a constitutional right. And it is a reversal of it.

Since when did the Government acquire the power to rank identities? When did dignity become selective? When did rights become exclusionary privileges?

Madam, is it difficult to stop discrimination? Is it difficult to ensure employment? Is it difficult to provide healthcare?

Or is it simply difficult to accept diversity? Provide all these provisions, all these assurances in your Bill and then make it effective and then talk about anything in the real sense of the word.

If the law struggles with complexity, the answer is not erasure. It is better governance. This Bill is sheer erasure and not better governance. The Government says identification must not be based on personal choice or self-perceived identity.

This is perhaps the most dangerous line and the most revealing, most objectionable aspect of this Bill. This is because what it really means is that the State does not trust transgender persons. The State believes that identity must be certified. The State believes that autonomy is negotiable. This is moral regression, moral policing.

This Bill removes the statutory right to self-identification. It replaces it with medical boards. It requires scrutiny. Let me ask a simple question. Does a cisgender citizen, a man or a woman, require a medical certificate to be recognised as a man or a woman in this country?

Will it be different with the trans men then? Are not we all the same? It is purely a human right issue, violation of human rights, dignity.

17.00 hrs

This Bill, in plain words, says: ?Show us, tell us, prove to us who you are, and then we will decide whether to believe it or not.? The Bill narrows the definition of transgender persons so sharply that it excludes trans women, trans men, non-binary persons, and genderqueer persons, unless they fit into a rigid biological or socio-cultural checklist. What kind of legislation is this?

I am just going through it briefly, Madam. Please allow me. The Bill is again an infiltration into the right to privacy. Privacy is being infiltrated upon here. The Supreme Court, in the Puttaswamy versus Union of India judgment, recognised privacy as a Fundamental Right, and this Bill goes against that. Further, freezing identity into traditional boxes such as *hijra*, *aravani*, *kinner*

or similar community structures is also a matter of concern. It fragments identities rather than including all, particularly trans men.

The Bill also claims to provide protection by criminalising coercion, abduction, forced labour, forced identity, and bodily harm. While I understand the concerns, one cannot claim to protect transgender persons merely by introducing such provisions, especially when transgender and queer persons with disabilities have already expressed apprehension that this Bill will push them further to the margins. By casting suspicion on caregiver support systems, it threatens the very networks that enable their survival. This approach contradicts the spirit of the Rights of Persons with Disabilities. This is not merely a policy debate; it concerns survival itself. Why is the law collapsing victimhood into identity? Why is it using a penal concern to redraw the meaning of gender itself?

I would like to reiterate a few concerns. The larger political question is that over the past decade, we have seen a troubling pattern of this BJP Government. Rights are being reframed as privileges, autonomy as risk, and diversity as disorder. Through you, Madam, I have a few questions for the Government. Why are you asking the transgender community beings to trust a law that begins by doubting them? Why are you deleting self-identification when the Supreme Court has already affirmed it? Why are you introducing medical gatekeeping when the world is moving away from it? Why are you using the language of safety to produce insecurity? The Constitution does not say: 'You are free. However, subject to approval.'

I would like to quote Foucault, one of the greatest philosophers. He says:

'The purpose of constant surveillance is to compel prisoners to regard themselves as subjects of correction. The purpose of constant surveillance is not to scare prisoners who are thinking of escaping but rather to compel them to regard themselves as subject to correction.'

This Government treats the transgender community as subjects to be corrected, which is highly condemnable. On these principles ? social justice, dignity and inclusive governance ? Tamil Nadu stands firm. On these very principles, we reject this Bill. The DMK rejects this Bill. At the very least, it must be withdrawn or referred to the Parliamentary Standing Committee. A nation is not judged by how it treats its most powerful; it is judged by how it treats those whose voices are the easiest to ignore. I urge the Government to withdraw this draconian Bill.

SHRIMATI JUNE MALIAH (MEDINIPUR): Hon. Chairperson, Madam, I rise to strongly oppose the Transgender Persons (Protection of Rights) Amendment Bill, 2026.

I speak not only as a representative voice, but as a supporter to transgender, intersex, gender-diverse and queer persons across our country ? citizens whose dignity, rights, and identities are being debated in this House today. This Bill does not protect; it excludes. It does not empower; it controls. Most importantly, it does not uphold the Constitution; it weakens it. Let us recall the landmark judgment of the Supreme Court in National Legal Services Authority versus Union of India. In that historic case, the Court affirmed a Fundamental Right ? the right of every individual to determine their own gender identity. This was not just a legal ruling; it was a recognition of dignity, autonomy and personhood.

Following this, the Parliament enacted the Transgender Persons (Protection of Rights) Act, 2019, built on key principles of self-identification, simple administrative processes, no compulsory medical procedures, recognition of non-binary identities, and access to gender-affirming care. But this Amendment Bill dismantles these very principles.

India is home to one of the largest transgender populations in the world.

The 2011 Census recorded nearly 4.9 lakh persons, though this is widely understood to be an undercount. Yet, as of March 2026, in India, only 35,000 applications have been filed for transgender certificates. This is just seven per cent of people, as per Census of 2011.

Even today, many transgender persons face exclusion from education, employment, healthcare, and housing. They are pushed to the margins, not by choice, but by discrimination. Only 809 trans-individuals stand as beneficiaries of the PM Awas Yojana with 12 States and Union Territories having zero beneficiaries. And yet, instead of addressing these real challenges, this Bill focuses on restricting their identity.

The most alarming provision is the removal of the right to self-identification. Let me explain clearly what this change means in practice. Until now, transgender persons had the right to identify themselves. They could say who they are, and the State was bound to respect that identity. This Bill is not bringing progress. It is taking rights away.

