ANTI-DEFECTION LAW IN INDIA: CONSTITUTIONAL SAFEGUARD OR POLITICAL FORMALITY

P. Karthikeya, BBA LLB, Mahatma Gandhi Law College, Hyderabad.

ABSTRACT

The Anti-Defection Law was introduced in India to address the chronic problem of political defections and to maintain stability and discipline within the parliamentary system. The 52nd Constitutional Amendment Act, 1985, inserted the 10th schedule into the constitution, providing for the disqualification of elected representatives on specified grounds to prevent opportunistic floor-crossing. However, the continued occurrence of defections as raised significant questions regarding the law's real-world effectiveness. This article examines the historical background and constitutional framework of Anti-Defection Law, evaluating its grounds for disqualification alongside practical challenges surrounding its implementation. Analyzing foundational and evolving jurisprudence up to the Supreme Court's critical 2025 ruling. This paper assesses systematic vulnerabilities in such as deliberate adjudications delays by the Speaker, tactical resignation and the ongoing exploitation of 2/3rd mergers exception. Ultimately, this article evaluates whether the Tenth Schedule continues to serve as an effective constitutional safeguard or has faded into a mere political formality. Concluding with structural recommendations to enforce timely implementation and restore the integrity of the democratic mandate.

Keywords: Anti-Defection Law, Tenth Schedule, Constitutional Safeguard, Political formality, Judicial Review, Partisan Speaker, Mass Defection, Tactical Resignations, Legislative Discipline, Parliamentary Democracy.

Introduction

Political defection is the act of an elected representative leaving the political party they belonged to and joining another party. The stability of a parliamentary democracy relies entirely on the integrity of its legislative bodies and the fidelity of elected representatives to their political mandates. When representatives shift alliances mid-term, this behavior is known as floor-crossing which directly alter governing majorities without voter consent, creating structural vulnerabilities in the legislature. To address this constitutional vulnerability, the Anti-Defection framework operates by attaching a statutory penalty of disqualification to actions that compromise party discipline, thereby codifying political morality into positive law. In combat to the rampant, unprincipled floor-crossing of the late 1960's, Parliament enacted the Anti-Defection Law via the 52nd Amendment Act of 1985, inserting the Tenth Schedule[1]. Forty years post-enactment, severe enforcement gaps and procedural manipulations face intense scrutiny. Does the Tenth Schedule remain a robust constitutional safeguard protecting voter intent, or has it deteriorated into a toothless political formality?

Historical Background

The road to the Anti-Defection Law began with the massive political challenges following the February 1967 general elections. As the single-party dominance broke down, fragile state coalition government emerged. This shift triggered an era of rampant floor-crossing, with state assemblies recording over 1,400 unprincipled defections between 1967 and 1971.

Lawmakers routinely switched sides for cash or cabinet posts, causing multiple state governments posts, causing multiple state governments collapse. This chaos was famously epitomized by the October 1967 "Aaya Ram Gaya Ram" incident, where a Haryana Legislator changed parties three times in a single fortnight and twice within nine hours.

Faced with these severe systemic crises, a widespread demand for a statutory remedy finally arose to protect democratic integrity. In response, Parliament appointed a high-level committee, leading to the Chavan Committee Report of 1968, which recommended barring defecting lawmakers from holding ministerial positions.

In translating this demand into law was a long process, Initial Anti-Defection bills were

[1] The Constitution (Fifty-Second Amendment) Act, 1985.

introduced in 1973 and 1978 repeatedly stalled due to lack of political consensus and free speech concerns. The breakthrough came following the December 1984 general elections, where the new government secured a massive mandate for political cleanup.

