



IAS PARLIAMENT

Information is Empowering
A Shankar IAS Academy Initiative

Ending Speakers' Inaction on Disqualification

Why in News?

The Supreme Court has made some decisions on the position of Speaker as the adjudicating authority under the Anti-Defection Law (ADL).

What is Anti-Defection Law?

- The ADL is contained in the **10th Schedule** of the Indian Constitution.
- It was enacted by Parliament and came into effect in 1985.
- Its purpose is to **curb political defection** by the legislators.

What are the aspects to SC's new decision?

- The Parliament should **replace the Speaker with a permanent tribunal** or external mechanism to render quick and impartial decisions on questions of defection.
- Its extraordinary ruling that the reference by another Bench, in 2016, of a key question to a Constitution Bench was itself unnecessary.

What are the questions arisen? Why?

- The question awaiting determination by a larger Bench is whether courts have the power to direct Speakers to decide petitions seeking disqualification within a fixed time frame.
- The question had arisen because several presiding officers have allowed defectors to bolster the strength of ruling parties.
- These officers have allowed the defectors be sworn in Ministers by merely refraining from adjudicating on complaints against them.
- Some States have seen en masse defections soon after elections.
- Speakers have been wilfully failing to act as per law, thereby helping the ruling party, which is the one that helped them get to the Chair.
- They do this in the security of the belief that no court would question the delay in disposal of disqualification matters as long as the matter was pending before a Constitution Bench.

What was the reference made?

- The reference to a larger Bench, in 2016 in S.A. Sampath Kumar vs. Kale Yadaiah was based on the landmark judgment in **Kihoto Hollohan** (1992) which upheld the validity of the ADL.
- This verdict had also made the **Speaker's order subject to judicial review** on limited grounds.
- It made it clear that the court's jurisdiction would not come into play unless the Speaker passes an order, leaving no room for intervention prior to adjudication.
- The 2016 Bench found several pending complaints before Speakers.
- So, it decided that it was time for an authoritative verdict on whether Speakers can be directed to dispose of defection questions within a time frame.

What is the present case?

- In the present case, Justice R.F. Nariman has fixed a **3-month limit** for the Manipur Assembly Speaker to decide the disqualification question in a legislator's case.
- He has also held that the reference was made on a wrong premise.
- He has cited a Constitution Bench judgment in which the Uttar Pradesh Speaker's order refusing to disqualify 13 defectors was set aside on the ground that he had failed to exercise his jurisdiction.
- The jurisdiction that he failed to exercise was to decide whether they had attracted disqualification, while recognising a split in the legislature party.
- As "**failure to exercise jurisdiction**" is a recognised stage at which the court can now intervene, the court has thus opened a window for judicial intervention in cases in which Speakers refuse to act.
- This augurs well for the enforcement of the law against defection in letter and spirit.

Source: The Hindu



IAS PARLIAMENT

Information is Empowering

A Shankar IAS Academy Initiative