

**Feasibility Of Electorate's Right To Recall In India: A Critical Analysis**

Dr. Balwinder Singh\* & Navin Pal Singh\*

**Abstract**

*Electoral reforms in India have been campaigned very hard. Certain reforms like right to recall and right to reject incompetent and non-serious candidates and representatives are deemed to be the need of the hour. Recall is a term used to describe a process whereby the electorate can petition to trigger a vote on the suitability of an existing elected representative to continue in office. In essence, it gives the voters an opportunity to remove representatives whom they feel are not doing a good job. Recall procedures vary around the globe. At present, there is no provision in the Indian Constitution or in the Representation of People's Act, 1951 for the recall of a duly elected member. In India, provision for recall exists at the level of local bodies in Chhattisgarh, Madhya Pradesh and Bihar. Through this decision the power is given directly to the electorate if two-thirds of the registered voters of a particular constituency sign a petition, the government can take steps for removal of the corporator. Besides, many countries like the Philippines, Venezuela, some states of the USA, Switzerland, etc., have already made provisions in varying forms in their respective constitutions. Presently it has been observed that some of the elected representatives are either, incompetent, corrupt and unresponsive towards the electorate demands or remain silent spectators in their respective Houses throughout five years. Under this extenuating position, electorates are helpless and have to wait for up to five years to make a change. Thus, this is sheer wastage of time and money, besides hampering the development in their respective constituencies. Recall provisions look at right to recall mechanism to make elected representatives more continuously, rather than periodically, responsible and responsive to the will and desires of the electorate. This is the landmark reforms in our electoral system and if introduced at the State and National levels, it would go a long way in strengthening one of the features of our democracy which is in peril today. Here, an attempt is made to highlight the feasibility of Right to recall in Indian democracy vis-a-vis point out various impediments in its implementation.*

**I PRELUDE**

*“Politics encircles us today like the coil of a snake from which one cannot get out, no matter how much one tries.”*

-Mahatma Gandhi

The Indian Constitution envisages a Sovereign, Socialist, Secular, Democratic, Republic. Democracy thrives in equal participation of common men in the nation building may be directly or indirectly. One of the unassailable postulates of a representative democracy is free and fair elections held periodically to elect members for the Legislative Assemblies, Councils and Parliament, so that these constitutional bodies may, in the discharge of their constitutionally contemplated functions, accomplish the task of ushering in a welfare state by heeding to the dictates of the directive

---

\* Assistant Professor(SG), School of Law, University of Petroleum and Energy Studies, Dehradun  
• Assistant Professor, School of Law, University of Petroleum and Energy Studies, Dehradun

principles of State policy. Elections sustain and enliven the democratic process, while postulating periodical elections, democracy also mandates that they should be free and fair. In a democracy, elections provide the basis of people's choice and representation. They help to crystallise their interests and give expression to them and at the same time, allows substantive processes of political mobilisation and participation. It is through these processes that peripheral groups transcend their regional and caste identities and acquire over time a certain commonality of economic interests and political identification which helps to establish a political framework of conflict and negotiation among divergent interests within the society.<sup>1</sup>

## II ELECTION PROCESS IN INDIA

The Constitution of India describes India as a Union of States. The Indian Constitution sets up a federal system of government. One of the main aspects of federal set up is the division of powers between the Central and the regional governments. Owing to the parliamentary form of government both at the Centre and the State levels, elections are held separately for the Union Parliament and the State legislature.<sup>2</sup> The mode of election of member to the State Legislature is mostly the same as that of the Union Legislature.

In India the plurality system or the first past the post system has been adopted for elections to the House of People and State legislative Assemblies and that of proportional representation by means of the single transferable vote, for election to the offices of President, Vice- President and to the Council of State and Legislative Councils.<sup>3</sup> During the discussion in the Constituent Assembly on the choice of electoral system a section of the members pleaded for the adoption of the system of proportional representation with multiple member constituencies by means of cumulative vote or by means of single transferable vote. This system of representation was more democratic and scientific according to them. It could entitle people and parties in the country holding different views from the majority party to be represented in the legislature and help in ensuring representation of minority according to their support in the electorate. The main arguments against proportional representation

---

1 A.S. NARANG, INDIAN GOVERNMENT AND POLITICS, 445 (2000).

2 CONSTITUTION OF INDIA, Article 79 provides that in Centre there is a bicameral legislature having House of people and Council of State. Similarly the Constitution provides for a legislature for every State. However, the question as to whether the state Legislature shall be unicameral or bicameral is left for each state to decide for itself. Article 168 provides that where there are two Houses of the Legislature one shall be known as the legislative Council and the other as the Legislative Assembly and where there is only one house, it shall be known as the Legislative Assembly.