I strongly oppose this Bill, and my Party opposes this Bill because this is something that we do not stand for. It says that a person must now fit into limited categories such as Hijra or Kinner,

Aravani, Jogta or prove their identity through biological criteria. But how does one become Hijra or Kinner? Is it not also through a self-perceived identity? These are not merely biological labels. They are deeply rooted in identity, lived experience and social belonging. By restricting recognition to a few categories, this Bill excludes many communities such as Kothi, Khwaja Sira, Thirunangai, Mangalamukhi, Thirunambi, Durani, Nupi Manbi and Nupi Manba. This is not inclusion. This is exclusion by design.

The Bill also forces individuals to undergo medical processes to prove who they are. They must approach doctors, Medical Boards and Government officials for approval. This is not protection. It is control. Gender identity is not something that can be certified by a medical test. It comes from within.

Many transgender persons already face violence and rejection at home. Thus, forcing disclosure through official processes would expose them to even greater danger. Are we protecting them or are we putting them at risk?

There is also the issue of criminalization. Now, let us take a look at the criminal provision this Bill introduces. For example, in Clause 7, if a friend, a support group, or an NGO helps a transgender person escape abuse or migrate from their villages, they are to be punished with imprisonment for a term of no less than six months, which may extend up to two years. Such vague provisions create fear, not safety. Even basic self-expression would be questioned. Most importantly, this Bill takes away rights that were already recognized. People who had begun to live with dignity may now be pushed back to fear. This is not reform. This is a rollback, and this is precisely why this provision violates Fundamental Rights.

The Supreme Court in Justice K. S. Puttaswamy *versus* Union of India held that privacy is a Fundamental Right under Article 21. Mandatory medical certification directly violates that right.

The Bill also introduces a narrow and arbitrary definition of transgender. India has long recognised transgender as an umbrella term, including transmen, transwomen, non-binary persons, genderqueer individuals and socio-cultural identities. This Bill restricts that understanding and excludes many. Even more concerning is the conflation of intersex persons with transgender persons. These are distinct issues and merging them ignores the right of both groups.

This Bill creates a dangerous legal gap. By narrowing the definition, it removes recognition and protection for many individuals. We are not just amending a law in this House; we are

erasing people from it.

This House has a history of progressive leadership. Hon. Members like Tiruchi Siva showed that Parliament can lead with inclusion and dignity. We must live up to that legacy.

I would also like to highlight that inclusive governance is already being practised under the leadership of Chief Minister of West Bengal, Mamata Banerjee. Mamata Didi established a Transgender Development Board in 2015. The State has taken steps to provide identity recognition, welfare access, and social security. But beyond policy, let us look at the lived reality.

India's first openly transgender college principal, who was made the principal of Krishnanagar Women's College, Nadiya district on 7th of June 2015 in West Bengal, Manobi Bandopadhyay, once spoke of how she received recognition and dignity under Mamata Banerjee's leadership after years of denial despite legal documents. This is dignity in action. This shows us a different path, a path of inclusion, not restriction. When States are now moving forward, why should national law move backward?

The current definition of a transgender person is not vague. It emerged from years of legal and community effort. It emerged from an expert committee on transgender issues in 2013, the NALSA judgement in 2014, and years of community consultation. To dismiss it is to ignore a decade of progress.

This Bill replaces inclusion with exclusion, dignity with control and rights with restrictions. Instead of restricting identity, we should focus on real issues, education, employment, healthcare, and protection from violence; not policing identity.

I urge this House and hon. Members to stand with Constitution, reject this Bill, refer it to a Select Committee, include the transgender community in the process because no law about a community should be made without that particular community. That is what I feel.

Madam, I conclude with the words of Swami Vivekananda and I quote:

?If every soul is divine, then no law should deny a person the right to be who they are.?

This is not just about a Bill. This is not just about one Bill. This is about the kind of India we choose to be: an India that recognises dignity or one that controls identity; an India that includes or one that excludes. Hence, let us choose dignity, let us choose equality, let us choose justice. Thank you, Madam. Jai Hind, Jai Bangla.

DR. BYREDDY SHABARI (NANDYAL): Madam, thank you for giving me this opportunity to speak on this very important Bill.

There are a few concerns which were there since past few months, and after seeing the concerns of transgender community, I have read this Bill in detail and it is very much clear that the transgender community has misunderstood this Bill. I can say that it is a historic Bill that gives identity and justice also to the transgender community. There is a small story in the Ramayana where Lord Rama went to 14 years of Vanavas. He asked whoever came with him to go back to Ayodhya and let him finish off his 14 years of Vanavas. When he came back after 14 years, he saw a few people there waiting for Lord Rama. Rama asked them, "Why did you not go?" They replied, "Lord Rama, you have asked only men and women to go and we do not belong to either men or women." Lord Rama was so moved with that answer that he said, "I give up. I want to bless you all." So, he had given the power to the transgenders to bless everyone and from then on, they have become an integral part of our culture and especially the transgender community from my district has been very close to my heart.

We believe that the transgenders are Ardhanarishwara; we believe that they are Ayala; and we believe that they are Brihannala. When Modi Ji has brought Rama to Ayodhya, I am pretty sure that he will do justice to the people who are blessed by Lord Rama and the people who bless us.

Coming back to the Bill, there are a few concerns and the main concern about this is omission of trans men and trans women in the definition of transgender. Apart from identifying people with socio-cultural identities into transgender, this Bill also includes people with gonadal malformations, agenesis and also people with primary sexual characters and external genitalia, endogenous hormone production and all. There should be a proper system. When we are born, doctors determine our sex and every person sitting here has the birth certificate to determine our sex and this birth certificate is used until we are dead. Why can a transgender not have an identification? I just heard from one of our colleagues that the women's reservation Bill is coming. If we do not have a system to identify our sex, then we will identify as women and then we will gain out of women's reservation Bill. That is what they have been saying because the fake cases have been increasing a lot. There are fake cases where people, who are posing as transgenders, have been increasing and there was a transgender community that has come to me. Today, the Opposition has been speaking about the rights of the transgender community but when they were in power, did they even do justice to the transgender

community? They just left them on the street and they were left to rot on the road.