The Constitution (52nd Amendment) Bill was swiftly introduced in Lok Sabha on January 24, 1985. It was passed by the Lok Sabha on January 30, 1985 and by the Rajya Sabha on January 31, 1985. Upon receiving Presidential signature and assent on February 15, 1985, it culminated in the successful enactment of the 52nd constitutional Amendment Act, officially bringing the Tenth Schedule into force on March 1st, 1985.[2]

Year / Date	Historical/ Legislative Milestone
February 1967	General Elections mark the decline of single-party dominance and the rise of fragile state coalitions.
1967-1971	Era of rampant floor-crossing; state assemblies record over 1,400 unprincipled defections, collapsing multiple ministries.
October 1967	The infamous "Aaya Ram Gaya Ram" incident occurs, where a Haryana lawmaker switches parties three times in a fortnight.
1968	The high-level Chavan Committee Report formally recommends barring defecting lawmakers from holding ministerial offices.
1973 & 1978	Early legislative attempts stall; anti-defection bills fail to pass due to a lack of political consensus.
January 24, 1985	The constitution (Fifty-Second Amendment) Bill is formally introduced in the Lok Sabha following a decisive reform mandate.
January 30-31, 1985	The bill successfully clears both the Lok Sabha and the Rajya Sabha on consecutive days.
February 15, 1985	The Bill receives official Presidential Assent and signature.
March 1,1985	The Tenth Schedule officially comes into force, formally codifying political morality.

Constitutional Framework: Statutory Grounds for Disqualification

The 52nd Constitutional Amendment Act of 1985 altered India's legislative jurisprudence by amending Articles 101,102,190 and 191 of the Constitution.[3] Article 101 and 102 govern the

[2] The Constitution (Fifty – Second Amendment) Act, 1985.
[3] India Const. art. 101; India Const. art. 102; India Const. art. 191; India Const. sched. X.

vacation of seats and disqualifications of Members of Parliament, while Articles 190 and 191 apply the identical constitutional restrictions to Members of State Legislative Assemblies. By inserting the Tenth Schedule, the amendment established clear statutory mechanisms and objective criteria to penalize political defection across three distinct categories:-

1) Members of Political Party [Paragraph 2(1)]:- A lawmaker faces disqualification if they voluntarily give up the membership of their political party, which the judiciary interprets broadly based on anti-party conduct rather than formal resignation alone. Disqualification is also triggered if a member votes or abstains contrary to the official party whip without obtaining prior permission or subsequent condonation within 15 days. [4]

2) Independent Members [Paragraph 2(2)]:- An independent legislator faces automatic disqualification if they join any political party post-elections, thereby protecting the voter mandate that elected them as an unaligned candidate.[5]

3) Nominated Members [Paragraph 2(3)]:- A nominated lawmaker is permitted a six-month window to align with a political party after taking their seat. Joining a political party after this statutory period expires results in automatic disqualification.[6]

To prevent bulk floor-crossing the 91st Constitutional Amendment Act of 2003 completely repealed the provision that protected a one- third "split" within a political party.[7] Under the current legal architecture, the only valid defense against disqualification is a merger under Paragraph 4. This exception strictly requires at least 2/3rd of the legislative wing of a political party to agree to align with another political entity, ensuring that individual political shifts are penalized while regulating collective party choices.[8]

Legislative Objectives of the Anti-Defection Law

The main and primary objective of the Anti-Defection Law, as outlined is to combat the elected representatives from changing political allegiance for personal or political advantage that threatened the foundations of Indian Democracy. The Statutory intent focuses on three core

[4] India Const. sched. X, para. 2(1).
[5] India Const. sched. X, para. 2(2).
[6] India Const. sched. X, para. 2(3).
[7] The Constitution (Ninety-First Amendment) Act, 2003.
[8] M.P. Jain, Indian Constitutional Law 845 (8th ed. 2018)

pillars:-

1) Ensuring Political Stability:- To protect democratically elected governments[9] from being destabilized by erratic, opportunistic floor-crossing driven by the lure of power or rewards.

2) Upholding Voter Fidelity:- Voters choose representatives in the context of political parties and their programmes. To ensure that elected representatives remain loyal to the party manifesto and the political mandate upon which the electorate voted for them. Unprincipled defections may therefore be viewed as undermining the political choice made by the electorate.

