

Indian Journal of Modern Research and Reviews

This Journal is a member of the '*Committee on Publication Ethics*'

Online ISSN:2584-184X



REVIEW PAPER

International Standards Vs. Indian Practice: A Comparative Study of Prisoners' Voting Rights

Anshika Gupta ^{1*}, Prof. (Dr.) Sushil Kumar Singh ²

¹ Research Scholar, Teerthanker Mahaveer College of Law & Legal Studies, Teerthanker Mahaveer University, (U.P.) India

² Principal, Teerthanker Mahaveer College of Law & Legal Studies, Teerthanker Mahaveer University, (U.P.), India

Corresponding Author: *Anshika Gupta

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17299561>

ABSTRACT

This paper examines international human-rights standards on the right to vote and compares them with Indian statutory and judicial practice. International instruments and expert bodies (the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR) and Human Rights Committee guidance, the United Nations Standard Minimum Rules for the Treatment of Prisoners (Nelson Mandela Rules), and regional jurisprudence such as the European Court of Human Rights' rulings) set strong norms favoring universal suffrage and require any restriction to be provided by law, necessary and proportionate. India's law — chiefly Section 62(5) of the Representation of the People Act, 1951 — effectively imposes a blanket ban on voting by persons confined in prison on the date of an election; Indian courts have upheld this statutory rule. The paper argues that India's blanket exclusion raises serious concerns under international standards and recommends realistic, rights-based reforms (pilot special polling, absentee voting for eligible prisoners, including undertrials, clearer rules distinguishing pre-trial detainees from convicted prisoners, and better data collection).

Manuscript Info.

- ✓ ISSN No: 2584- 184X
- ✓ Received: 12-07-2025
- ✓ Accepted: 24-08-2025
- ✓ Published: 30-09-2025
- ✓ MRR:3(9):2025;104-107
- ✓ ©2025, All Rights Reserved.
- ✓ Peer Review Process: Yes
- ✓ Plagiarism Checked: Yes

How To Cite this Article

Gupta A, Singh SK. International standards vs. Indian practice: a comparative study of prisoners' voting rights. Ind J Mod Res Rev. 2025;3(9):104-107.

KEYWORDS: Prisoners' voting rights; universal suffrage; ICCPR Article 25; General Comment 25; Representation of the People Act 1951; Section 62(5); Anukul Chandra Pradhan; Hirst v UK; Nelson Mandela Rules; Venice Commission.

1. INTRODUCTION

The right to vote is central to democratic governance and is protected by multiple international instruments. States, however, differ in whether and how they limit the electoral franchise for persons deprived of liberty. This divergence raises the question of whether domestic exclusions, especially blanket bans, comply with international human-rights obligations. This paper compares international legal standards and guidance with Indian statutory practice and judicial interpretations to assess compliance and to propose reforms consistent with rights and practicability.

2. METHODOLOGY

The study is doctrinal and comparative. It uses (a) primary international instruments (treaties, UN guidance), (b) regional human-rights case law (European Court of Human Rights), (c) official UN and expert-body instruments (Nelson Mandela Rules, Venice Commission opinions), and (d) Indian statutory law and key Supreme Court decisions. Secondary sources include reports from major civil-society organizations and academic commentary. Emphasis is on legal texts, treaty-body guidance, and leading jurisprudence.

3. International Standards and Human Rights Guidance

3.1 ICCPR and The Right to Political Participation

Article 25 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights guarantees the right of every citizen to take part in public affairs, vote and be elected, and to have access to public service, subject to national law qualifications. The Human Rights Committee's General Comment No. 25 elaborates that restrictions on Article 25 rights must be provided by law and must not be applied in a manner that would nullify the rights guaranteed by the Covenant. Blanket or arbitrary restrictions are inconsistent with the Covenant's object and purpose.

3.2 UN Standard Minimum Rules (Nelson Mandela Rules) And Prisoners' Rights

The Nelson Mandela Rules emphasize the preservation of prisoners' fundamental human rights consistent with their status as persons. While the Rules do not frame a specific article saying "prisoners shall vote," they encourage actions that preserve prisoners' contact with the outside world and civic life; expert commentary reads these Rules as supportive of practical measures to enable voting where feasible.

