

**BEFORE THE ELECTION COMMISSION OF INDIA
AT NEW DELHI**

Nirvachan Sadan, Ashoka Road, New Delhi 110001

To,

Shri Rajiv Kumar Chief Election Commissioner Nirvachan Sadan, Ashoka Road, New Delhi 110001 Email: complaints@eci.gov.in Phone: 23052220, 23052221	Shri Gyanesh Kumar Election Commissioner Nirvachan Sadan, Ashoka Road, New Delhi 110001 Email: complaints@eci.gov.in Phone: 23052220, 23052221	Dr Sukhbir Singh Sandhu Election Commissioner Nirvachan Sadan, Ashoka Road, New Delhi 110001 Email: complaints@eci.gov.in Phone: 23052220, 23052221
---	---	--

Dated: July 18, 2024

Notice

We are filing the instant Notice on the issues of Gross illegalities/irregularities, Vote Manipulation and Misconduct, Spurious injection of Votes as well as violations Model Code of Conduct and Supreme Court judgments during Voting and Counting in the 18th Lok Sabha Election 2024 conducted under the Superintendence, direction and control of the Election Commission of India as Commission is holder of repository power under Article 324 of the Indian Constitution

MOST RESPECTFULLY SHOWETH;

1. Article 324 of the Constitution provides that the power of superintendence, direction and control of elections to parliament, state legislatures, the office of president of India and the office of vice-president of India shall be vested in the Election Commission of India (ECI). The Representation of the Peoples Act 43 of 1951, "the Act", confers extensive powers on the ECI in regard to conduct of free and fair elections without any interference. The Supreme Court of India in

People's Union for Civil Liberties and Another vs. Union of India, (2013) 10 SCC 1, reiterated that “Free and fair election is a basic structure of the Constitution and necessarily includes within its ambit the right of an elector to cast his vote without fear of reprisal, duress or coercion. Protection of elector's identity and affording secrecy is therefore integral to free and fair elections and an arbitrary distinction between the voter who casts his vote and the voter who does not cast his vote is violative of Article 14. Thus, secrecy is required to be maintained for both categories of persons.”

2. The role of the Election Commission while holding public elections has become so vital, a greater and wider responsibility is imposed on the Election Commission to ensure that those who contest the elections maintain high levels of integrity and honesty and that the voting public are not duped by their evil designs. The ECI has been charged with the duty and mandated with extraordinary powers to hold elections to both parliament and state legislature from time to time. The power it possesses under Article 324 is plenary. Undoubtedly, the Election Commission is duty bound to act in a fair, impartial and legal manner. In our constitutional scheme of things, ECI is the sole institution and holder of repository power empowered to take appropriate steps in compliance to the constitutional mandate of free and fair elections.
3. Unfortunately, the poll body has evidently conducted the Lok Sabha election 2024 in a biased and partial manner to favour the ruling dispensation. From polling to counting, the provisions of the Representation of Peoples Act, 1951, the Conduct of Elections Rules, 1961, the relevant laws and instructions were blatantly violated by the political parties and ignored by the ECI. The Election Commission cannot turn a Nelson's eye over the reports of voting manipulation and misconduct that happened during Lok Sabha Election 2024. We, are seeking your accountability, answerability and reasonable explanation on the following egregious incidents, violations, illegalities

and irregularities in relation to the Conduct of Lok Sabha Election 2024.

A. Appointment of the Election Commissioners is partisan

4. The purpose of the appointment of the Election Commissioners, is to ensure that the process always remains independent from any interference of the executive, and the selection of the Election Commissioners cannot be left in the hands of the Executive. It is pertinent to mention that the Selection Committee comprising Prime Minister, Union Cabinet Minister and the LoP (Leader of the Opposition) were meant to meet on March 15, 2024. However, this date got changed to March 14, 2024 on March 9, 2024. On 12 March, 2024, the LoP, Adhir Ranjan asked for a list of shortlisted candidates and was handed a list of 200 candidates on 13 March, 2024 when the Selection Committee first met. Since no selection happened that day, the Committee met again the next day. On March 14, 2024 a shortlist of six candidates was given to the Selection Committee of which two candidates, Gyanesh Kumar and Sukhbir Singh Sandhu, were selected.
5. That LoP Adhir Ranjan alleged that he was given the list of six candidates 10 minutes before the meeting. It is a substantial fact to be considered that the LoP was not given sufficient and reasonable time to consider the candidates. The Election Commission of India vide its press note [No. ECI/PN/22/2024](#) dated 15.03.2024 informed that Gyanesh Kumar and Sukhbir Singh Sandhu assumed charge as Election Commissioners in the ECI and notification regarding appointment of the newly appointed Election Commissioners was published in the Gazette on March 14, 2024, while appointing the Election Commissioners a gross concealment and secrecy were adopted by the Committee and the whole process conducted without transparency. It is significant to note that Notification of election for the 18th Lok Sabha was made just two days later on March 16, 2024.

