Tenth Schedule – Its Growth Through Judiciary & Global Impact

Arka Kumar Nag [1]
[1] Research Scholar, Department of Law, Mansarovar Global University, Sehore, M.P., India.

Dr. Tai Chourasiya [2]
[2] Supervisor, Department of Law, Mansarovar Global University, Sehore, M.P., India.

ABSTRACT

The Tenth Schedule to the Constitution of India represents one of the most significant constitutional responses to the problem of political defection. Introduced through the Constitution (Fifty-Second Amendment) Act, 1U85, the anti-defection law sought to address political instability, unprincipled floor-crossing and the erosion of electoral mandates caused by legislators changing political allegiance after election. However, the constitutional text has never operated in isolation. Its meaning, scope and practical consequences have been substantially shaped by judicial interpretation.

The Supreme Court of India has progressively transformed the Tenth Schedule from a relatively confined disqualification mechanism into a significant constitutional field involving judicial review, legislative privilege, separation of powers, constitutional morality, representative democracy and institutional accountability. Beginning with Kihoto Hollohan v. Zachillhu, the judiciary established the constitutional reviewability of decisions under the Tenth Schedule. Subsequent decisions such as Ravi S. Naik v. Union of India, G. Viswanathan v. Speaker, Rajendra Singh Rana v. Swami Prasad Maurya, Nabam Rebia v. Deputy Speaker, Shrimanth Balasaheb Patil v. Hon'ble Speaker, Keisham Meghachandra Singh v. Hon'ble Speaker and Subhash Desai v. Principal Secretary, Governor of Maharashtra have progressively clarified the meaning of defection, the powers of the Speaker, the limits of legislative autonomy and the role of judicial review.

This article analyses the development of the Tenth Schedule through these judicial interventions and examines its broader democratic implications. It also undertakes a comparative examination of selected jurisdictions, including the United Kingdom, Bangladesh, Pakistan, South Africa and New Zealand, to identify different constitutional responses to party switching and legislative dissent. The article argues that the central constitutional problem is not simply whether legislators should be prevented from defecting, but how to reconcile three competing democratic interests: the electoral mandate of the voter, the institutional coherence of political parties and the constitutional autonomy of elected representatives. The article concludes by proposing reforms directed towards timely adjudication, institutional neutrality, restricted application of party whips and stronger protection of genuine legislative deliberation.

Keywords: *Tenth Schedule, Anti-Defection Law, Political Defection, Speaker, Judicial Review, Parliamentary Democracy, Electoral Mandate, Party Discipline, Constitutional Morality, Comparative Constitutional Law.*

I. Introduction

Representative democracy rests upon the proposition that citizens elect individuals to participate in the constitutional process of governance. In a parliamentary system, however, individual representatives ordinarily function within political parties whose programmes, manifestos and legislative strategies influence the electoral choice of citizens. This creates an inherent tension between the autonomy of an elected representative and the organisational discipline of the political party through which the representative enters the legislature.

The problem becomes constitutionally significant when an elected legislator changes political allegiance after obtaining electoral support under the banner of one political party. Such conduct may alter the numerical composition of a legislature, affect the survival of governments and, in certain circumstances, undermine the political expectations associated with an election. The phenomenon popularly described as "defection" consequently became a major concern of Indian constitutional politics, particularly after the general elections of 1U67, when extensive movement of legislators between political formations contributed to instability in several States. The subsequent political experience generated sustained demands for a constitutional mechanism against defections.

The Constitution (Fifty-Second Amendment) Act, 1U85 consequently inserted the Tenth Schedule into the Constitution. The Schedule presently operates through Articles 102(2) and 1U1(2), and establishes circumstances in which a Member of Parliament or a member of a State Legislature may be disqualified on the ground of defection.

The constitutional text provides, inter alia, for disqualification where a member voluntarily gives up membership of a political party or votes or abstains from voting contrary to the direction issued by the political party, subject to the exceptions contained in the Schedule.

The enactment of the Tenth Schedule did not, however, settle the constitutional debate. Questions immediately emerged concerning the meaning of "voluntarily gives up membership", the scope of party directions, the status of independent and nominated members, the merger exception, the authority of the Speaker or Chairman and the availability of judicial review.