3 *Supra* note 1 at p.446.

were that it would produce weak government, multiplicity of parties and will be impracticable in the country on account of low percentage of literacy and large size constituencies.<sup>4</sup>

As democracy contemplates and presupposes election of representatives to the Legislatures, it necessarily follows that there should be- an election Code for governing or regulating elections,<sup>5</sup> an impartial body or authority entrusted with the task of ensuring due conduct of elections<sup>6</sup> and a tribunal to resolve election controversies or disputes.<sup>7</sup> India, as a Parliamentary democracy, has an elaborate system of electing people's representatives placed under the supervision and direction of a constitutional authority 'The Election Commission.' It is the Election Commission that is responsible for conducting all elections for the national Parliament as well as for the Legislatures of all States and Union territories. The operation of holding a general election in India is sometimes said to be equal to holding simultaneous polls in Europe, the United States, Canada and Australia. It is no mean feat that about 0.9 million polling booths are set up and over 4 million election personnel are mobilised and administered for the purpose of conducting general elections. In addition to this about 2 million security personnel need to be used to maintain law and order on polling day once if, State and local elections are taken into account, the figures become truly staggering. There are over 3.2 million directly elected people's representatives covering various tiers of governance in India.<sup>8</sup> The Election Commission has the huge task of preparing electoral rolls, supervision, direction and control of the election process, laying of general rules for elections and issues notifications of dates and schedule of election, determination of the code of conduct to be observed by the parties and candidates etc. The Election Commission evolves a code of conduct from time to time and the political leaders are expected to follow it while campaigning however many a time it is blatantly violated.<sup>9</sup>

The election laws of the country comprise the Presidential and Vice Presidential Elections Act, 1952, The Representation of the People Act, 1950, The Representation of the People Act, 1951, The Government of Union Territories Act, 1963 supplemented by Registration of Election Rules, 1960

---

4 B. SHIVA RAO, THE FRAMING OF INDIA'S CONSTITUTION-A STUDY, 320 (1968).

5 CONSTITUTION OF INDIA, Article 327 deals with power of Parliament to make provision with respect to elections to Legislatures and Article 328 deals with the power of legislature of a State to make provision with respect to elections to such Legislature.

6 *Ibid.*, Article 324 vests superintendence, direction and control of elections in the Election Commission.

7 *Ibid.*, Article 329(b) states that no election to either House of Parliament or to either House of the legislature of a State shall be called in question except by an election petition presented to such authority and in such manner as may be provided for by or under any law made by the appropriate legislature.

8 V.A PAIPANANDIKER AND SUBHASH .C. KASHYAP, POLITICAL REFORMS- ASSERTING CIVIC SOVEREIGNTY, 294 (2000).

9 S.C. Parasher, *Electoral Reforms and Democracy*, 18 JOURNAL OF CONSTITUTIONAL AND PARLIAMENTARY STUDIES, 55 (1984).

and Conduct of Election Rule, 1961. The Representation of the People Act, 1951 embodies a comprehensive code regulating the whole election process. It prescribes inter alia, qualifications for membership of State and Central Legislatures, disqualifications for membership of the above bodies as well as disqualifications for voting, for establishment of the required administrative machinery for conduct of elections, registration of political parties, the procedure for conduct of elections and declaration of election results, for a correct account of election expenditure be maintained and submitted to the prescribed authority, list of electoral offences, the power of the Election Commission while conducting inquires.<sup>10</sup> The Supreme Court has ruled that Representation of People Act, 1951 regulates the entire election and that outside the Statute there is no right to elect, no right to be elected and no right to dispute the election.<sup>11</sup> The Hon'ble Supreme Court has also made a remark showing the importance of election in democracy by stating that "*it needs little argument to hold that the heart of the parliamentary system is free and fair elections periodically held, based on adult franchise, although social and economic democracy may demand much more.*"<sup>12</sup> However in the last two decades, the condition of election and electoral process has worsened significantly. There are numerous reasons for such degradation such as mushrooming of political parties, illegal financing of elections, no checks on funding of political parties, criminalisation of politics and the weak structure of Election Commission and so on. All such flaws in electoral system of India significantly gave rise to criminalisation of politics and end number of corruption cases by politicians and political parties came into light.