This raises disturbing questions on the impartiality of the Election Commissioners.

B. Voting system violates Representation of People's Act, 1951

6. It is humbly submitted that Section 59 of the Representation of People's Act, 1951 (RPA) which mandates the conduct of elections through ballot paper has been violated with impunity. This is what the provision says: ***"Manner of voting at elections: - At every election where a poll is taken votes shall be given by ballot in such manner as may be prescribed and, save as expressly provided by this Act, no votes shall be received by proxy."*** This was followed by non-compliance of Section 61A which provides for voting machines at elections subject to conditions: *"Notwithstanding anything contained in this Act or the rules made thereunder, the giving and recording of votes by voting machines in such manner as may be prescribed, may be adopted in such constituency or constituencies as the Election Commission may, having regard to the circumstances of each case, specify."*
7. **It is to be noted that while Section 59 uses the word "shall", Section 61A says only "may" making the legislative intention clear—conduct of elections in India should be with ballot paper and EVM may be an option if that was not possible.** Therefore, as per administrative protocol, Election Commission of India (ECI) is required to issue a constituency-wise 'notification' explaining the circumstances under which elections could not be conducted with ballot papers and electronic voting machines (EVM) would be used for the purpose. No such notifications were issued by the ECI either before or after the announcement of the election schedule on March 16, 2024. **This makes the election ab-initio void and illegal.**

C. Elections conducted through EVMs are undemocratic

8. Under the EVM voting system voter cannot examine what has been recorded, and has no way to know that her/his vote is cast as intended, recorded as cast and counted as recorded. It also does not

provide provable guarantees against hacking, tampering and spurious vote injections. Design and implementation of EVMs as well as the results of both software and hardware verification are not public and open to independent review. Due to absence of End-to-End (E2E) verifiability, the present EVM system is not verifiable, violates 'Democracy Principles' and therefore is unfit for democratic elections.

9. In conducting elections through the EVM the way it did ECI has wantonly defied Supreme Court orders. In its judgment dated 8.10.2013 in ***Subramanian Swamy v. Election Commission of India, (2013) 10 SCC 500***, Supreme Court had clearly laid out the purpose of introducing the Voter Verifiable Paper Audit Trail (VVPAT) along with EVMs: "From the materials placed by both the sides, we are satisfied that the "paper trail" is an indispensable requirement of free and fair elections. The confidence of the voters in the EVMs can be achieved only with the introduction of the "paper trail." EVMs with VVPAT system ensure the accuracy of the voting system. With an intent to have fullest transparency in the system and to restore the confidence of the voters, it is necessary to set up EVMs with VVPAT system because vote is nothing but an act of expression which has immense importance in democratic system."

[<https://electionjudgments.org/en/entity/jda45mfo7xi?page=18>]

10. Apex Court's purpose was to make the EVM voting/counting to comply with the essential 'Democracy Principles' of End-to-End (E2E) verifiability. This ipso facto meant that EVM should be used for voting and all the printed slips in the VVPAT machine should be counted before declaring results. Pursuant to the 8.10.2013 order and other directives ECI arranged for all EVMs to be accompanied with VVPAT for the 2019 general elections.
11. But, in defiance of this basic principle, vide its letter dated 13.02.2018 ECI directed state chief electoral officers to mandatorily verify VVPAT paper slips in only one randomly selected polling station in each

assembly constituency. This being around 0.5% sample size which is pathetically low, defeated the very object of installing VVPATs in all EVMs which tantamount to non-implementation of Supreme Court Order. Subsequently the sample size from a microscopic 0.5% to miniscule 2 % through an ad hoc order of the Supreme Court whereas the demand was for a reasonable 30% to 50% based on sound statistical principles. E2E verifiability had thus been intentionally denied, thus paving the way for “spurious injection of votes.”

In its Report titled “Is the Indian EVM and VVPAT System Fit for Democratic Elections?” released in January, 2021 and submitted to ECI, Citizens Commission on Election (CCE) had said that EVM system does not provide provable guarantees against hacking, tampering and spurious vote injections and the VVPAT system as practiced does not allow the voter to verify the slip before the vote is cast and the absence of E2E verification would lead to voting and counting manipulation and had suggested remedial measures. ECI did not bother to respond.

[<https://constitutionalconduct.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/04/citizens-commission-on-elections-vol.-i.pdf>].

12. Therefore, in August/September 2023, civil society submitted a Memorandum to ECI signed by about 10,000 voters making a specific demand: “The VVPAT system should be re-calibrated to be fully voter-verifiable. A voter should be able to get the VVPAT slip in her hand and cast it in a chip-free ballot box for the vote to be valid. These VVPAT slips should be fully counted first for all constituencies before the results are declared.” [<https://www.change.org/p/ecisveep-eci-must-implement-its-constitutional-mandate-to-conduct-free-and-fair-election>]. ECI did not even acknowledged this Memorandum leave alone acting upon it.