3) Strengthening Party Discipline:- To institutionalize political morality by making legislators accountable to their political parties. Thereby the law seeks to ensure that elected representatives do not easily abandon the platform on which they were elected.

The objective of the law is consequently not merely to punish individual legislators. It is intended to protect the functioning and stability of the system itself.

These objectives can be achieved only when the law is effectively implemented.

Legal Loopholes and Practical Failure:-

Although the Anti-Defection Law appears strong on paper, its practical operation raises serious concerns.

The primary legal loopholes and operational failures include:-

1) The 2/3rd Merger:- Paragraph 4 of the Schedule was intended to protect genuine ideology mergers. In practice, it has become a tool for "Institutionalized floor-crossing ". Entire legislative wings exploit the script of the Law to change affiliations without losing their seats, turning a constitutional safeguard into a procedural roadmap for switching slides.

2) The Delay in deciding Disqualification petitions:- The Partisan Speaker Trap:- The law designates the speaker as the sole adjudicating authority. Because the speaker usually belongs to the ruling party, this office has frequently been weaponised. Speakers often use deliberate procedural delays sitting on disqualifications petitions for months or even years to allow

[9] D.D. Basu, Commentary on the Constitution of India 412 (9th ed. 2014).

defected members to sustain a fragile ruling coalition, rendering the law practically.

3)Route Of Tactical Resignations- Instead of risking disqualification by voting against their party, lawmakers simply resign from the house. This tactical move achieves the same goal: it instantly lowers the strength of the House, allowing bringing down the government and forming a new one. The resigned candidates are than rewarded with ruling party tickets in by-elections.

This creates a serious gap between legal accountability and political reality. The problem is therefore not simply whether the Anti-Defection Law exists. The deeper question is whether the Law operates correctly and quickly enough to achieve its intended purpouse.

The Role of Speaker: Institutional Conflict of Interest

Under Paragraph 6 of the Tenth Schedule, the Speaker or chairman holds the exclusive authority to adjudicate disqualification petitions. While this offers administrative convenience because the speaker belongs to the legislature, it introduces a severe conflict of interest. This political tie creates a perception of partisan bias.

The Supreme Court addressed this institutional friction in "Kihoto Hollohan vs. Zachillhu (1992)".[10] The court upheld the constitutional validity of the Anti Defection framework but clarified that speaker functions as a quasi-judicial tribunal when deciding these cases. Consequently, the speakers decisions are subject to judicial review to prevent arbitrariness.

However, the system breaks down when a speaker simply avoids making a choice. In "Rajendra Singh Rana vs. Swami Prasad Maurya (2007)[11]", the court handled a scenario where a speaker recognized a party merger while a disqualification petition was actively pending. The court ruled that claims of a split or merger cannot be separated from ongoing disqualification proceedings. Showing how a speaker's handling of procedure can undermine the entire Tenth Schedule.

Judicial Oversight and the Problem of Procedural Delay

The statutory utility of the Tenth Schedule depends fundamentally on the element of time.

[10] Kihoto Hollohan v.Zachillhu, 1992 Supp.(2) S.C.C.651.
[11] Rajendra Singh Rana v. Swami Prasad Maurya, (2007) 4 S.C.C.270.

When a Speaker deliberately delays adjudicating a disqualification petition, the Anti-Defection Law is effectively paralyzed, allowing an unprincipled political alignment to solidify without legal consequences. To counter this institutional stagnation, the judiciary has progressively expanded its sight to enforce administrative accountability.

The definitive turning point occurred in Keisham Meghachandra Singh vs. Speaker, Manipur Legislative Assembly (2020)[12], where the Supreme Court confronted chronic delays in defection proceeding these petitions, the speaker does not act in a political capacity but functions strictly as a quasi-judicial tribunal. Consequently, the court mandated that defection disputes must be settled within a reasonable period, prescribing a strict three-month outer limit barring exceptional circumstances.