The Supreme Court's decision in Kihoto Hollohan v. Zachillhu, 1UU2 Supp (2) SCC 651, became the foundational judicial authority. The Court sustained the constitutional validity of the anti-defection framework while rejecting the attempt to place decisions under the Tenth Schedule beyond judicial scrutiny. The constitutional history of the Schedule thereafter became, in substantial measure, a history of judicial interpretation.

The importance of the subject has increased with the changing nature of coalition politics, factional realignments, resignations followed by political realignment, merger claims and disputes concerning the identity of legislative parties. The contemporary anti-defection debate therefore cannot be confined to the question of whether defections are desirable or undesirable. It requires a deeper examination of the relationship between the voter's mandate, the political party's mandate and the representative's constitutional role.

This article accordingly examines the Tenth Schedule through four interconnected dimensions: its constitutional evolution, its judicial development, its effect upon parliamentary democracy and its comparative/global significance.

II. Research Problem and Methodology

The principal research problem addressed by this article is the constitutional tension between preventing opportunistic political defection and preserving the deliberative autonomy of elected representatives.

The study proceeds on the assumption that anti-defection law serves a legitimate democratic purpose, but that excessive party control may produce a different constitutional difficulty by converting elected representatives into instruments of party voting rather than participants in legislative deliberation.

The research adopts a doctrinal and comparative constitutional methodology. Primary materials include the Constitution of India, the Tenth Schedule, constitutional amendment legislation and judgments of the Supreme Court of India. Secondary materials include reports concerning electoral and parliamentary reform and academic literature concerning representative democracy and party discipline. The comparative component examines selected constitutional systems in which party switching is either permitted, restricted or linked to loss of legislative membership.

The article does not treat the existence of anti-defection legislation as inherently incompatible with democracy. Instead, it evaluates the constitutional equilibrium that the law must maintain between political stability, electoral accountability, party discipline and legislative independence.

III. Constitutional Evolution of The Tenth Schedule

The anti-defection movement in India emerged from political developments considerably earlier than 1U85. The post-1U67 period witnessed substantial movement of elected representatives between parties, giving rise to concerns regarding governmental instability and political bargaining. The phenomenon became sufficiently prominent to stimulate institutional consideration of legislative measures against defections.

The Constitution (Fifty-Second Amendment) Act, 1U85 inserted the Tenth Schedule. It also amended Articles 101, 102, 1U0 and 1U1 to establish constitutional consequences for defection. The original framework contained provisions dealing with individual defection and a “split” exception.

The constitutional design was subsequently altered by the Constitution (Ninety-First Amendment) Act, 2003. The Amendment eliminated the earlier “split” exception contained in paragraph 3 and retained the merger exception under paragraph 4, subject to the requirement that not less than two-thirds of the members of the legislature party agree to the merger. It also introduced restrictions concerning the size of the Council of Ministers and the holding of remunerative political offices by disqualified members.

This history demonstrates that the Tenth Schedule is not static. It represents an evolving constitutional response to changing patterns of political behaviour.

The present Schedule broadly operates through four principal situations. First, a member belonging to a political party may be disqualified for voluntarily giving up membership of that party. Secondly, a member may incur disqualification for voting or abstaining contrary to a party direction without prior permission, where the conduct is not condoned within the prescribed period. Thirdly, an independent member joining a political party after election may attract disqualification. Fourthly, a nominated member joining a political party after the constitutionally prescribed period may similarly attract disqualification.

The constitutional framework therefore regulates not merely formal resignation from a political party but conduct which demonstrates a substantive departure from the political affiliation under which legislative membership was acquired.

IV. Judicial Constitutionalisation of The Tenth Schedule

1. Kihoto Hollohan v. Zachillhu: The Foundational Decision

The first major constitutional challenge to the Tenth Schedule culminated in Kihoto Hollohan v. Zachillhu, 1UU2 Supp (2) SCC 651. The Supreme Court’s decision is the starting point for understanding the judicial growth of anti-defection law. The case is officially recognised among the Supreme Court’s leading constitutional authorities.

The principal constitutional question concerned the validity of the Tenth Schedule and, particularly, the exclusion of judicial review over decisions of the Speaker or Chairman.

The Court upheld the constitutional validity of the anti-defection framework but rejected the proposition that the Speaker's decision was completely immune from judicial review. Judicial review could be exercised on constitutionally recognised grounds, thereby preventing the Tenth Schedule from becoming a wholly self-contained and judicially unaccountable constitutional mechanism.