### III PROBLEMS IN PRESENT ELECTION SYSTEM

Catering the need of 125 billion people and allowing them to be the part of democratic setup in India, the electoral system of India is considered as one of the finest electoral system among democratic countries around the globe. However there are certain issues which have emerged as a serious threat to the election procedure in India and maligning the image of democracy. After getting independence, the common people were hopeful that now in free India they will have their say in the governance of country which was denied to them by Britishers nearly for 200 years however their aspiration remained as a distant dream due to prevailing corrupt practices in election procedure which grew manifold with the passage of time and subsequent elections. The present day

---

10 S.S. Visweshwara, *Deportable Defections- In Search of Panacea*, 39 JOURNAL OF INDIAN LAW INSTITUTE, 51(1997).

11 Jyothi Basu v. Debi Ghosal AIR 1982 SC 986.

12 Mohinder Singh Gill v. Chief Election Commissioner, (1978) SCC 405.

elections are crippled with issues like unregulated funding of political parties, mushrooming of political parties losing their substratum, keeping political parties out of the purview of RTI, lack of State funded elections, ECI emerging as weak constitutional body to regulate elections, system of First Past the Post procedure, hate speech during elections, lack of political will to recognise measures viz., Right to Recall and Right to Reject are the key contemporary issues and challenges needs to be addressed. In this paper the main thrust will be on right to recall as a tool to check some issues relating to elections. viz., corruption, deadwood ministers, and lack of political will to solve public concerns.

#### **IV RIGHT TO RECALL: A WAY FORWARD**

The right of an electorate to recall its representatives is a way of ensuring the accountability of the elected legislator towards the people. The recall of the elected representatives to a legislature, Central or State, is considered to be a democratic method by which the citizens are vested the power to remove or in effect de-elect a legislator before the expiry term of office. This power is an important instrument in any democratic set up as it allows the voters to scrutinize the performance of the persons whom they are electing as their representatives. This process of recall is beneficial as it ensures delivery of services and fulfillment of the promises made during an election campaign by a candidate. It becomes the prerogative of the constituent to decide whether a nonperforming representative should be allowed to continue in office for a full term or not, as the government exchequer has to bear the costs of the poor performance, which in fact, is the money of the masses. The right to recall also serves as a check on whether the people's representative is misusing his/her position.

##### **Right to recall: Meaning**

According to General Clause Act, 1897, power to make the appointment shall also have power to suspend or dismiss any person appointed. [Section 16 of The General Clause Act, 1897] Dictionary meaning of the Recall is the right or procedure by which a public official may be removed from a position by a vote of the people prior to the end of the term of office. Recall is the retiring of an elected officer by a vote of the electorate. Some State constitutions prescribe the procedure that must be followed in a recall—for example, requiring the filing of a petition containing the signatures of a specific number of qualified voters. Thus, the right or procedure by which a public official, commonly a legislative or executive official, may be removed from office, before the end of his term of office, by a vote of the people to be taken on the filing of a petition signed by a required number or percentage of qualified voters. Through an electoral procedure, this power of

removal, constitutionally, is either granted to or reserved by the people, depending on the theory of government and sovereignty in the country in question.

### **Right to recall: Across the World**

The history of right to recall dates back to one of the earliest democracies in human civilization, Athens, where the Constitution of Athens granted the right to recall the representatives. In the modern times, the right to recall was initiated in the Municipality of Los Angeles in the United States in 1903 followed by Michigan and Oreo in 1908. The right to recall is an established right under the Constitution of Uganda. In the US, where 18 states have the provision to recall at the State level and 36 at the local level, 75 percent of all recalls happened at the city council or school board level. At the State level, California initiated 32 gubernatorial recall attempts since 1911, but the 2003 recall, when Arnold Schwarzenegger became governor, was the first ever to lead to a vote. In Canada, the right to recall forms a part of the political agenda of the parties and a bill has been introduced for implementation of the same. In Guyana, the political parties have the right to recall. In Switzerland and Venezuela, despite the presence of recall provisions, the process is seldom practiced. In countries like Germany, United Kingdom, New Zealand and Sweden, the recall process is being debated in the legislatures.