This timeline is a critical constitutional necessity because delayed adjudication reduces the statutory remedy to a mere retroactive formality. If a ruling is withheld until a legislative term concludes or a government completes its political transition, the law loses all its deterrent power.

Recognizing that strategic inaction could frustrate the entire objective of Tenth Schedule, the judiciary has continued to tighten its parameters.

In Padi Kaushik Reddy vs. State of Telangana (2025)[13], the Supreme Court reaffirmed that Judicial Review can actively step in to ensure that a speaker's silence is not used as a shield to bypass constitutional mandates. Yet, while these progressive ruling provide a vital check on political gamesmanship, judicial intervention remains a temporary remedy, it cannot completely fix the structural vulnerabilities written[14] into the text of the statute itself.

Constitutional Safeguard or Political Formality

The core issue is whether the Tenth Schedule serves as a genuine constitutional safeguard or has faded into a political formality?

The Law has certainly achieved partial success by codifying party discipline and attaching clear legal penalties to opportunistic floor-crossing. It changed the political calculations of individual

[12] Keisham Meghachandra Singh v. Speaker, Manipur Legislative Assembly, (2020) 2 S.C.C. 789.
[13] Padi Kaushik Reddy v. State of Telangana, 2025 I.N.S.C. 912.
[14] Kihoto Hollohan v.Zachillhu, 1992 Supp.(2) S.C.C.651.

lawmakers.

However, modern political crises show that the law has merely shifted the methods of defection rather than eliminating its incentives. The primary weakness is the enforcement gap. A disqualification provision carries zero deterrent value if a ruling is delayed until after the political landscape has changed.

Furthermore, when political factions use coordinated resignations to achieve their goals without triggering penalties, the integrity of the framework fails. The Tenth Schedule functions as a safeguard on paper, but institutional delays and tactical maneuvers frequently reduce it to a mere formality in practice.

Reformative Steps For Effective Enforcement

Restoring the statutory intent of the Anti-defection framework requires clear institutional adjustments:-

Enforceable Statutory Timelines:- Disqualifications petitions must be bound by strict, non-negotiable deadlines to strip the speaker of the power to delay.

Independent Adjudication:- The power to decide disqualification should be transferred from the politically aligned speaker to an independent body, such as the Election Commission of India as suggest by the Supreme Court in Keisham case.

Narrowing The Scope Of The Whip:- The use of party whips should be restricted to votes that directly impact government survival.

Requirement for Reasoned Rulings:- Speakers must issue transparent, well-reasoned orders that can be clearly evaluated under judicial review.

Conclusion

The Anti-Defection Law was introduced as a necessary constitutional response to a systemic crisis of political integrity, aiming to dismantle the destabilizing "Aaya Ram" culture that threatened early Indian governance. Enacted under the Tenth Schedule, the statutory framework represents an indispensable mechanism to enforce legislative discipline, stabilize elected executives, and protect the core democratic contract between the voter and the

representative. However, the real-world value of any legislation depends entirely on its execution. The persistent evolution of strategic political maneuvers such as engineered en-masse mergers, tactical resignations, and deliberate administrative delays in adjudication reveals a widening chasm between the written word of the Constitution and the fluid reality of political behavior.

Ultimately, this analysis shows that the Tenth Schedule remains a vital constitutional safeguard on paper, but institutional limitations and procedural exploitation continuously threaten to reduce it to an empty political formality. Resolving this tension does not require a complete dismantling of the law, but a rigorous, independent enforcement mechanism that strips partisan actors of the power to delay justice. Political representation must remain anchored to the mandate of the electorate rather than the personal ambitions of individual lawmakers. Unless the consequences of political defection are rendered swift, certain, and completely insulated from partisan influence, the law will continue to act as a reactive script rather than a proactive shield. For Indian Democracy to preserve its representative character, the statutory principles of the Tenth Schedule must be enforced strictly and instantly, ensuring that political fidelity remains a binding obligation rather than a negotiable option.