The significance of Kihoto Hollohan extends beyond the immediate question of defection. It established an important constitutional proposition: legislative adjudication does not automatically become immune from constitutional scrutiny merely because it occurs within the legislative institution.

The judgment therefore established the first major stage in the judicial development of the Tenth Schedule: constitutional validity accompanied by judicial review.

2. Meaning of "Voluntarily Giving Up Membership"

The expression "voluntarily gives up membership" became one of the most important judicially developed concepts.

In Ravi S. Naik v. Union of India, (1UU4) Supp 2 SCC 641, the Supreme Court adopted a substantive rather than purely formal approach. Voluntary relinquishment of party membership need not necessarily be demonstrated through a formal resignation. Conduct may establish that a member has voluntarily abandoned political allegiance.

This interpretation prevented the anti-defection mechanism from being defeated by purely formal distinctions. A legislator could not necessarily avoid the constitutional consequence merely by retaining formal party membership while publicly and politically acting in a manner inconsistent with continuing allegiance.

At the same time, the doctrine creates an important constitutional question: when does political disagreement become defection? If the expression is interpreted too broadly, ordinary political dissent may become vulnerable to disqualification. If interpreted too narrowly, strategic defections may escape the constitutional prohibition.

The judicial task has therefore been to distinguish between legitimate political disagreement and conduct amounting to abandonment of party membership.

3. G. Viswanathan v. Speaker: Continuing Party Affiliation

In G. Viswanathan v. Speaker, Tamil Nadu Legislative Assembly, (1UU6) 2 SCC 353, the Supreme Court further developed the relationship between expulsion from a political party and legislative membership.

The decision illustrates an important structural principle: legislative membership and party membership are constitutionally related but not identical. Expulsion by a political party does not necessarily create an automatic escape from the Tenth Schedule. The question remains whether the constitutional conditions for disqualification are satisfied.

This approach prevents political parties from manipulating the constitutional scheme merely by altering the formal status of their members.

4. Rajendra Singh Rana: Judicial Scrutiny of Legislative Claims

In Rajendra Singh Rana v. Swami Prasad Maurya, (2007) 4 SCC 270, the Supreme Court examined questions concerning alleged defections, the role of the Speaker and the constitutional consequences of legislative conduct.

The case demonstrated that the Speaker's determination is not merely a matter of parliamentary procedure. Where constitutional disqualification is involved, the decision has consequences capable of judicial examination.

The judgment consequently reinforced the principle that the Tenth Schedule must operate within the constitutional framework rather than as an isolated political mechanism.

V. The Speaker as Adjudicator: Neutrality and Institutional Difficulty

The choice of the Speaker or Chairman as the primary decision-maker under the Tenth Schedule reflects the constitutional importance traditionally attached to the neutrality of the presiding officer.

The arrangement nevertheless creates an institutional difficulty. The Speaker is generally elected by the House and ordinarily belongs to the political party or coalition forming the legislative majority. The same institution therefore places a politically situated constitutional functionary in the position of determining the legislative status of political opponents or members whose defection may affect the survival of a government.

This tension became particularly visible in later cases.

In Nabam Rebia v. Deputy Speaker, Arunachal Pradesh Legislative Assembly, (2016) 8 SCC 1, the Supreme Court examined the relationship between the Speaker's constitutional role and proceedings concerning the Speaker's own position. The judgment brought questions of institutional impartiality and constitutional propriety into sharper focus.

In Shrimanth Balasaheb Patil v. Hon'ble Speaker, Karnataka Legislative Assembly, (201U) 2 SCC 415, the Supreme Court considered the relationship between resignation and disqualification proceedings. The Court emphasised the constitutional responsibilities of legislative functionaries and held, among other things, that disqualification cannot simply be converted into a mechanism for imposing an additional period of exclusion beyond what the constitutional scheme permits. The Court's discussion also demonstrates the constitutional importance of institutional responsibility in dealing with legislative membership.

The difficulty is therefore not necessarily that the Speaker is incapable of acting impartially. Rather, the institutional design creates an appearance-of-neutrality problem that can affect public confidence in the adjudicatory process.

VI. S. Delay as A Constitutional Problem

One of the most serious practical challenges to the Tenth Schedule is delay.