If one looks at any of the existing recall processes or the envisaged ones, there is a fundamental procedures which are is followed across the board. For instance, such commonality of procedure can be demonstrated by comparing the existing recall process of US against the one enumerated in the ‘Recall of elected representatives Bill, 2012-13’ of the UK.

The recall process in US commences with the filing of a notice of intention to circulate a recall petition, however, eight states requires certain grounds to be shown before the filing of such notice. Similarly, in UK the recall would commence only when the Speaker gives the notice to the returning officer indicating that a ‘condition’ triggering recall has occurred. The next step involved in a recall process is the circulation of the recall petition and getting it signed by a ‘minimum number’ of voters within a ‘specific time’ . Once the requisite percentage of signature has been collected, the process of the verification of these signatures is undertaken. After the said gamut of events, the seat of the recalled representative is automatically vacated and a by-election is held.

### **Right to recall: Position in India**

The concept of “Rajdharma” during the Vedic times is similar to the concept of Right to Recall. In this system, the king was removed when there is a lack of effective governance. In 1944, M.N. Roy proposed the decentralisation and devolution of governance which will allow for the election and recall of representatives. Mr. L. N. Misra, Member of Constituent Assembly during the constituent

assembly debates on 29<sup>th</sup> Nov, 1948 brought a motion of amendment bearing amendment No. 273 that sought for the insertion of Article 8A (*Right of suffrage and election*)<sup>13</sup> after Article 8. Mr. Misra was of the opinion that the people in a constituency may be given the power to elect their primary members. These primary members then in turn will use their discretion to elect their representative either to the Union Parliament or to the State Assembly. In this they will know the man they will be selecting as their representative and that will be a healthy and real process of election. According to the motion of Mr. Misra these primary members shall have the right to recall the member they elected to the Parliament or the Assembly of the State. In the words of Mr. Misra: *"This is a very real fundamental right. We know that when we are returned to the Assemblies we come there as representing the masses for five years. But what we care for is the party caucus--the high command--and if it is pleased we are all right. We do not care for the people. I therefore submit that if we are to be real members representing the people, our first concern should be the people. They must be our masters. If we serve them well we are there; if we do not we must go out. But that does not happen now. Therefore it is essential that if people have a right to elect members they must have the right to recall them if things go wrong. The right to recall is a fundamental right in democracy. Unless we have that we cannot have proper democracy. I therefore submit to you that if we are going to give the people a right to elect their representatives who will rule in their name, we must at the same time give them the right to recall the representative if things go wrong. In fact what happens here is, we do not care for the people; there is somebody high up and he selects people. He says so and so must be elected and it is done. Therefore the selected person's primary business is to look up and not down. It is a bad state of democracy and I say we must stop it."*<sup>14</sup>

---

**13 Article 8A- RIGHT OF SUFFRAGE AND ELECTION-** (1) Every citizen who is not less than 21 years of age and is not otherwise disqualified under this Constitution or any law made by the Union Parliament or by the Legislature of his State on any ground, e.g., non-residence, unsoundness of mind, crime or corrupt or illegal practice, shall be entitled to be registered as a voter at such elections.

(2) The elections shall be on the basis of adult suffrage as described in the next preceding sub-clause but they may be indirect, i.e., the Poura and Grama Panchayats or a group of villages, a township or a part of it having a particular number of voters or being an autonomous unit of local self-government shall be required to elect primary members, who in their turn, shall elect members to the Union Parliament and to the State Assembly.

(3) The Primary Members shall have the right to recall the member they elected to the Parliament or the Assembly of the State.

(4) A voter shall have the right to election and the cost of election shall be met by the State.

(5) Every candidate must be elected by the People and even if there is no rival, no candidate shall be elected unless he gets at least 1/3 of the total votes.' "

14 Constituent Assembly of India Debates (Proceedings)- Volume VII dated Monday, 29th November 1948. available at: <http://164.100.47.132/LssNew/constituent/vol7p15.html> (Last visited on 15 Sept 2020)

The motion presented by Mr. Misra was negated on the ground that at that particular moment the Constituent Assembly was having the discussion on the Fundamental Rights of the Draft Constitution. Moreover matters relating to elections have been dealt with in the Draft Constitution at other places where it has been stated as to how the legislature shall be formed, who shall be the members of the legislatures; what shall be their rights; what shall be the procedure of their elections. It was mentioned that Amendments of this nature maybe moved in the article dealing with such things. This amendment was seen totally irrelevant to Fundamental Rights of the Draft Constitution. Dr. B. R. Ambedkar too didn't accept this proposed amendment.