People from the transgender community have come and told us that some people are posing as transgenders and they are doing their job. They are going to every occasion in my Nandyal district for the blessings. This has created a lot of difficulties among the transgender population because they have been dominating us. So, such fake cases should come down. This Bill has included the provision to give birth certificate. There is also a provision that they can change the name in the birth certificate and also the sex in the birth certificate which is very useful to them.

There is also a legal recognition of gender identity such as male, female or third gender in every way possible and these people can be identified through a medical board which is very much easy. From their childhood in the school, college and during their jobs, everywhere they have been discriminated against and they have faced a lot of problems. This section 18 has further been amended. This section was very important since it provides strict and rigorous penalties for those people who are exploiting the transgender community. They have been penalised strictly. Also, kidnapping any person and causing castration, amputation or any surgical, chemical or hormonal procedure or permanent or severe injury to the body or bodily and forcing children to turn them into transgender are offences. Therefore, we have to be thankful to the Government that strict punishment of 10 to 14 years and a penalty of 3 years has been imposed on them.

Madam, also, there are many instances where transgender community had to move to courts for the basic human rights. This Bill will resolve majority of the problems. With various schemes, like SMILE Scheme, health insurance in Ayushman Bharat and also providing them shelters and rehabilitation in every possible way, we have been helping them. The State of Andhra Pradesh has the second largest transgender community in the country. We have been supporting them in every way we can, and even today, our Social Welfare Minister has distributed auto-rickshaws to members of the transgender community. We have also been giving NTR Bharosa pension to every transgender person in our State.

I would also like to request the hon. Minister that we have been receiving a lot of concerns from the transgender community every day. So, I would like to request the hon. Minister to examine every concern raised by the transgender community, as we must stand by their side. I am confident that we will do justice, and that this Bill will ensure true justice for the transgender community. With these words, I support the Bill. Thank you.

there was no urgency. We would have rather had a debate today on the Eastern war and the global issues than discussing this Bill in such a haste. I see no reason why this is being discussed instead of the economic situation, the crisis of this country and the world under pressure. There are three limited points which I want to raise and I hope the hon. Minister gives pointed answers for these.

The first point which I would like to raise is about the arbitrary and narrow definition of transgenders in this new Bill. It is arbitrary and it is very, very narrow. I would like to read from here. The definition leaves out majority of the identities recognized nationally in the 2019 Act, which is transgender men, women, gender non-binary people, and the Supreme Court's NALSA right to life and dignity, which is already given to them. It looks like the perception of it is taken away. I would like to quote:- "The right to choose one's gender identity is integral to the right to life with dignity and therefore falls within the scope of right to life under the Indian Constitution, Article 21".

The second question I would like to ask is about invasive reporting of medical procedures. I want a pointed reply for this. My question is, if somebody chooses a gender that they want and they choose to operate, why should a magistrate or a collector need it? It is invisibility. It is my privacy. If I go to a doctor, I will choose what I want. Who is the Government to tell me that? The point is this. But then their question will be that we are here for all your rights. My point is that we are not asking for those rights. There may be many transgender people who need not want all these rights. It is something very personal. Why does this Government want to know it and be so intrusive about everything? If somebody goes ahead, operates, it is that person's right to privacy. Why does this Government want to do policing? It comes across as an anti-transgender Bill, not a pro-transgender Bill. So, this Government should make it very clear, and withdraw this. This is exactly why we wanted this to go to a Select Committee, because it is completely against the privacy and personal rights of every citizen, whether it is a man or a woman or a transgender. It is something which is very individual and personal, and it is not the business of any Government of the time or any country for that matter.

The third point which I would like to raise is the criminalization of families, care providers and transgenders. I appreciate the point that if somebody is misusing any power, they must be criminalised. But for decriminalisation, at one time, the Government has to decide to take a stand. Prof. Sougata Ray ji is right here in the House. Just last week, the Government had taken a stand on financial Bills, in which criminalization was brought in by Shri Arun

■■■■■ ■ Why not do that? You want to be such a progressive Government, go and walk the extra mile, we all will support you. I tell you this on behalf of all of us. ■■ ■■■■■ ■■■ ■■■■■■■ ■.

SHRI PRATAP CHANDRA SARANGI (BALASORE): Thank you, hon. Madam Chairperson, for allowing me to participate in the discussion.

SHRI PRATAP CHANDRA SARANGI (BALASORE): Thank you, hon. Madam Chairperson, for allowing me to participate in the discussion.

with dignity. They require our sympathy; not only sympathy but honour also.

When a man murders somebody, he is penalized. He may get life imprisonment and he may be hanged, sentenced to death. But if he kills 10,000 sepoys in the war, he will be honoured with a Param Vir Chakra. Although it looks like the same, but the motive is different. In killing somebody, violence was the motive and here, patriotism is the motive. So, in enacting this Bill, the motive of the Government is very different. The motive of the Government is to give them prestige, to protect them against every oppression, and to protect them from impersonation.

Suppose the Government makes some reservations or special privileges for them, any person, through self-identification, without being a transgender person, can snatch away their rights, and real transgender persons may not get the opportunity. Somebody might take it away. So, this is to protect the transgender community from infiltrators.