D. Registration and Counting Manipulation of Election

13. In his Paper titled “Democratic Backsliding in the World’s Largest Democracy,” (2023) scholar Sabyasachi Das, formerly of the Ashoka University who studied the 2019 General Election to Parliament, says that electoral manipulation can take place at the stage of voter registration (registration manipulation) or at the time of voting or counting (turnout manipulation). At the time of voter registration, manipulation is done in the form of targeted deletion of names of voters who are unlikely to vote for the incumbent party. At the time of voting, polling officers can strategically discriminate against registered voters, who are likely to vote against the ruling dispensation. Manipulation can take place at the time of counting of votes due to confusion created by variations in voter turnout data and percentages as well as weak or prejudiced monitoring by counting observers appointed by the ECI who are from the State Civil Service (SCS), as opposed to the Indian Administrative Service (IAS) especially those coming from beneficiary states who are pliable. Both these manipulations happened in the 2024 election also and ECI neither took preventive steps, nor acted upon the many complaints sent to them.

E. Large-scale spurious injection of votes

14. This deliberate denial of E2E verifiability has facilitated large scale spurious injection of votes in various constituencies. This has been done by substantial hiking of vote percentages in all phases of polling. Significantly, the total hike in absolute number of votes cumulatively for all the phases between the turnout figures reported at 7-8 PM and final turnout—figures extrapolated from the Available Figures of the Percentage of Polled Votes, supplied by the ECI--is close to 5 crore votes, or 4,65,46,885 to be precise! The ECI has failed to provide any justifiable reason to explain these significant, even staggering hikes and has preferred to shirk off its responsibility as the highest Constitutionally mandated authority to conduct free and fair elections, by remaining mute spectators. These and other

discrepancies and figures are outlined in detail in this report/analysis.

15. We would like to place on record the analysis and figures closely monitored and prepared by us in order to bring discrepancies and unusual hike in vote percentage that grossly violates the spirit of the free and fair election and raised serious doubts about large scale spurious injection of votes that could alter the results.
16. In Phase 1, 102 Parliamentary Constituencies covering 21 states/UTs went to the polls on April 19, 2024. The ECI press release on the same day observed that the voter turnout percentage reported at 7 pm was above 60%, but it jumped to 66.14% when the final turnout data was released on April 30, 2024 this Commission did not explain as to why there was a substantial hike in the final figures, nor did the poll body explain the long delay (11 days!) in releasing the final figures and that too in percentages only.
17. In Phase 2, this Commission still has not provided the poll day i.e. April 26, 2024 figures and voter turnout percentage for Phase 2. This concealment and non-disclosure deprived the voters from right to information as well as such information was the subject of mandatory disclosure. In absence of actual figures of poll day for Phase 2 raise reasonable doubts and questions over the conduct of this Commission in concealing the real time figures for Phase 2. However, at the end of the polling, the tentative figures for voter turnout released by ECI stood at 60.96% at 7 PM, though the circular did not give state-wise data as provided in the first phase. The final turnout data was released after four days on April 30, 2024 which reported turnout at 66.71% (increase of around 6%), this Commission only provided aggregate vote percentage through a press note dated 30.04.2024 along with Phase 1 figures without disclosing State/UT and PC wise figures.
18. In Phase 3, On the polling day i.e. May 7, 2024, the voter turnout percentage issued by the ECI press note (ECI/PN/74/2024) shows

turnout at 61.45% as of 8 PM, but it was updated to 64.4% as of 11:40 PM in the later press note released close to midnight the same day. Curiously, in a separate press note released on the next day, i.e., May 8, the ECI gave updated turnout figures at 65.68% as of 10 PM. Here the time was decreased from 11:40 PM (May 7, 2024) to 10:00 PM (May 8, 2024) but the percentage of votes increased from 64.4% to 65.68 %, which is more than the turnout reported at 11:40 PM. The difference of time between press note date May 7, 2024 and May 8, 2024 needs to be clarified by this Commission.

19. In Phase 4, on polling day i.e. May 13, 2024, this Commission issued two press releases, the first one reported the voter turnout at 62.84% as of 8 PM, and the second one updated the voter turnout at 67.25% as of 11:45 PM. The final turnout report was released on May 17, which reported the turnout figures at 69.16%. Notably, compared to turnout reported at 8 PM (62.84%), the final turnout increased by little more than 6% to stand at 69.16%.
20. In Phase 5, 49 seats across 8 states/UTs went to the polls in the fifth phase of the Lok Sabha Election 2024 on May 20, 2024. On the same day, the Election Commission reported 57.47% voter turnout at 7:45 PM, which was updated to 60.09% by 11:30 PM as per the ECI press note released just after midnight. The final voter turnout figure was released on May 23, 2024 which reported it at 62.20% with 2.11%.
21. In Phase 6, as per ECI's press note (ECI/PN/104/2024) issued on same day i.e. May 25, 2025, the total voter turnout recorded 59.06% as of 7:45 PM but subsequently jumped to 63.37% with a hike of 4.31%, according to the final voter turnout recorded in the ECI's press note (ECI/PN/109/2024) on May 28, 2024.
22. In Phase 7, as per ECI press note (ECI/PN/114/2024) released on June 1, 2024, the voter turnout was recorded 59.45% as of 8:45 PM. Subsequently, ECI released another press note (ECI/PN/115/2024)

on June 1, 2024, in which voter turnout was recorded at 61.63% as of 11:45 PM for Phase 7 with a hike of 2.18%.