3.3 Regional Jurisprudence — European Court of Human Rights

The European Court of Human Rights (ECtHR) has treated prisoner disenfranchisement as subject to scrutiny under the Convention (Article 3 of Protocol No. 1, right to free elections). In *Hirst v. United Kingdom (No. 2)* (2005), the Grand Chamber held that a blanket and automatic prohibition on voting for all detained convicted prisoners was disproportionate and therefore incompatible with the Convention's guarantees; the ECtHR affirmed that restrictions must be justified and proportionate. The decision does not require universal enfranchisement of all prisoners, but it rejects indiscriminate, unqualified bans.

3.4 Advisory Opinion and Expert Guidance — Venice Commission, Human Rights Bodies

The Council of Europe's Venice Commission and other international expert bodies have recommended abolishing blanket bans and adopting narrower, proportionate restrictions, if any. The Venice Commission explicitly advised that prisoners should be allowed to vote except where a specific, justified restriction is imposed and when prison conditions make voting physically impossible; even then, authorities should pursue alternatives (absentee ballots, special polling stations, assisted voting).

3.5 Summary of International Standard

Summing up, international instruments and leading jurisprudence favour broad protection of the franchise. Restrictions must be grounded in law, pursue a legitimate aim, and satisfy necessity and proportionality. Blanket exclusions of all persons deprived of liberty on the date of an election are strongly disfavoured by international human-rights authorities.

4. INDIAN STATUTORY AND JUDICIAL PRACTICE

4.1 Statutory Rule — Representation of the People Act, 1951

Section 62(5) of the Representation of the People Act, 1951 provides that "No person shall vote at any election if he is confined in a prison, whether under a sentence of imprisonment or transportation or otherwise," effectively creating a date-of-poll exclusion for any person in lawful custody. This statutory provision is absolute in its terms and applies to both convicted prisoners and persons in custody (including, in practice, many undertrials).

4.2 Key Judicial Authority — *Anukul Chandra Pradhan v. Union of India*

The constitutional validity of Section 62(5) has been challenged. In *Anukul Chandra Pradhan v. Union of India* (1997), the Supreme Court of India addressed challenges to the statutory provision and sustained the legislative scheme. The Court accepted several rationales: logistical and security difficulties in conducting polling inside prisons, the objective of preventing "criminalization" of politics, and the legislative competence to regulate franchise subject to reasonable classification. Indian jurisprudence thus treats the statutory exclusion as permissible under domestic constitutional tests.

4.3 Practical Effect and Critique

In practice, the effect is that many undertrial prisoners, who have not been finally convicted and who may have spent long pre-trial periods in custody, are disenfranchised at the time of elections. Civil-society commentators and some academics argue that this practice is arbitrary and disproportionate, undermines the presumption of innocence, and conflicts with international standards that require proportionality in restrictions. There have been calls for absentee voting options, mobile polling, or selective enfranchisement for undertrials and convicted prisoners serving short sentences.

5. Comparative Analysis: International Standards Vs Indian Practice

5.1 Legal Compatibility

International standards (ICCPR Article 25 and General Comment 25, ECtHR jurisprudence, and Venice Commission guidance) require that any restriction on the franchise must be lawful, pursue a legitimate aim, and be proportionate. India's Section 62(5), as interpreted by the Supreme Court, is "lawful" in the domestic sense, but its blanket nature raises proportionality concerns under the international standards elaborated above. The core tension: Indian law effects an across-the-board exclusion that international authorities have criticized when similarly framed in European jurisdictions.

5.2 Treatment of Undertrials

International principles stress that pre-trial detainees retain the presumption of innocence and should not be disenfranchised as a punitive measure. India's blanket date-of-poll exclusion does not distinguish between convicted prisoners and undertrials; consequently, many who are legally innocent or not yet

convicted lose the right to participate in elections — a significant divergence from recommended international practice.

5.3 Proportionality and Operational Alternatives

The international jurisprudence encourages states to adopt less intrusive, feasible alternatives (absentee voting, proxy voting, special polling stations). India's stated reasons for the exclusion — administrative difficulty and security — are legitimate on their face; however, international bodies require evidence that

less restrictive measures were considered and shown to be infeasible. Several states and countries have demonstrated that special measures can work (e.g., some European countries permit polling in prisons or absentee voting for prisoners), signaling that blanket exclusion is not the only practical option. India has limited pilots or systematic arrangements allowing incarcerated persons to vote, making its blanket policy appear disproportionate against the international yardstick.