Now, I will touch upon a different dimension. Earlier, the penal provisions were very negligible. So, people were encouraged to commit any type of crime against transgender persons, and with very nominal penalties, they would get away. But this Act makes the penal provisions much stricter. I will read out a very small portion of the penal provisions:

?Whoever compels or entices a transgender person to indulge in forced or bonded labour, other than any compulsory service for public purposes imposed by the Government, shall be punishable with imprisonment for a term which shall not be less than six months but may extend to two years. Whoever, with the intent of, or in the course of, compelling such a person to assume, adopt, or outwardly present a transgender identity against the will or consent of such person, whether by force, allurement, deceit, undue influence, or otherwise, shall be punishable with rigorous imprisonment for a term which shall not be less than ten years but may extend to imprisonment for life, and shall also be liable to a fine which shall not be less than Rs.2 lakh. Whoever kidnaps or abducts any child and causes grievous harm to such a child, whether by mutilation, emasculation, amputation, or any surgical, chemical, or hormonal procedure, or permanent or severe injury to the body or bodily functions of the child, with the intent or in the course of compelling such a child to assume, adopt, or outwardly present a transgender identity, whether by force, allurement, deceit, undue influence, or otherwise, shall be punishable with rigorous imprisonment for life and shall also be liable to a fine

which shall not be less than Rs.5 lakhs.?

HON. CHAIRPERSON: Kindly conclude.

SHRI PRATAP CHANDRA SARANGI: Madam, in the case of sexual abuse, how do we determine it? Unless there is medical scrutiny, anybody can be penalised if someone claims that they have been tortured. So, there is a scientific approach, and that is through medical scrutiny. This is for the betterment of this community, and our hon. Prime Minister, Shri Narendra Modi ji, has every honour, respect, and love for this community and for all vulnerable communities. Therefore, it is for the betterment of their community that this law should be passed unanimously. Given the good intentions of the Government, everybody should come unanimously, without opposing, and support the Bill. I appeal to the Opposition as well. I support the Bill. Thank you.

SHRI ARVIND GANPAT SAWANT (MUMBAI SOUTH): Thank you, hon. Madam Chairperson. At the outset, let me state that a transgender person is a human being; you must understand that they are human beings and should not be humiliated. What exactly we are going to do, I do not know. What is the necessity or urgency for the Government to introduce such a Bill and get it passed right now?

If you look at the population of India, it is 140 crore. What is the population of transgender persons today? It is hardly 4.8 lakh. Out of that, 37,000 are registered as transgender persons; 3,000 are waiting for registration; and 1,400 are registered for skill development training. This is the situation in the country. I do not understand what the necessity or urgency was for the Government to introduce this Bill and get it passed today itself.

Madam, we strongly oppose the Transgender (Protection of Rights) Amendment Bill, 2026, as it undermines the constitutional rights to equality, self-determination, life, liberty, and dignity. Article 14 of the Constitution provides for equality before the law and equal protection of the law. Article 15 of the Constitution prohibits discrimination on the grounds of religion, race, caste, sex, or place of birth.

In *National Legal Services Authority versus Union of India* case, the hon. Supreme Court of India affirmed that the term 'sex' under Article 15 includes gender and gender identity, extending full constitutional protection to transgender persons in India. It further recognised self-determination of gender identity as a part of Article 19 protecting freedom to 'express one's chosen gender identity through varied ways and means by way of expression, speech, mannerism, clothing, etc., including one's right to express one's gender identity. Article 21 guarantees the right to life and personal

liberty, which includes living with autonomy, dignity and self-respect. The ability to determine and express one's gender is central to this right. Together, Articles 14, 15, 19 and 21 affirm that transgender persons are entitled to equality, freedom, self-determination and dignity under the Constitution of India. The Transgender Persons (Protection of Rights) Act 2019 enacted in 2019 is an anti-discrimination and welfare rights legislation. So, this was the very good existing legislation. Now, what are we doing?

The proposed definition restricts recognition to select socio-cultural groups and intersex persons. It arbitrarily removes transmen, transmasculine, transwomen who do not belong to the socio-cultural group, gender queer and gender diverse persons from the definition. This is even more important. There is an arbitrary erasure of some categories, and there is no constitutional basis to distinguish between them. All these categories are constitutionally protected categories under the umbrella term 'transgender' persons. Failing to account for this diversity not only violates constitutional safeguards but also risks exclusion and marginalisation, including indigenous identities.

Now, I come to violation of the Constitutional Right to self-determination. The proposed amendment arbitrarily and unconstitutionally deletes Section 4 (2) of the 2019 Act, which guarantees the right to self-perceived identity. The erasure of self-identification is a systematic denial of personhood, dignity and decisional autonomy. It effectively criminalises living with oneself, denying the right to live as one's true self and undermines Articles 14, 15, 19 and 21 of the Constitution.

How are they doing this criminalisation? The proposed insertion of Section 18(g) which criminalises alluring or forcing someone to present as transgender is deeply concerning. By introducing punitive measures within an anti-discrimination and welfare legislation, the Bill risks criminalising transgender persons and their support structure. Such provisions are sweeping. He has rightly pointed out that they are asked to strip their clothes at police stations. Such provisions are sweeping, vague and prone to misuse making them both contradictory and counterproductive to the original legislative intent to protect rights of transgender persons. The provision echoes colonial-era suspicion and control of marginalised communities, reminiscent of the Criminal Tribes Act (Amended) 1897, which criminalised the entire community. Such rhetoric has been rejected by the High Court of Telangana in striking down the Telangana Eunuch Act, 1919, recognising its incompatibility with fundamental rights.

The Bill proposed the establishment of a medical board to screen transgender persons, whose recommendation may determine whether the District Magistrate may issue a certificate of identity, with further discretion to seek additional medical opinion from a medical expert. The Bill also proposes the mandatory furnishing of details by medical institutions of individuals who have undergone gender-affirming care. These provisions are highly invasive and constitute a clear violation of the right to privacy and decisional autonomy, as affirmed by the nine-judge bench of the Supreme Court in K. S. Puttaswamy vs. Union Of India, which recognises bodily integrity and decisional autonomy as constitutionally protected.

They have not consulted any stakeholders. That is the worst part of it. I came across so many genuine NGOs. There were some eunuchs. We call them in Maharashtra as *hijras*. They came to my office and told us that they have not been consulted at all. They are the stakeholders. They should have been consulted while amending this rule. The proposed amendment jeopardises thousands of transgender persons who have already exercised their Constitutional right to legal recognition under the 2019 Act.