A disqualification petition concerning an elected representative may have immediate political consequences. Yet if adjudication takes place only after a substantial portion of the legislative term has elapsed, the eventual decision may lose much of its practical significance.

This problem was directly considered in Keisham Meghachandra Singh v. Hon'ble Speaker, Manipur Legislative Assembly, (2021) 16 SCC 503. The Supreme Court recognised the need for timely adjudication and considered the question whether the Speaker should remain the sole adjudicatory authority without a constitutionally enforceable time framework.

The problem is structural. Suppose a government survives or falls because of a group of allegedly defecting legislators. If the disqualification proceedings remain undecided during the critical political period, the eventual decision may not effectively restore the electoral or legislative position that existed before the alleged defection.

Consequently, delay can transform an otherwise effective constitutional remedy into a largely retrospective declaration.

A credible anti-defection system therefore requires not merely an adjudicator but an adjudication mechanism capable of functioning within a constitutionally meaningful period.

VII. The Contemporary Judicial Stage

Subhash Desai

The constitutional disputes arising from political developments in Maharashtra brought the Tenth Schedule into renewed prominence.

In Subhash Desai v. Principal Secretary, Governor of Maharashtra, (2024) 2 SCC 71U, the Supreme Court dealt with issues concerning the Tenth Schedule, the authority of the Speaker and the relationship between legislative-party claims and political-party identity. The proceedings raised important constitutional questions concerning the interaction of the Speaker's adjudicatory role with the Governor's constitutional functions and judicial review. The Supreme Court's own records identify the matter as involving interpretation of the Tenth Schedule, powers of the Speaker and Governor, and judicial review.

The importance of Subhash Desai lies in its demonstration that the modern anti-defection dispute cannot always be isolated from broader constitutional questions concerning government formation, legislative majorities and the identity of political parties.

The judgment also demonstrates an increasingly important distinction between:

1. The original political party;
2. The legislature party;
3. The individual legislator; and
4. The institutional majority within the House.

Confusion between these categories can produce constitutional consequences extending beyond the immediate disqualification petition.

The modern jurisprudence therefore requires the Tenth Schedule to be read together with Articles 163, 164, 174, 1U0, 1U1 and 212 and with the broader constitutional principles governing representative government.

VIII. Electoral Mandate, Party Mandate and Representative Autonomy

The deepest normative question surrounding the Tenth Schedule is: whose mandate does an elected legislator possess?

Three possible answers can be identified.

First: The Individual Electoral Mandate

The voter formally votes for a candidate. The candidate is therefore the immediate bearer of the electoral mandate. This understanding gives substantial weight to representative autonomy.

Secondly: The Party Mandate

In contemporary parliamentary elections, voters frequently make choices influenced by party identity, manifesto, leadership and political programme. A candidate's election may therefore be inseparable from the political party through which candidature was obtained.

Thirdly: The Legislative Mandate

Once elected, a representative participates in a collective constitutional institution. The legitimacy of the legislature depends upon maintaining stable governmental arrangements and meaningful legislative deliberation.

The Tenth Schedule privileges the second and third considerations over unrestricted individual autonomy.

Yet an unlimited party whip may itself undermine the third consideration. Parliament is not merely a numerical voting machine. It is also a deliberative constitutional institution.

The central challenge is therefore not to abolish party discipline but to distinguish between votes essential to governmental stability and ordinary legislative questions where genuine representative deliberation should remain possible.

IX. Anti-Defection Law and Parliamentary Democracy

The Tenth Schedule has undoubtedly altered the relationship between political parties and legislators. Its positive constitutional objectives include:

- Discouraging opportunistic party switching;
- Promoting political stability;
- Protecting electoral expectations;
- Preventing legislative majorities from being altered through individual bargaining;
- Reducing incentives for political inducement associated with floor-crossing.

At the same time, several concerns have emerged.

First, the law may strengthen party leadership at the expense of individual legislators. Secondly, a broadly framed whip may reduce independent legislative judgment.

Thirdly, the Speaker's political affiliation may create perceptions of institutional bias.

Fourthly, prolonged adjudication may permit the political consequences of alleged defection to occur before constitutional adjudication.

Fifthly, the merger exception may permit large-scale political realignment while leaving smaller-scale individual dissent subject to disqualification.

The challenge is therefore one of constitutional proportionality. The objective of preventing political corruption and instability must be reconciled with the constitutional value of representative deliberation.