23. The gross mismatch in the figures of Votes Polled and made available immediately after polling and then days later, coupled with the failure of the ECI to abide by its legal obligations and provide 17-C forms to all candidates that are the ultimate arbiter/ proof of Votes Polled is a pointer to the fact that a) either EVMs have been tampered or rigged) machines EVMs themselves changed/replaced which makes the entire exercise unreliable/suspect. The Election Commission of India (ECI) has not provided any reasonable justification for such a hike except suggesting delays due to distance, logistics, complexity of the exercise, need for triangulation, and personnel issues.
24. **The Chart – Phase wise hike in total votes polled (at Annexure A “Phase Wise Hike in Total Votes Polled”) indicates 4.65 crore spike in “polled” votes working out to average of 4.72% which is much higher than the historical variation of about 1%. In some states it is much higher. ECI has so far not given any satisfactory explanation to this abnormal hike. This leads us to the conclusion that in this election large-scale spurious injection of votes has been resorted to with the intention to steal the mandate of the people in favour of a political party.**
25. **The Table which has “State-wise Increase of Seats on the basis of Hike/dumped Votes from Extrapolated Figures” (at Annexure B) clearly brings out that people’s mandate has been stolen at least in 76 Parliamentary Constituencies by resorting to spurious injection of votes. A more detailed analysis could increase this number.**

F. Illogical and chaotic scheduling of election

26. Article 324 of the Constitution of India bestows the relevant powers, duties and functions upon the Election Commission of India, while Article 83(2) of the Constitution of India and Section 14 of the

Representation of the Peoples Act provides for the Conduct of the elections to constitute a new Lok Sabha before the expiry of its current term. The term of the 17th Lok Sabha expired on June 16th, 2024.

27. The Election Commission of India vide its press note [NO. ECI/PN/23/2024](#) dated 16.03.2024 announced the schedule for General Elections to Lok Sabha and Legislative Assemblies of Andhra Pradesh, Arunachal Pradesh, Odisha & Sikkim, 2024. As per the schedule announced by the Election Commission, it was a multi-phased election conducted in 7 Phases.
28. The elections were conducted for 542 Parliamentary Constituencies of 36 States and UTs in 7 Phases. However, it is doubtful and questionable what determinant factor the Election Commission applied in order to determine the schedule and distribute the PCs of Particular States/UTs for How Many and Which Particular Phase.
29. For instance, Assam with only 14 PCs, yet the election for these PCs were conducted in three phases [Phase 1 (5 PCs) Phase 2 (5 PCs) and Phase 3 (4 PCs)] but on the other hand in Andhra Pradesh with 25 PCs (more PCs compared to the Assam), the polls were conducted for these 25 Pcs only in single phase i.e. Phase 4, on May 13, 2024.
30. Similarly, with regards to the state of Jharkhand with 14 PCs, Odisha with 21 PCs. The poll was conducted in five Phases (Phase 4,5,6,7, respectively) while, on the other hand Tamil Nadu with as many as 39 PCs, Gujarat with 26 Pcs, the voting was conducted in one single phase (Phase 1,2, respectively).
31. Interestingly, J&K has 5 PCs and polls were conducted for all 5 PCs in over five Phases (Phase 1 to 5) and Polls for 14 PCs of Chhattisgarh were conducted in three phases (Phase 1 to 3). We are highlighting only a few examples for the sake of brevity but there could be more that demonstrate no clear rationale behind this distribution.

G. Voting Misconduct:

32. The process of election starts with the issuance of notification for holding an election by the Election Commission of India and ends with the declaration of the result of that particular constituency. Section 21, 28, 29-A, 79(d) and 81 of the Representation of Peoples Act, 1951 provide a complete scheme for holding elections.
33. The Returning Officer is appointed under section 21 of the Act and his duties are given under Section 24. For the sake of convenience Section 24 is reproduced as below: –
- “24. General duty of the returning officer. - It shall be the general duty of the returning officer at any election to do all such acts and things as may be necessary for effectually conducting the election in the manner provided by this Act and rules or orders made thereunder.”*
34. That Section 28 of the Act provides the duration of the appointment or continuance of the Returning Officer and Polling Officer etc. shall be deemed to be on deputation to the Election Commission on and from the date of the notification calling for such election and ending with the date of declaration of the results of such election. However, the Election Commission retains a skeleton machinery like District Election Officer in every District which coordinates and supervises all works in the district relating to the conduct of all elections such as preparation and revision of electoral rolls etc., but after declaration of the result of the election in a particular area he ceases to be a Returning Officer.
35. That the reason in highlighting the forgoing contentions is that in case of votes manipulation and misconduct during the elections, the Returning Officer is the person who has been authorised by the Election Commission to take appropriate action in accordance with the Law, Rules and Guidelines.