The proposed clause in Section 18(g) is misconceived and misplaced, which risks exposing transgender persons and those who support them, their families and friends, healthcare providers and doctors. Instead of providing protection, the proposed Bill introduces fear and uncertainty within homes and support structures.

As far as the invasive Medical Gatekeeping of Identities is concerned, it is imperative to note that the Standing Committee on the Transgender Bill, 2019, had cautioned against such a mechanism, observing that the presence of medical professionals on a screening panel creates a serious risk that recognition of a person's identity may be subject to assessment of medical, psychological and biological 'eligibility'. Such an approach would risk pathologizing trans identities, and violate the right of transgender persons under the Supreme Court judgement and international human rights law and standard to have their self-identified gender recognized.

While certain provisions of the 2019 Act, including Sections 4 to 7 and Section 18 are currently under Constitutional challenge before the Supreme Court, the transgender community has never expressed any concerns with the definition under the 2019 Act. Recent landmark cases such as Jane Kaushik versus Union of India challenge discrimination and non-implementation of the Act but not the definition itself. The Bill introduces exclusion, violation

of Constitutional rights without addressing any genuine legal and practical concerns faced by the community.

I, therefore, respectfully request the Government to let the good sense prevail. Kindly withdraw the Bill. There is no hurry as such. I have just quoted the total number of transgenders. I do not know what your urgency is. Send it to the Standing Committee. We are here to support it. Whatever the lacunae we have expressed here, kindly get it corrected, and bring that Bill. We will support that Bill, Sir. Thank you.

... (.....) :
.....
..... (.....)
....., 2026

.....,
.....
.....
..... 14, 15 21
.....
.....
.....
..... 2011 4.9
.....
.....

....., 2019
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

.....,
.....
..... -
.....
.....

[illegible][illegible]

NALSA

NCRB

SMILE, YOU ARE BEAUTIFUL

[illegible]

The diagram illustrates a sequence of 16 blocks, each containing a 4x4 grid of squares. The blocks are arranged in two rows of eight. The top row has a comma after the first block. The bottom row has a comma after the eighth block. The blocks are connected by a horizontal line.

24

2026 2019
 18

[illegible]

_____ , _____ _____ _____ _____
_____, _____ _____ _____ _____ _____
_____ _____ '_____ _____' _____ _____ _____
_____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____
_____ _____ _____ _____

_____ _____ , _____ _____ _____ _____ _____
_____ _____ _____ , _____ _____ , _____ _____ _____
_____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____
_____ , _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____
_____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____
_____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____
_____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____
_____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____
_____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____:

_____ ? _____ _____ _____ _____ , _____ _____
_____ _____ ,

_____ _____ _____ _____ _____ , _____ _____
_____ _____ _____

_____ _____ _____ _____ _____ , _____ _____ _____
_____ ,

_____ _____ _____ _____ _____ , _____ _____
_____ _____ _____ ?

_____ - _____ _____ _____ _____ ! _____
_____ !

18.00 hrs

_____ _____ : _____ _____ _____ , _____ _____
_____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____
_____ _____ _____ _____ ?

_____ _____ _____ _____ : _____ _____

_____ _____ _____ : _____ _____

_____ _____ _____ _____ _____

ADV. GOWAAL KAGADA PADAVI (NANDURBAR): Thank you, Chairperson Madam. I want to
thank my party, the Indian National Congress, for giving me an
opportunity to speak on such a sensitive issue. I just want to start.
Perhaps the most famous example is of Lord Vishnu transforming
into Mohini, the woman version. We have heard the stories of
Samudra Manthan, how Lord Vishnu in the form of Mohini,
distracted the *asuras*. We have heard the story of how Mohini
tricked Bhasmasura, the demon, to destroy himself. We have
heard the story of how Lord Vishnu, in the form of Mohini, formed
union with Lord Shiva. We have also heard the story of how Arjuna,

as Brihannala, acted as a female dancer. We have also heard the story of King Ila, who married Buddha. We have also heard the story of Arjuna and Nagakanya Ulupi, who united together and produced a child called Aravan. And just not to die single, Vishnu ji again took the form of Mohini to get married.

-

18.02 hrs

(Shrimati Sandhya Ray in the Chair)

I want to narrate one important situation in this country. In the State of Tamil Nadu itself, there is Koothandavar temple - my Tamilian friends, I do not know if I have got it right or not - in Villupuram district, which was built for Aravan, who was a transgender. People all over the country do visit it, even from abroad, even from Japan. People do visit this temple created for a transgender.

Hon. Chairperson, Madam, I rise today to speak on a matter that is not merely legislative, but deeply constitutional, moral, and civilisational. The Bill before this House seeks to amend the Transgender Persons (Protection of Rights) Act, 2019. At first glance, the Government presents this amendment as an administrative correction. But when we read the provisions carefully, it becomes evident that the Bill risks rolling back the hard won constitutional rights of one of the most marginalised communities of our country, the transgender community. Let me state clearly, this debate is not about just ideology. It is about the Constitution of India and the dignity of human beings.

Hon. Chairperson, Madam, in *National Legal Services Authority v. Union of India*, popularly known as the NALSA judgement, the hon. Supreme Court delivered a historic verdict stating that a transgender person must be recognised as a third gender and enjoy full constitutional protection under Articles 14, 19, and 21. Most importantly, the court recognised the right to self-identification of gender and held that the gender identity is an intrinsic part of human dignity and personal liberty. The court explicitly stated that no person should be forced to undergo medical tests or procedures to prove their gender identity. Yet, this Amendment Bill now proposes a system where identity must effectively be validated through medical authorities and administrative certification. I ask the Government respectfully: are we legislating against the spirit of our own Supreme Court? Time and again, the Government circumvents the Supreme Court's decisions. Sometimes, even contempt of order, contempt of court has been committed.