X. Global Comparative Perspective

The Indian model is distinctive because it constitutionally attaches legislative disqualification to specified forms of party defection. Comparative constitutional experience demonstrates that this is not the only possible approach.

1. United Kingdom

The United Kingdom generally permits Members of Parliament to change party affiliation without automatically losing their parliamentary seats. The House of Commons Library records that changing party does not ordinarily trigger a by-election.

The British model therefore places greater emphasis on the individual representative's continuing electoral mandate and political accountability at the next election.

Party discipline nevertheless remains significant through political mechanisms such as the party whip. The distinction is important: party discipline exists without necessarily becoming a constitutional ground for automatic loss of legislative membership.

2. Bangladesh

Bangladesh represents a contrasting constitutional model. Article 70 of the Constitution imposes a stringent restriction upon members elected as nominees of political parties who resign from the party or vote against the party.

The Bangladeshi experience is therefore closer to the Indian approach in treating party allegiance as constitutionally relevant to legislative membership. Comparative analysis of the two systems demonstrates the difficult balance between party cohesion and legislative independence.

3. Pakistan

Pakistan also incorporates constitutional anti-defection provisions. Article 63A addresses defection in specified circumstances, including votes relating to election of the Prime Minister or Chief Minister, votes of confidence or no-confidence, money Bills and constitutional amendment Bills.

The Pakistani approach is therefore narrower in important respects than a system which subjects every legislative disagreement to party discipline.

This provides an instructive comparative possibility for India: constitutional anti-defection protection may be concentrated upon votes having direct implications for government formation, survival and constitutional structure rather than every legislative division. Comparative research has similarly identified Pakistan among the relatively small group of jurisdictions that constitutionally regulate party switching or voting against party lines.

4. South Africa

South Africa's constitutional experience illustrates a different model. Its electoral system is based substantially upon proportional representation, and legislative representation is closely linked with political parties. The Constitution nevertheless does not reproduce the Indian Tenth Schedule model of general constitutional disqualification forvoting against the party line.

The South African experience demonstrates that the design of anti-defection law cannot be separated from the electoral system. The relationship between representative and party necessarily operates differently in a proportional representation system than in India's predominantly constituency-based system.

5. New Zealand

New Zealand provides an especially interesting intermediate model. Its Electoral (Integrity) Amendment Act 2018 introduced provisions concerning Members of Parliament who cease to be parliamentary members of the political party for which they were elected. The statutory purpose expressly includes maintaining the proportionality of political party representation as determined by electors.

The New Zealand approach therefore connects party switching to the integrity of proportional representation rather than adopting the exact Indian constitutional model.

XI. What India Can Learn from Comparative Experience

Comparative analysis reveals that there is no universally accepted constitutional solution to political defection. Three broad models can be identified.

Model I – Individual Mandate Model:

Party switching does not automatically vacate the legislative seat. The United Kingdom provides an example.

Model II – Constitutional Anti-Defection Model:

Defection can result in loss of legislative membership. India and Bangladesh fall within this broad category.

Model III – Limited Anti-Defection Model:

Party discipline is constitutionally enforced primarily with respect to votes concerning government survival or constitutionally significant measures. Pakistan offers a comparative example.

The appropriate lesson for India is not to mechanically transplant another country's constitutional model. Instead, comparative experience demonstrates that anti-defection regulation should correspond with the country's electoral system, party structure and constitutional objectives.

XII. Reforming The Tenth Schedule

The future of the Tenth Schedule should be directed towards strengthening both democratic stability and legislative accountability.

Independent Adjudicatory Mechanism

The most frequently recurring institutional difficulty concerns the Speaker's dual position as presiding officer and adjudicator.

A constitutionally independent tribunal or a specialised adjudicatory mechanism may be considered, subject to appropriate safeguards ensuring institutional accountability and judicial review.

The objective should not be to diminish legislative autonomy but to enhance confidence in impartial adjudication.

Statutory or Constitutional Time Limit

Disqualification proceedings should be determined within a clearly defined period, subject to exceptional circumstances where reasons for extension are recorded.

A constitutional remedy which arrives after the relevant political crisis has ended may fail to provide effective relief.

Narrower Operation of The Whip

The anti-defection mechanism should distinguish between votes that determine:

- Confidence or no-confidence in the Council of Ministers;
- Appropriation and essential financial legislation;
- Constitutional amendments;
- Motions directly affecting governmental survival; and
- Ordinary legislative business.