36. The Returning Office who plays a pivotal role in order to conduct election free and fair manner and the actual purity and safety of the whole election vests in the Returning Officer. Despite this statutory mandate and constitutional duty, Returning Officers –in a large instance of cases– failed to protect the democratic values of free and fair elections through their conduct. Apart from the general duty of RO to take all measures as may be necessary for the effective and lawful conduct of the election, RO is required to comply with the provisions under the Representation of Peoples Act, 1951, the Conduct of Elections Rules, 1961 and the Handbook for Returning Officer (H.R.O.).

H. Malpractices and Voting Manipulation:

37. It is submitted that elections of *at least* 18 Parliamentary Constituencies have been tainted by vote manipulation and malpractices and the election process of the said PCs affected by the Corrupt Practices and Booth Capturing. We are highlighting a few PCs but there could be more subject to investigation of this Commission. The election process in 18 PCs of 10 States/UTs materially affected by mal and corrupt practices adopted by the Returning Officers concerned. Specifically in Assam's Karimganj allegation was on the District Collector and allegation of indulgence of DM in materially affecting the result of the election. There was a discrepancy of 3811. Another PC of Assam, Kokrajhar where as per the final ECI voter turnout data, 12,40,306 votes (excluding postal ballots) were cast in Kokrajhar PC, but on the day of counting, only 12,29,546 EVM votes were counted. A deficit of 10,760 votes is reported in Kokrajhar.
38. That, in Maharashtra's Mumbai North West PC where the returned candidate secured his election with a very narrow margin of 48 votes the entire matter is subject to a dispassionate Inquiry and Investigation of this Commission as controversy outraged in the Mumbai North West PC due to reports of blatant counting manipulation and malpractices adopted by the Returning Officer

concerned. It was also alleged that round-wise announcement of votes was stopped after the 19th until 26th round. It has also been alleged that the conduct of the elections inside the Counting Centre was not exemplary and did not follow guidelines. According to some media reports, the Returning Officer had been previously involved in some controversial acts too.

39. However, in Jaipur PCs of Rajasthan State, 2490 postal ballot votes of the runner up candidate were rejected without reasons given in writing and in absence of the candidate and his counting agent, and declared returned candidate winner by a mere 1615 votes. In Farrukhabad PC, voter suppression was reported from several polling booths. Voters deprived of their right to vote.
40. That for the sake of brevity we are highlighting only a few seats where manipulation and misconduct took place. We have prepared a detailed **Table of “State/PCs wise analysis of alleged malpractice during voting and counting, Grievance of the Candidates & Source and Relevant News Articles/Tweets.”** (Annexure C)

I. Serious violations of Model Code of Conduct:

41. It is important to note here that in huge numbers communal and hate speeches were given by the star campaigners of the National Political Parties and the candidates him/herself during the Model Code of Conduct and Silence Period of 48 Hours. After the voting for the First Phase, Prime Minister Narendra Modi delivered hate speech on 21.04.2024 in Banswara, Rajasthan. Against the hateful and derogatory remarks given by Mr. Modi, multiple complaints had been filed before this Commission but this Commission had turned blind eye to the nature of speeches delivered and the speech given by Mr. Modi was repeatedly posted on different social media platforms to promote enmity between different groups on grounds of religion.
42. It is submitted before this Commission that under section 125 of the 1951 Act, promoting enmity between classes on ground of religion in

connection with election and promoting feelings of enmity and hatred is punishable under the Act. section 125 provides that;

“125. Promoting enmity between classes in connection with election. —Any person who in connection with an election under this Act promotes or attempts to promote on grounds of religion, race, caste, community or language, feelings of enmity or hatred, between different classes of the citizens of India shall be punishable, with imprisonment for a term which may extend to three years, or with fine, or with both”.

43. That this commission failed to order the registration of FIR against the lead and star campaigners who were delivering divisive speech and neither were they barred from further campaigning. We are concerned about the deliberate silence kept by this Commission over the reports and allegations of the Hate Speeches and during the MCC period, no appropriate action had been taken against the hate speakers in the Lok Sabha Election 2024.
44. What is worse, Chief Election Commissioner gave a self-incriminating explanation to this impotent inaction when he said that the Election Commission had deliberated over poll code violations during the 2024 general elections at length and had decided to not admonish two top leaders each from the Bharatiya Janata Party and the Indian National Congress- Narendra Modi and Amit Shah of the BJP and Rahul Gandhi and Priyanka Gandhi Vadra of the INC. This is clear discrimination and constitutional violation by the CEC.