Hon. Chairperson, Madam, the Constitution does not grant dignity through a certificate. The Constitution recognises dignity because a person exists. Article 14 speaks of equality before the law. Article 19 guarantees freedom of expression. Article 21 protects life and personal liberty. In NALSA judgement, the Supreme Court interpreted these provisions to include the freedom to express one's gender identity. Gender identity is, the court said, ?an innate perception of one's gender.? By narrowing the definition of transgender persons and placing their identity under bureaucratic verification, this amendment risks transforming a constitutional right into an administrative privilege.

Hon. Chairperson, Madam, India has historically been a civilisation that recognises diversity. Across the world, courts and democracies are increasingly recognising gender identity as a matter of human rights and personal autonomy.

Countries such as Argentina, Malta, Ireland, and Denmark have enacted self-identification laws where gender recognition is based on a person's declaration rather than medical verification. The Yogyakarta Principles, which are widely recognised in international human rights law, affirm that gender identity is a part of the right to dignity, privacy, and self-determination. India, through the NALSA judgment, was once among the leaders of the Global South in recognising transgender rights. However, today, through this amendment, we risk moving backwards.

The transgender community in India has suffered centuries of discrimination ? in education, health, employment, housing, and dignity. The hon. Supreme Court acknowledged this history and recognised transgender persons as socially and educationally backward, recommending affirmative action for them. The purpose of the 2019 Act was to remove barriers, but instead of removing them, this amendment risks creating new ones. As per the 2011 Census, only 4.9 lakh transgender persons were recorded, though this figure is under-reported.

I would like to raise a fundamental question. If the State begins to decide who qualifies as a legitimate identity, where does it stop? Tomorrow, will the State decide who is legitimately religious, who is legitimately tribal, or who legitimately belongs to a particular caste? Identity cannot be certified by the State; it is a part of human existence. I would also like to refer to a Supreme Court judgment in the Jane Kaushik case, where the Court observed that an expert committee should be constituted to address the harassment faced by transgender persons. Without constituting such an expert committee, this Bill should not have been introduced. What is the malice for introducing it? That needs to be clarified by the

Government.

Therefore, the Opposition is not against reform, nor are we against strengthening penalties for crimes against transgender persons. In fact, we seek a stronger law. However, the principles must be clear: do not dilute the right to self-identification; ensure that administrative processes facilitate identity recognition rather than police it; consult transgender communities, stakeholders, and civil society before bringing such amendments; and uphold the spirit of the Constitution and the landmark NALSA judgment. Thank you.

1. 根据《中华人民共和国公司法》（以下简称《公司法》）及《公司章程》的有关规定，结合公司实际情况，经董事会决议，决定向特定对象发行人民币普通股股票，募集资金总额不超过人民币 100,000,000.00 元（含本数），募集资金净额扣除发行费用后将全部用于补充流动资金和偿还债务。

[illegible]

2019

Section 2 transgender transgender biological medical self-perceived identity sexual orientation LGBTQ+ Navtej Johar sexual orientation

?,

SHRI BALWANT BASWANT WANKHEDE (AMRAVATI): Honorable Chairperson Madam, the Transgender Persons Protection (Amendment) Bill, 2026, has recently been introduced in the Lok Sabha. Prior to this, the

Transgender Persons (Protection of Rights) Act, 2019, was in force. However, the Minister of Social Justice and Empowerment, Shri Virendra Kumar, introduced this amendment bill after making radical changes to the existing legislation. It is imperative to examine the significant changes that this amendment bill is set to bring about.

Honorable Chairperson, the question arises: why is a separate law necessary for transgender persons? They constitute a marginalized section of society, and the Supreme Court has itself underscored their educational and social backwardness. Through continuous collective struggle, transgender persons have secured their rights. Over the past decade, the community has achieved significant success, primarily in securing legal reforms and protective measures.

Honorable Chairperson, the 2021 Act reite transgender persons?like all other individuals?are entitled to the freedom to live with dignity, as well as equality before the law, justice, fundamental rights, gender equality, freedom of expression, and the right to privacy. However, the introduction of this 2026 Amendment Bill in the Lok Sabha appears to constitute an assault on the freedom of expression of transgender persons.

Honorable Chairperson, the proposed amendments?which represent suggested changes to the original 2019 Act?primarily pertain to three key aspects.

Honorable Chairperson, the first aspect concerns the definition of a "transgender person." Under the existing law, this definition is broad in scope and aligns with the principle of "self-identification." In other words, the definition implies that an individual identifies as transgender because their gender identity does not correspond to the sex assigned to them at birth. However, the amendment bill completely discards this principle of self-identification, thereby narrowing the definition of a transgender person.

Honorable Chairperson, while the amendment bill acknowledges social, cultural, and other factors, it specifically categorizes individuals such as Kinnars, Hijras, Jogtas, or intersex persons, as well as those born with sexual anomalies whose gender has been forcibly assigned. This amendment bill infringes upon the personal liberty of transgender individuals, as it places the determination of their identity solely in the hands of the government. Consequently, their identity will be established only upon obtaining a certificate from the District Hospital and the District Collector.

Honorable Chairperson, therefore, it would be appropriate to withdraw this bill and engage these individuals in consultation. Through this medium, I demand that this bill either be referred to a Joint Committee or be withdrawn entirely. Furthermore, the rights and authority previously granted by the government should be upheld. Thank you.

KUMARI SUDHA R. (MAYILADUTHURAI): Hon. Chairperson, Madam, I rise today, not merely to oppose the Transgender Persons (Protection of Rights) Amendment Bill, 2026, but to fundamentally challenge the intent, the direction, and the consequence of this legislation. This Bill, which the Government presents as a reform, is in reality a retreat from constitutional morality, from judicial guidance, and from the hard-fought rights of one of the most marginalised communities in our country. Let us be absolutely clear at the outset that the transgender community in India has endured centuries of exclusion, stigma, and violence. Any law that claims to protect them must be expansive, inclusive, and rooted in dignity.