5.4: Comparative Table: International Standards vs. Indian Practice

Criteria / Issue	International Standards (ICCPR, ECtHR, Venice Commission, etc.)	Indian Practice (Section 62(5), Supreme Court Decisions)	Comparative Remarks
1. Legal Basis	Any restriction must be provided by law, serve a legitimate aim, and be necessary and proportionate.	Restriction is legally grounded (Representation of the People Act, 1951, Sec. 62(5)) but applies uniformly to all prisoners.	India meets the legality requirement but fails the proportionality test.
2. Proportionality	Restrictions should be narrow and tailored, limited to serious offences or individual circumstances (e.g., <i>Hirst v UK</i>).	A blanket ban applies to all prisoners, regardless of the severity of their offence or sentence.	India's approach is overbroad and inconsistent with proportionality principles.
3. Treatment of Undertrials	Pre-trial detainees retain the presumption of innocence and should not be disenfranchised.	No distinction — undertrials are also disenfranchised despite not being convicted.	This violates the presumption of innocence and diverges sharply from international norms.
4. Alternative Voting Mechanisms	Special polling stations, postal ballots, or proxy voting are recommended to enable prisoners' participation.	No such mechanisms exist; logistical and security issues are cited as justification for total exclusion.	India has not explored or implemented less restrictive alternatives.
5. Human Rights Approach	Nelson Mandela Rules emphasize that prisoners remain part of civic society and their rights should be preserved.	Voting rights are removed entirely, excluding prisoners from the democratic process.	India's policy is not aligned with a human rights-based approach.
6. Social Impact	Broader enfranchisement ensures participation of marginalized groups and strengthens democracy.	Blanket disenfranchisement further silences already disadvantaged groups.	India's practice exacerbates democratic exclusion.
7. Global Trend	Most democratic nations impose limited or no restrictions (e.g., Canada, Norway, South Africa).	India is among the countries with a total ban on prisoner voting.	India is out of step with global democratic trends and standards.

COMPARATIVE CONCLUSION

The above comparison demonstrates that India's current legal framework — particularly Section 62(5) of the Representation of the People Act, 1951 — diverges significantly from international human-rights standards. While international instruments emphasize legality, legitimate purpose, proportionality, and minimal restrictions, Indian law enforcers impose a blanket, undifferentiated ban on all prisoners, including those who are undertrial and presumed innocent.

This approach raises serious concerns regarding democratic inclusion, the rule of law, and compliance with international commitments. To bridge this gap, India must consider practical reforms such as introducing alternative voting mechanisms, distinguishing between undertrials and convicted prisoners, and tailoring disenfranchisement only to the most serious cases — steps that would better align domestic practice with global norms and democratic values.

6. HUMAN-RIGHTS AND DEMOCRATIC IMPLICATIONS

6.1 Exclusion of Marginalized Voices

Prison populations disproportionately comprise socio-economically disadvantaged groups. Blanket disenfranchisement, therefore, produces a systemic exclusion of

Already marginalized communities from civic participation, heightening democratic deficit, and potentially weakening incentives for penal reform responsive to affected communities. This effect is emphasized in comparative reports documenting large numbers of disenfranchised people in jurisdictions with expansive bans.

6.2 Presumption of Innocence and Rule of Law

Disenfranchising undertrials undermines the presumption of innocence — a cornerstone of criminal justice. International human-rights guidance emphasises that restrictions should not operate as additional punitive measures against persons not yet convicted. India's practice places many pre-trial detainees outside the political community for the duration of custody, sometimes for long periods, raising significant rule-of-law concerns.

6.3 Operational Concerns vs. Rights Protection

Authorities cite logistical and security difficulties for not enabling voting inside prisons. These concerns are real, but international guidance and practices from other jurisdictions indicate workable solutions (advance voting, mobile polling, supervised absentee voting), so the genuine operational difficulty must be weighed against rights protection and tested via pilot programs rather than serving as permanent justification for a blanket ban.

7. RECOMMENDATIONS

To align Indian practice more closely with international standards while recognizing administrative realities, the following reforms are proposed:

1. **Distinguish Undertrials from Convicted Prisoners:** Amend or reinterpret Section 62(5) to allow persons not yet convicted (Undertrial Detainees) to vote, preserving the presumption of innocence. Pilot absentee voting or proxy voting for undertrials in major districts.
2. **Pilot Special Polling and Absentee Voting:** Conduct time-limited pilot projects (select states/districts) to test secure special polling stations inside prisons and absentee voting procedures (postal ballots or supervised proxies) and evaluate feasibility and turnout. Lessons from other jurisdictions should be adapted, not directly transplanted.
3. **Proportionality Review and Legislative Clarification:** Parliament should revisit the provision to require that any disenfranchisement be narrowly tailored (for instance, limited to particular serious convictions and subject to judicial review), reflecting ICCPR proportionality requirements.
4. **Data Collection and Transparency:** Election authorities should collect and publish disaggregated data on the number of persons disenfranchised and their custodial status (convicted versus undertrial) to inform policy and compliance assessments.
5. **Capacity Building and Voter Education:** Invest in training election officers and prison authorities on procedures for enabling prisoner voting and on protecting the secrecy and integrity of ballots.