J. Form 17C not distributed to the Voting Agents:

45. It is pertinent to mention that under Rule 49S of the 1961 Rules, at the time of close of the poll, the presiding officer furnishes attested true copy of the account of votes recorded in Part I of Form 17C to the polling agents of the candidates. He also retains a receipt of the same from the polling agent. The Presiding Officer is also duty bound to give

the attested copy of the form 17C in which ballot paper account is recorded, to each election agent present at the close of the polls. During the voting period, there was a huge blatant violation over the non-providing of Form 17C to the electoral agents of the candidates. “[2) *The presiding officer shall furnish to every polling agent present at the close of the poll a true copy of the entries made in the ballot paper account after obtaining a receipt from the said polling agent therefor and shall also attest it as a true copy.*]” **[Violation of Rule 45(2) of the 1961 Rules]**

46. The issue of not providing Form 17C was specifically addressed to you on June 2, 2024 by CPI (ML) Bihar State Secretary Shyam Chandra Chaudhary. Chaudhary in his complaint alleged that “*most of our polling agents were not furnished with Form 17C despite repeated requests for the same, Moreover, our polling agents were misbehaved with for seeking Form 17C, which is mandatory in nature*” **[Violation of Rule 49S of the Conduct of Elections Rules 1961 (thereafter referred as “1961 Rules”)]**

47. The Hon’ble Supreme Court of India in ***Association for Democratic Reforms v. Election Commission of India and Another, (2024) SCC Online SC 661***, postulated that;

“17. At the end of the voting process, the Presiding Officer is required to record in Form 17C, not just the total number of voters as per the Register of Voters, but also the total number of votes recorded per voting machine as well as those staying away from the voting process despite affixing signature on the register. The total votes polled as per Form 17C is then again tallied with the total votes recorded by the control unit. Rule 56D(4) also provides that if there is any mismatch between these two totals, the printed VVPAT slips of the polling station would be counted. Furthermore, if a voter is aggrieved by a mismatch in the candidate voted for in the ballot unit vis-a-vis that recorded in the VVPAT, Rule

49M allows the voter to approach the Presiding Officer. Upon the conclusion of polling, there exists yet another remedy under Rule 56-D, for a candidate to apply for a count of the VVPAT slips, should any discrepancy be suspected. Thus, it is manifest that there is in place a stringent system of checks and balances, to prevent any possibility of a miscount of votes, and for the voter to know that his/her vote has been counted. There can be no doubt that such a system, which is distinctly more satisfactory compared to the system of the yester-years, suitably satisfies the voter's right under Article 19(1)(a) to know that his/her vote has been counted as recorded.”

48. The Hon’ble Court in ADR Judgement (**Supra**) further reiterated the manner in which the presiding officer is duty bound to furnish the attested true copy of the account of votes recorded in Part 1 of Form 17C to the polling agents of the candidates and read hereunder:

“50. Under Rule 49S of the 1961 Rules, at the time of close of the poll, the presiding officer furnishes attested true copy of the account of votes recorded in Part I of Form 17C to the polling agents of the candidates. He also retains a receipt of the same from the polling agent.”

49. That it is a much needed robust and necessary exercise for an Independent Body through an Independent Inquiry and Investigation to check **and make public** how many polling agents of the candidates failed to get/ or were deprived Form 17C at the end of polling day and how many were able to collect this document (Form 17C) vital for verification.
50. That it is pertinent to mention that under Sub-para 13.16.8 of Para 13.16 of the H.R.O. 2023, **“the presiding officers shall ensure that the data of the mock poll is cleared from Control Unit (CU) by pressing ‘CLEAR’ button on CU before sealing and all mock poll**

slips have been removed from the VVPAT drop box, without fail. This is very critical step before start of Actual Poll.”

51. However, the presiding officers deputed under the supervision and direct control of the Returning Office failed to comply and adhere to the statutory duty to protect the integrity and fairness of the elections. Hence, the Presiding Officers concerned must be prosecuted and answerable against his/her conduct.

K. Delay in releasing voter turnout:

52. The Election Commission of India should be accountable for not releasing voter turnout data in a reasonable time manner. The delay caused by this Commission in the timely release the actual voter turnout created suspicion and doubt amongst the voters. The Commission failed to honour its own promise made in the [press release](#) on 19.04.2024 that the final figures shall be released by the next day on compilation of Form 17A. This Commission also failed to stick to the age-old and time-tested practice of releasing constituency wise final figures the next day.
53. The generic response given the Commission that collection, reception, and triangulation of the voter turnout data take some time due to factors like distance, location, and manpower consideration, is totally untenable and unacceptable.