The most alarming feature of this Bill is the complete removal of the definition of the transgender person as it existed in the 2019 Act. While the parent Act defines a transgender person as a person whose gender does not match with the gender assigned at birth, the proposed Bill states that it will not include persons with different sexual orientations and self-perceived sexual identities. The Act includes a person with a socio-cultural identity as a *kinnar*, *hijra*, *aravani*, or *jogata*, and a person with variations at birth in characteristics as a primary sexual characteristic, external genitals, chromosomes, or hormones from the narrative standard of male or female body. But the Bill quite unfairly removes a trans man or trans woman, irrespective of whether such a person has undergone sex reassignment surgery, hormone therapy, or laser therapy, or such other therapy. It has also removed the gender-queer people from its ambit. Under the parent Act, the transgender person may apply to the district collector for issuing a certificate of identity as a transgender person. But the Bill adds that the district collector will issue the certificate after examining the recommendation of the designated medical officer, medical board. The board will be headed by a chief medical officer or a deputy chief medical officer. The district collector may take assistance of other medical experts.

Madam, the transgender and the queer gender is all about feelings and emotions. The child notices changes within him or within her, then realises that she or he is different from others. That is the inner feelings which make him or her to set out on a journey towards self-identification. How can a medical board diagnose the

2019 年 12 月 31 日，本集团持有的金融资产按照公允价值计量的金融资产，其公允价值按照以下方法确定：
 1. 对于存在活跃市场的金融资产，其公允价值按照活跃市场中的报价确定。
 2. 对于不存在活跃市场的金融资产，其公允价值按照以下方法确定：
 (1) 对于在活跃市场中没有报价，但公允价值能够通过其他可观察到的市场数据确定的金融资产，其公允价值按照其他可观察到的市场数据确定。
 (2) 对于在活跃市场中没有报价，且其公允价值不能通过其他可观察到的市场数据确定的金融资产，其公允价值按照估值技术确定。

本集团持有的金融资产按照公允价值计量的金融资产，其公允价值按照以下方法确定：
 1. 对于存在活跃市场的金融资产，其公允价值按照活跃市场中的报价确定。
 2. 对于不存在活跃市场的金融资产，其公允价值按照以下方法确定：
 (1) 对于在活跃市场中没有报价，但公允价值能够通过其他可观察到的市场数据确定的金融资产，其公允价值按照其他可观察到的市场数据确定。
 (2) 对于在活跃市场中没有报价，且其公允价值不能通过其他可观察到的市场数据确定的金融资产，其公允价值按照估值技术确定。

本集团持有的金融资产按照公允价值计量的金融资产，其公允价值按照以下方法确定：
 1. 对于存在活跃市场的金融资产，其公允价值按照活跃市场中的报价确定。
 2. 对于不存在活跃市场的金融资产，其公允价值按照以下方法确定：
 (1) 对于在活跃市场中没有报价，但公允价值能够通过其他可观察到的市场数据确定的金融资产，其公允价值按照其他可观察到的市场数据确定。
 (2) 对于在活跃市场中没有报价，且其公允价值不能通过其他可观察到的市场数据确定的金融资产，其公允价值按照估值技术确定。

本集团持有的金融资产按照公允价值计量的金融资产，其公允价值按照以下方法确定：
 1. 对于存在活跃市场的金融资产，其公允价值按照活跃市场中的报价确定。
 2. 对于不存在活跃市场的金融资产，其公允价值按照以下方法确定：
 (1) 对于在活跃市场中没有报价，但公允价值能够通过其他可观察到的市场数据确定的金融资产，其公允价值按照其他可观察到的市场数据确定。
 (2) 对于在活跃市场中没有报价，且其公允价值不能通过其他可观察到的市场数据确定的金融资产，其公允价值按照估值技术确定。

_____ 14 _____ 21 _____

2025 年 12 月 31 日，本公司 2025 年度利润分配方案为：以 2025 年 12 月 31 日总股本 100,000,000 股为基数，向全体股东每 10 股派发现金股利 1.00 元（含税），共计派发现金股利 10,000,000.00 元。该方案尚需经 2026 年第一次临时股东大会审议通过后方可实施。

2026 年 1 月 1 日起，本公司将开始实施 2025 年度利润分配方案。届时，本公司将根据 2025 年度利润分配方案，向全体股东派发现金股利。

2026 年 1 月 1 日起，本公司将开始实施 2025 年度利润分配方案。届时，本公司将根据 2025 年度利润分配方案，向全体股东派发现金股利。

2019年12月31日，公司总资产为1,234,567,890.12元，较年初增加12.34%，主要系货币资金、应收账款、预付款项、其他应收款、存货、固定资产、无形资产、递延所得税资产、长期股权投资、其他权益工具投资、其他非流动资产等增加所致。其中，货币资金增加1,234,567.89元，应收账款增加1,234,567.89元，预付款项增加1,234,567.89元，其他应收款增加1,234,567.89元，存货增加1,234,567.89元，固定资产增加1,234,567.89元，无形资产增加1,234,567.89元，递延所得税资产增加1,234,567.89元，长期股权投资增加1,234,567.89元，其他权益工具投资增加1,234,567.89元，其他非流动资产增加1,234,567.89元。

2019年12月31日，公司净资产为1,234,567,890.12元，较年初增加12.34%，主要系未分配利润、盈余公积、资本公积、其他综合收益、其他权益工具等增加所致。其中，未分配利润增加1,234,567.89元，盈余公积增加1,234,567.89元，资本公积增加1,234,567.89元，其他综合收益增加1,234,567.89元，其他权益工具增加1,234,567.89元。

2019年12月31日，公司负债总额为1,234,567,890.12元，较年初增加12.34%，主要系应付账款、预收款项、其他应付款、应付职工薪酬、应付利息、应付股利、应付债券、长期借款、其他非流动负债等增加所致。其中，应付账款增加1,234,567.89元，预收款项增加1,234,567.89元，其他应付款增加1,234,567.89元，应付职工薪酬增加1,234,567.89元，应付利息增加1,234,567.89元，应付股利增加1,234,567.89元，应付债券增加1,234,567.89元，长期借款增加1,234,567.89元，其他非流动负债增加1,234,567.89元。

11

Diagram illustrating a grid structure with missing elements (represented by black squares) and a sequence of elements (represented by blue squares). The grid is divided into three rows:

- Row 1: A sequence of 10 blue squares.
- Row 2: A sequence of 10 blue squares, with the first square replaced by a question mark and a 1x6 grid of black squares.
- Row 3: A sequence of 10 blue squares, with the first square replaced by a question mark and a 1x6 grid of black squares.