The possibility of protecting greater freedom of voting on ordinary legislation deserves serious constitutional consideration.

4. Clarification of "Voluntarily Gives Up Membership"

Judicial interpretation has necessarily expanded the expression beyond formal resignation. Nevertheless, legislative or constitutional clarification could reduce uncertainty by identifying relevant indicators of voluntary abandonment while protecting legitimate political disagreement.

5. Regulation of Resignation-Defection Cycles

A recurring political phenomenon is resignation from legislative office followed by political realignment and subsequent re-entry through another electoral route. Constitutional and statutory rules may be considered to ensure that resignation is not used merely as a procedural substitute for defeating the purpose of anti-defection law.

6. Strengthening Reasoned Orders

Every disqualification decision should contain detailed findings on facts, evidence, statutory provisions and constitutional principles. Reasoned decision-making would facilitate both public accountability and judicial review.

XIII. Towards A New Constitutional Balance

The evolution of the Tenth Schedule suggests that the central constitutional question has changed. In 1U85, the principal concern was political instability caused by defections.

After Kihoto Hollohan, the concern became the constitutional accountability of the Speaker.

Following Ravi S. Naik and G. Viswanathan, attention shifted towards identifying substantive defection.

Later cases increasingly focused upon the relationship between legislative institutions, resignation, government formation and constitutional morality.

The contemporary problem can therefore be described as a search for constitutional equilibrium between party government and representative government.

Political parties are indispensable to parliamentary democracy. A completely unrestricted right of legislators to switch political allegiance may undermine electoral stability. Equally, an unrestricted power of party leadership to control every legislative vote may weaken the representative character of Parliament.

The objective should consequently be neither unrestricted individualism nor unrestricted party supremacy. The constitutional principle that emerges is one of responsible representative autonomy.

A legislator should remain accountable to the electorate and political party, but should also retain sufficient constitutional space to deliberate, criticise and vote independently on matters that do not threaten the fundamental stability of the government or the political mandate for which the party received electoral support.

XIV. Findings

The analysis produces five principal findings.

First, the Tenth Schedule was enacted as a constitutional response to a genuine democratic problem: political instability and opportunistic defection.

Secondly, judicial interpretation has transformed the Schedule from a legislative mechanism into a significant constitutional doctrine concerning judicial review, institutional accountability and representative government.

Thirdly, the Speaker’s position as adjudicator presents an institutional challenge that cannot be resolved merely by assuming political neutrality; procedural safeguards and timely adjudication are equally important.

Fourthly, comparative constitutional experience demonstrates that party switching can be addressed through several models, ranging from political accountability to constitutional disqualification.

Fifthly, the future of Indian anti-defection law requires a more carefully calibrated relationship between electoral mandate, party mandate and legislative autonomy.

The ultimate objective should be to preserve the integrity of electoral choice without converting representative democracy into an exclusively party-controlled system.

XV. Conclusion

The Tenth Schedule is one of the clearest examples of the Indian Constitution evolving through interaction between constitutional text, political experience and judicial interpretation.

The Constitution (Fifty-Second Amendment) Act, 1U85 attempted to address the political instability associated with defections. The Constitution (Ninety-First Amendment) Act, 2003 subsequently modified the framework by eliminating the split exception and retaining a restricted merger exception. Yet the most substantial development has occurred through judicial interpretation.

Beginning with Kihoto Hollohan, the Supreme Court constitutionalised the operation of the Tenth Schedule by subjecting the Speaker's decision to judicial review. Subsequent judgments have elaborated the meaning of voluntary abandonment of party membership, the relationship between party membership and legislative membership, the institutional role of the Speaker, the consequences of resignation and the necessity of timely adjudication. Contemporary litigation has further demonstrated that anti-defection questions can intersect with broader constitutional disputes concerning government formation and legislative majorities.

The Tenth Schedule has therefore moved through three broad stages. The first was the legislative-constitutional stage, marked by the enactment of the anti-defection mechanism in 1U85. The second was the judicial-constitutional stage, in which the Supreme Court defined the limits and meaning of the Schedule. The third is the emerging institutional-accountability stage, in which questions of delay, neutrality, party identity, resignation and legislative autonomy have become central.