L. Returning Officers Violating statutory directions

54. The non-compliance with provisions of the Act and Violation of Statutory Instructions issued by the ECI were further accentuated by unlawful conduct by the Returning Officers (ROs) and Observers in some of the Parliamentary Constituencies (PCs). In the said PCs, the role of the RO was –in several cases--found questionable and deliberate misconduct was alleged to benefit the ruling party at the centre.

55. In relation to the conduct of Returning Officer for Mumbai North West PC, Ms. Vandana Suryavanshi, the allegation made by Shiv Sena (UBT) candidate Amol Kiritikar subject to inquiry and for your kindly perusal as Ms. Suryavanshi has antecedents of misconduct and continued to commit misconduct even at the time of counting as conducted for Mumbai North West PC. Ms. Suryavanshi did not take signatures of the election regents of the candidates at the time of announcement of election results after counting of each round.

[Violated Statutory Mandate under Sub-para 15.16.1 and 15.16.1 of Para 15.16, H.R.O. 2023]

56. Returning officer (Ms. Suryavanshi) continuously went off stage several times and did not announce the results at the end of each round.

[Violation under Rule 60 of the 1961 Rules that counting shall be continuous without any interval]

57. Returning Officers are required to provide detailed information by filling in the 'INDEX CARD' of Annexure 46 as early as possible but not later than 07 days after the counting and declaration of the result and send it through the Chief Electoral Officer of the State/Union Territory.

[Violation of Para 19.4 - Handbook for Returning Officer, 2023]

M. Discrepancies between Votes polled and votes counted:

58. The differences between votes polled and votes counted are huge in numbers. Except Lakshadweep, D.N.H. Daman & Diu and Amreli Parliamentary Constituencies, in the rest of 539 PCs votes polled in EVM did not tally with the votes recovered at the time of Counting. It is a serious and explanatory issue on your part as discrepancy of votes has been found in all the 7 Phases, the variation ranging from 1 vote to 16791 votes. The lowest difference of 1 vote was found in Navsari PC (Gujarat) and highest difference was found in Tiruvallur PC (Tamil Nadu). The discrepancies of vote created doubt and questions on the

fairness of the elections amongst voters of the country about whether their votes were actually counted or not.

59. That the deliberate silence on the issue of discrepancies of votes itself created a doubt about the deliberate concealment by the Commission. ECI has to come out in public and clarify the discrepancies in Assembly Constituencies wise even if the difference is 1 vote because it attracts prosecution under Section 65 of the Representation of Peoples Act, 1951 that talks about equality of votes.
60. That it is important to note that over the media reports and public discussion on the issue of more EVM votes were counted than votes polled, while replying to a chat on X (formerly known as Twitter), Uttar Pradesh's Chief Electoral Officer said that the Commission's data may be reflecting a deficit in votes counted because in some cases, the votes polled at certain polling stations are not counted "as per the extant protocol issued by the commission and provided in various manuals and handbooks". He further stated that "the polling stations whose votes polled are not counted are of two categories":

"(1) Where the Presiding Officer by mistake fails to clear the Mock Poll data from the Control Unit before starting the actual poll or he fails to remove Mock Poll slips from the VVPAT before starting the actual poll.

(2) The total votes polled in the Control Unit does not match the record of votes in Form 17-C prepared by the Presiding Officer and who records [an] incorrect number by mistake. The votes of above two categories of polling stations are counted towards the end of the counting only in the case if [the] sum total of votes polled in all such polling stations is equal to or greater than the margin between the first and the second candidate. If it is lower than the margin then the votes are not counted at all and therefore there arises a difference between total votes polled by EVMs and votes counted."

61. That it is pertinent to mention that under section 27, it shall be the general duty of the presiding officer at a polling station to keep order and see that the poll is fairly taken. If reliance is placed on the CEO, Uttar Pradesh then Presiding Officer subject to prosecution under Sections 27 and 100(d)(iv) of the Act for non-compliance with the provisions of the Constitution or of this Act or any rules or orders made under this Act.

N. Supreme Court Orders to strengthen integrity of the election process not complied with.

62. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in **ADR Judgement** (supra) delivered on 26.04.2024, Supreme Court opened two windows for verification and issued directions to the Election Commission of India in relation to the checking/verification of the burnt memory/microcontroller in 5% of the EVMs. Para 76 of the judgement hereunder;

“76. Nevertheless, not because we have any doubt, but to only further strengthen the integrity of the election process, we are inclined to issue the following directions:

(a) On completion of the symbol loading process in the VVPATs undertaken on or after 01.05.2024, the symbol loading units shall be sealed and secured in a container. The candidates or their representatives shall sign the seal. The sealed containers, containing the symbol loading units, shall be kept in the strong room along with the EVMs at least for a period of 45 days post the declaration of results. They shall be opened, examined and dealt with as in the case of EVMs.