8. CONCLUSION

International human-rights law strongly protects the right to political participation and requires that any restriction be lawful, necessary, and proportionate. India's current statutory rule (Section 62(5) RPA 1951), as upheld in domestic jurisprudence, institutes a blanket ban for persons confined in prison on the date of an election — a practice that conflicts in significant respects with international standards and with the presumption of innocence for undertrials. A pragmatic, rights-respecting reform agenda — distinguishing undertrials, piloting secure voting methods inside prisons, strengthening transparency, and legislating narrowly tailored disenfranchisement where truly necessary — would better reconcile India's electoral law with international commitments while addressing genuine operational concerns.

REFERENCES

1. United Nations. International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. Art. 25. New York: UN; 1966.
2. UN Human Rights Committee. General Comment No. 25: The right to participate in public affairs, voting rights, and equal access to public service. CCPR/C/21/Rev.1/Add.7. Geneva: UN; 1996.
3. United Nations. Standard Minimum Rules for the Treatment of Prisoners (the Nelson Mandela Rules). New York: UN; 2015.

4. European Court of Human Rights. Hirst v United Kingdom (No. 2), App No. 74025/01, Grand Chamber Judgment. Strasbourg: ECtHR; 2005.
5. Council of Europe, Venice Commission. Abolition of restrictions on the right to vote. Strasbourg: CoE; [year unknown].
6. Government of India. Representation of the People Act, 1951. Sec. 62(5). New Delhi: Gazette of India; 1951.
7. Supreme Court of India. Anukul Chandra Pradhan v Union of India. AIR 1997 SC 2814. New Delhi: SCI; 1997.
8. House of Commons Library. Prisoners' voting rights. Research briefing. London: UK Parliament; [year unknown].
9. The Sentencing Project. Out of step: US policy on voting rights in a global perspective. Washington, DC: The Sentencing Project; [year unknown].
10. Amnesty International. Country summaries and detention rights reports: India. London: Amnesty; [year unknown].
11. [Author unknown]. Dignity in prisoners' right to vote. [Place unknown]: [Publisher unknown]; [year unknown].
12. Government of India. Representation of the People Act, 1951. Full text. New Delhi: IndiaCode, Official Gazette; 1951.
13. IndianKanoon. Representation of the People Act, 1951: Sec. 62(5) annotations. [Internet]. [cited year unknown]. Available from: <https://indiankanoon.org>
14. European Court of Human Rights. Hirst v United Kingdom (No. 2) case summary. HUDOC database. [Internet]. Strasbourg: ECtHR; 2005.
15. Reuters. US litigation and developments on felony disenfranchisement. [Internet]. London: Reuters; [year unknown].
16. AP News. State reforms on the restoration of voting rights in the US. [Internet]. New York: AP; [year unknown].
17. Venice Commission. Report on the prohibition of prisoners' voting. Strasbourg: Council of Europe; [year unknown].
18. United Kingdom. Representation of the People Act and related measures. London: UK Government; [year unknown].
19. The Marshall Project. In just two states, all prisoners can vote: here's why few do. New York: The Marshall Project; [year unknown].
20. The Sentencing Project. Locked out 2024: Four million denied voting rights. Washington, DC: The Sentencing Project; 2024.
21. Ballotpedia. State restoration measures and comparative maps. [Internet]. Ballotpedia; [year unknown].
22. National Reentry Resource Center. State-by-state map: felony voting rights. Washington, DC: NRRRC; 2024–2025.
23. JurisCentre. Policy papers on prisoners' enfranchisement in India, 2023–2024. [Place unknown]: JurisCentre; 2024.
24. The Sentencing Project. Voting from prison: lessons from Maine and Vermont. Washington, DC: The Sentencing Project; [year unknown].
25. [Author unknown]. A comparative analysis of prisoners' disenfranchisement. Migration Lett. [year unknown];[volume(issue)]:[pages].

Creative Commons (CC) License

This article is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY 4.0) license. This license permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