The right to recall the elected representative has remained notional. The process of formulation of any legislation on the subject has been derailed by the political parties. Jayaprakash Narayan too had initiated the demand for right to recall during the *Sampoorna Kranti* (Total Revolution) movement on the 4th of November, 1974. It is well established fact that political leaders are reluctant to enact any legislation which depicts that they are hesitant to maturing into participatory democracy. The fight to achieve the right to recall has mainly been to curb the corruption which has crippled the growth of the Indian democracy since its inception in 1947. The Supreme Court<sup>15</sup> has strongly reprimanded the issue of corruption and has labeled it to be the opposition of democracy. The Court observed that,

*“Corruption in a civilized society is like cancer, which if not detected in time is sure to malignise the polity of the country leading to disastrous consequences. It is termed as a plague which is not only contagious but if not controlled spreads like a fire in a jungle. Its virus is compared with HIV leading to AIDS, being incurable. It has also been termed as royal thievery. The socio-political system exposed to such a dreaded communicable disease is likely to crumble under its own weight. Corruption is opposed to democracy and social order, being not only anti-people, but also aimed and targeted at them. It affects the economy and destroys the cultural heritage. Unless nipped in the bud at the earliest, it is likely to cause turbulence shaking of the socio-economic political system in an otherwise healthy, wealthy, effective and vibrating society”<sup>16</sup>*

No doubt electoral reforms were the mainly recommended by The Indrajit Gupta Committee in 1998 but this committee was not in favour of the right to recall. During the discussion on the Constitution Ninety Seventh Amendment Bill in Lok Sabha on the 16<sup>th</sup> December 2003, Late Shri Arun Jaitley accepted that the public demand was to implement the right to recall but his view was also the same like his precursors that it will not help in improving the political condition of the

---

15 *State of Madhya Pradesh v. Ram Singh* AIR 2000 SC 870

16 *Ibid.*



country. Mr. Kapil Sibal did not answer the suggestions of recall in year 2005 during the short term discussions in the Lok Sabha when Mr. Basu Deb Acharia was strongly favoured of the right to recall to be granted to the constituents.

In year 2007 during the Commonwealth Parliamentary Conference, Mr. Somnath Chatterjee, the then speaker of the Lok Sabha appeared to be a supporter of the right to recall. But according to Mr. Vinod Bhanu, who spoke to the assembled MPs, concluded that the general opinion of the MPs is that they are uncomfortable with the prospect of recall. The Chief Election Commissioner, Mr. S.Y. Qureshi opposed the suggestion made by Anna by stating that such a suggestion will escalate costs and is impossible in the Indian scenario. In 2016, Varun Gandhi introduced ‘The Representation of the People (Amendment) Bill in Lok Sabha to recall MPs, MLAs for the non-performance. Most constitutional experts and political observers have panned the idea of recall in India. According to Subhash C. Kashyap, former secretary general of Lok Sabha and author of several books on Indian constitution and polity “Given the number of people in an Indian constituency as well as our electoral system (first past the post), recall is an impractical idea made fashionable by arm chair critics. It works when the population of the constituency is small.” M.R. Madhavan of PRS Legislative Research says, “A recall may work against the electorate since the politician will be wary of taking tough decisions that may endanger his position in the short-term even though they may be beneficial for the public in the longer term.”

Neither the Indian Constitution nor any of the Central legislations allow right to recall to be practiced in India. However, in Chhattisgarh, Maharashtra and Madhya Pradesh, an attempt has been made to implement the right to recall. Section 47 (recall of president) of the Chhattisgarh *Nagar Palika* Act, 1961, provides for elections to be held to recall the elected representatives who are unable to perform. On 15th June, 2008, the first recall elections were held in Chhattisgarh for the three presidents in Chhattisgarh urban bodies. The State of Bihar was the latest one to bring in the right to recall in practice. The Nitish Kumar led Government vested the power to remove the elected representatives in urban civic polls directly to the voters in March 2011. The State cabinet has agreed to the ‘right to recall’ proposal in this regard by giving its nod to the amendment to the Bihar Municipal Act. It will enable the government to remove the elected representatives of the municipal corporations – *Nagar Parishad* and *Nagar Panchayat* -if two-thirds of the voters of their constituencies submit a signed petition to the urban development department against them. The department will look into the merit of the petition and take steps for the ouster of the councilors if it is convinced that they have lost the confidence of two-thirds of the voters. Earlier, the Act had a provision for the removal of a councilor only if two-thirds of fellow councilors filed a written

petition against him. But now, the government has vested the power directly with the voters. There is already a provision under the *Panchayati Raj* system in the State for the recall of elected *mukhiyas* (village headmen). It will now be applicable to the elected representatives of the urban civic bodies as well.