The comparative experience further demonstrates that India is not constitutionally compelled to choose between political stability and representative freedom in absolute terms. Different democratic systems have developed different balances. The United Kingdom relies heavily on political accountability; Bangladesh adopts a stringent constitutional approach; Pakistan concentrates constitutional restrictions upon specified categories of votes; South Africa's framework reflects its proportional representation system; and New Zealand has developed statutory mechanisms concerned with the integrity of party representation.

India's constitutional challenge is therefore one of calibration.

The anti-defection law should prevent the conversion of elected office into a commodity of political bargaining. At the same time, parliamentary democracy cannot flourish if every disagreement between a legislator and the party leadership carries the potential consequence of legislative disqualification.

The constitutional objective should consequently be to protect the electoral mandate without extinguishing representative judgment.

The future development of the Tenth Schedule should focus upon independent and timely adjudication, clearer standards, carefully defined application of party whips, transparent reasoning and effective judicial review. Such reforms would not weaken parliamentary democracy. Properly designed, they could strengthen it by ensuring that party discipline serves democratic representation rather than replacing it.

Ultimately, the legitimacy of the Tenth Schedule must be measured not merely by the number of defections prevented, but by whether it succeeds in maintaining the constitutional equilibrium between the voter who elects, the party that organises political representation, and the legislator who exercises constitutional power.

The enduring question is therefore not whether party discipline should exist. It is how much party discipline a constitutional democracy can legitimately impose without diminishing the representative character of the legislature itself.

That question places the Tenth Schedule at the continuing intersection of constitutionalism, electoral democracy and parliamentary government.

References

1. Ajay Kumar, "A Critical Analysis of the Anti-Defection Law in India: Contemporary Issues and Constitutional Challenge," Research Review International Journal of Multidisciplinary, Vol. 10, pp. 320–327 (2025), DOI: 10.31305/rrijm.2025.v10.n1.041.
2. Comparative Parliamentary Materials Concerning Party Switching and Legislative Representation.
3. Electoral Integrity Legislation of New Zealand.
4. G. Viswanathan v. Speaker, Tamil Nadu Legislative Assembly, (1996) 2 SCC 353.
5. K. Gireesan and Chinmay Bendre, "Anti-Defection Law – A Review" (2022).
6. Keisham Meghachandra Singh v. Hon'ble Speaker, Manipur Legislative Assembly, (2021) 16 SCC 503.
7. Kihoto Hollohan v. Zachillhu, 1992 Supp (2) SCC 651.
8. Law Commission of India, Electoral Disqualifications, 244th Report (2014).
9. Law Commission of India, Electoral Reforms, 255th Report (2015).
10. Law Commission of India, Reform of the Electoral Laws, 170th Report (1999).
11. Monica Madaan and Arryan Mohanty, "The Speaker as an Adjudicator in Anti-Defection Proceedings: Constitutional Challenges and Legal Perspectives," Vol. 7, International Journal of Political Science and Governance, pp. 166–176 (2025), DOI: 10.33545/26646021.2025.v7.i10b.721.
12. Nabam Rebia v. Deputy Speaker, Arunachal Pradesh Legislative Assembly, (2016) 8 SCC 1.
13. Parliamentary and Electoral Reform Materials Concerning the Operation of the Anti-Defection Law.
14. Rajendra Singh Rana v. Swami Prasad Maurya, (2007) 4 SCC 270.
15. Ravi S. Naik v. Union of India, 1994 Supp (2) SCC 641.
16. Shrimanth Balasaheb Patil v. Hon'ble Speaker, Karnataka Legislative Assembly, (2019) 2 SCC 415.
17. Subhash Desai v. Principal Secretary, Governor of Maharashtra, (2024) 2 SCC 719.
18. Surbhi Dubela and Sharma, "Balancing Act: Evaluating the Impact of Anti-Defection Laws on Democratic Governance in India," Vol. 29, Educational Administration: Theory and Practice (2023)
19. The Constitution (Fifty-Second Amendment) Act, 1985.
20. The Constitution (Ninety-First Amendment) Act, 2003.
21. The Constitution of Bangladesh, 1972, art. 70.
22. The Constitution of India, 1950, arts. 102, 105, 190, 191 and Tenth Schedule.
23. The Constitution of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan, 1973, art. 63A.
24. The Constitution of the Republic of South Africa, 1996.