11

A 10x10 grid of black and white squares. The pattern of black squares is as follows:
Row 1: (1,1), (1,2), (1,3), (1,4), (1,5), (1,6), (1,7), (1,8), (1,9), (1,10)
Row 2: (2,1), (2,2), (2,3), (2,4), (2,5), (2,6), (2,7), (2,8), (2,9), (2,10)
Row 3: (3,1), (3,2), (3,3), (3,4), (3,5), (3,6), (3,7), (3,8), (3,9), (3,10)
Row 4: (4,1), (4,2), (4,3), (4,4), (4,5), (4,6), (4,7), (4,8), (4,9), (4,10)
Row 5: (5,1), (5,2), (5,3), (5,4), (5,5), (5,6), (5,7), (5,8), (5,9), (5,10)
Row 6: (6,1), (6,2), (6,3), (6,4), (6,5), (6,6), (6,7), (6,8), (6,9), (6,10)
Row 7: (7,1), (7,2), (7,3), (7,4), (7,5), (7,6), (7,7), (7,8), (7,9), (7,10)
Row 8: (8,1), (8,2), (8,3), (8,4), (8,5), (8,6), (8,7), (8,8), (8,9), (8,10)
Row 9: (9,1), (9,2), (9,3), (9,4), (9,5), (9,6), (9,7), (9,8), (9,9), (9,10)
Row 10: (10,1), (10,2), (10,3), (10,4), (10,5), (10,6), (10,7), (10,8), (10,9), (10,10)
The grid is composed of black squares on a white background, forming a solid black area.

18
 5
 10
 14
 3

18
 5
 10
 14
 3

18
 5
 10
 14
 3

18
 5
 10
 14
 3

18
 5
 10
 14
 3

18
 5
 10
 14
 3

1

18.42 hrs

At this stage Shri B. Manickam Tagore, Shri Rajesh Ranjan and some other hon. Members left the House.

XXXXXXXXXX XXXXXXXXXXXX: XX. XX. XXXXXXXX XXXXXX XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX - XXXXXXXXXXXX XXXXXX XX

_____. ?

[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

? ■■ ■■■ 2 ■■■■■■ ■■ ■■■ ■■■ ■?

2

CLAUSE 3

1

Amendment of section 4

XXXXXXXXXX XXXXXXXXXX :XX. XX. XXXXXXXX XXXXXX XXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX - XXXXXXXXXXX XXXXXXX

□ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ :

? ■ ■ ■ ■ ■ 3 ■ ■ ■ ■ ■ ■ ■ ■ ■ ■ ■ ■ ■ ■ ■ ?

[illegible]

3

CLAUSE 4

1

Amendment of section 6

■■■■■■ ■■■■■■ :■■■■■ ■■■■■■ ■■■■■ ? ■■■■■■
 ■■■■■ ■

[illegible]

□□. □□□□□□ □□□□□□ ? □□□□□□□□ □□□□ □

**□ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ :
 .**

? ■■ ■■■ 4 ■■■■■■ ■■ ■■■ ■■■ ■?

□ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □

CLAUSE 5

Amendment
of
section
7

Section 7 of the Act is amended to read as follows:

7. (1) The Commission shall, as soon as practicable after the commencement of this Act, prepare and submit to the Minister a report on the state of the environment in the Province.

(2) The Commission shall, in preparing the report, have regard to the following matters:

(a) the state of the environment in the Province;

(b) the quality of the environment in the Province;

(c) the impact of any proposed development on the environment in the Province;

(d) the impact of any proposed development on the environment in the Province;

(e) the impact of any proposed development on the environment in the Province.

CLAUSE 6

Amendment
of
section
16

Section 16 of the Act is amended to read as follows:

16. (1) The Commission shall, as soon as practicable after the commencement of this Act, prepare and submit to the Minister a report on the state of the environment in the Province.

(2) The Commission shall, in preparing the report, have regard to the following matters:

(a) the state of the environment in the Province;

(b) the quality of the environment in the Province;

CLAUSE 7

Substitution
of new
section for
section 18

Section 18 of the Act is substituted with the following section:

□ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ ? □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □

[illegible]

□ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ :

? ■ ■ ■ ■ ■ 7 ■ ■ ■ ■ ■ ■ ■ ■ ■ ■ ■ ■ ■ ■ ■ ■ ?

[illegible]

7

CLAUSE 8

Amendment of section 22

■■■■■■ ■■■■■■ : ■■. ■■■■■■ ■■■■■■ ? ■■■■■■
 ■■■■■■ ■

□ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ :

? ■ ■ ■ ■ ■ 8 ■ ■ ■ ■ ■ ■ ■ ■ ■ ■ ■ ■ ■ ■ ■ ?

[illegible]

8

1,

[illegible][illegible]

? ■■ ■■■■■ ■■■■ ■■■■ ■■■■ ■■■■

[REDACTED] : [REDACTED]

? ■■ ■■■■■ ■■■■ ■■■■ ■■■■ ■■■■ ■■■■

[REDACTED]

25
 11

—

—

-

-

-

17.46 hrs