### **Right to Recall: A Legal and Judicial Perspective**

Going strictly by the golden rule of interpretation of Legal Jurisprudence, if we peruse Section 16 of the General Clauses Act, 1897, the power to make an appointment shall also include the power to dismiss the person so appointed. Thus the power to elect should also include the power to recall. The Supreme Court in its recent judgments has shown a strong wave of judicial activism by which the public demand has been given priority in decision making. A wider ambit has been given to the fundamental rights and several of the Directive Principles have been lifted to give them the character of fundamental rights. The day is not far when the right to recall will also be included within the wide ambit of the Fundamental Rights in the Constitution of India or rather the need for its implementation will dictate its inclusion.

The Indian Constitution mentions India to be a democracy only in the preamble of the constitution. The word democracy does not emerge anywhere in the Fundamental Rights section of the Constitution. The preamble of the Constitution forms the basic structure and the concept of democracy should be accounted for in Part III of the Constitution by empowering the citizens with a right to recall non performing legislators. Justice Sacchar has favoured the reformist view by calling for the right to recall and reject in the democratic spirit of the Constitution. The whole issue of right to recall has attracted both positive and negative reactions. But according to the perspective of law, the Constitution mandates a democracy and legislations are bound to give life to the spirit of the law.

In the case of *Mohan Lal Tripathi v. District Magistrate, Rae Bareilly and Ors.*,<sup>17</sup> the Supreme Court of India opined that:

*“A President who is elected by the entire electorate when removed by such members of the Board who have also been elected by the people is in fact removal by the electorate itself. The Board represents the entire electorate as they are representatives of the people although smaller in the body. Such provision neither violates the spirit nor purpose of recall of an elected representative.”*<sup>18</sup>

---

17 1993 AIR 2042

18 *Id.*, at 2044

However, the Allahabad High Court later in the case of *Smt. Ram Beti v. District Panchayat Raj Adhikari and Ors*<sup>19</sup> advised that the provisions of removal of the representative could be made more stringent by restoring the old provisions of recall by Gram Sabha i.e. by the electors themselves. The position taken by the Supreme Court appears to be quite dangerous and therefore, the advice was given by the Allahabad High Court indeed holds substance. Therefore, the interests of justice and fairness demand that the de facto power to remove the representatives should be with the electorate itself and not the representatives of the electorate.

### **Conclusion**

Concluding in the words of The Former Lok Sabha Speaker Mr. Somnath Chatterjee at Thiruvanthapuram where he recommended the introduction of right to recall of elected representatives in India. He said “It is time for us to look for devices such as ‘recall’ to ensure accountability of the members of democratic institutions at all levels, before the common man gets totally disillusioned with the prevailing system. Through the recall mechanism the elected representative could be made truly accountable to the people. In such scenario, political parties will be forced to nominate eligible and desirable candidates to contest elections because of the fear of removal of elected representative. However, for such system to work high level of political maturity is required on the part of voters. The performance and the functioning of the parliament as well as its members would improve if people who elected their representatives to voice their grievances watched the parliamentary proceedings regularly. But, it is not such an easy thing to be resolved in our parliamentary democracy as all the political parties have to arrive at a consensus, which may be a difficult task.”

India, the largest democracy isn't the most effective one. The irony and the clumsiness of the electoral process in India is that it has not been able to keep out criminal, anti-social and undesirable elements from participating in and even dominating the political scene and polluting the electoral and parliamentary processes. It can be corrected only by putting voters in control and ‘Right to recall’, is an excellent accountability tool. At present, provision for recall is necessary in democracy because elected representative at all levels give the impression that they have protection from all laws of the country and majority of them acts only for profit earning not for the welfare of the State.

\*\*\*

---

19 AIR 1998 All 80.