(b) The burnt memory/microcontroller in 5% of the EVMs, that is, the control unit, ballot unit and the VVPAT, per assembly constituency/assembly segment of a parliamentary constituency shall be checked and verified by the team of engineers from the manufacturers of the EVMs, post the announcement of the results, for any tampering or modification, on a written request made by candidates who are at Sl. No. 2 or Sl. No. 3, behind the highest polled candidate. Such candidates or their representatives shall identify the EVMs by the polling station or serial number. All the candidates and their representatives shall have an option to remain present at the time of verification. Such a request should be made within a period of 7 days from the date of declaration of the result. The District Election Officer, in consultation with the team of

engineers, shall certify the authenticity/intactness of the burnt memory/microcontroller after the verification process is conducted. The actual cost or expenses for the said verification will be notified by the ECI, and the candidate making the said request will pay for such expenses. The expenses will be refunded, in case the EVM is found to be tampered.”

63. That both these directions were not carried out in letter and spirit. Whereas Administrative SOP for the ‘burnt memory/microcontroller’ was issued on June 1, 2024—just three days before the date of counting and announcement of results charging a hefty fee of Rs. 40,000 plus 18% GST per EVM—no Technical SOP to make it operative as mentioned in Para 7 of Administrative SOP was issued before expiry of 7 days thereby effectively preventing candidates from availing of this window provided by the Supreme Court. Then ECI enacted a farce on July 16, 2024 (43 days after the counting and declaration of results) by issuing a so-called Technical SOP. **It is obvious that evidence of whatever spurious injection of votes carried out through tampering of micro-controllers would have been obliterated by the time re-examination if any is conducted. The suspicion is that this Commission did all this to facilitate stealing of the mandate in favour of a particular party.**

O. Election Commission has abdicated its Constitutional Role

64. Under the electronic voting system ECI has lost control of the electoral process. Public Sector Undertakings (PSUs) Bharat Electronics Limited (BEL), Bengaluru, and the Electronic Corporation of India Limited (ECIL), Hyderabad, manufacture EVMs and they are not under the control or supervision of the ECI. Instead, they are under the direct control of a department of the Union Government headed by a Minister from the ruling party with nominees of that party on the Board of Directors. These entities share the confidential software programme with foreign chip manufacturers to copy it on to micro-controllers used in the EVMs. When these foreign companies deliver micro-controllers fused with software code to the EVM manufacturers,

neither the manufacturer nor the ECI officials nor the technical advisers can read back their contents because they are locked. Since under the EVM system ECI has lost control of the elections it raises serious constitutional issues.

65. **In response to a recent RTI application this Commission has stated that it does not have the list of Returning Officers who conducted the 2024 Parliament Election on behalf of the ECI, counted the votes, declared the results and issued certificate to the winner.** This is clear indication that ECI has lost control of the electoral process and abdicated its Constitutional Role and is functioning at someone else's diktat. The election thus conducted therefore is also unconstitutional and has also violated a series of directions specifically issued by the Hon'ble Supreme Court, over the years, for the conduct of free and fair elections.

66. From the videos received from the ECI as well as evidence collected by Advocate Mehmood Pracha, independent candidate in Rampur Constituency in UP, it looks as if all the Rules, directions and Manuals issued by ECI for the conduct of free and fair election only remain on paper, but are being breached with impunity. **All these makes it clear that ECI does not exercise any supervision over ROs and other election officials and therefore has lost the superintendence, direction and control of the elections as envisaged in the Constitution thus making them partisan and prejudiced.**

P. OUR DEMANDS

67. The above factual narrative clearly establishes that India's electoral democracy is facing clear and present danger and all steps need to be taken to save it from extinction. Therefore, we hereby demand the following:

- a) Thorough investigation into the issues raised and the irregularities/illegalities pointed out in the Notice for the

information of the voting public who are the real stake holders in any election.

- b) Take immediate remedial action on all the issues raised.
- c) Set aside the election of the illegally returned candidates on ground of non-compliance with the provisions of the Constitution or of RP Act or of any rules or orders made under this Act.
- d) Order immediate registration of FIR Under Section 129 of the Representation of the People's Act, 1951, Section 65,66,66F of the Information Technology Act, 200 and Sections 171F/409/417/466/120B/201/34 Indian Penal Code and investigation into the roles of all involved, including ECI officials, BEL and ECIL engineers, and beneficiary parties.
- e) **Countermand the election in the constituencies where large-scale spurious injection of votes have taken place as per the list provided in Annexure B and Annexure C and order re-election.**
- f) to pass such other orders and further orders as may be deemed necessary on the facts and in upholding integrity and fairness of the elections for future also.

Annexure A: "Phase Wise Hike in Total Votes Polled)

Annexure B): "State-wise Increase of Seats on the basis of Hike/dumped Votes from Extrapolated Figures"

Annexure C: Table of "State/PCs wise analysis of alleged malpractice during voting and counting, Grievance of the Candidates & Source and Relevant News Articles/Tweets."

MG Devasahayam, (IAS) (Retd.) & Forum for Electoral Integrity

Prof. Harish Karnick, IIT Kanpur (Retd) & Member, Independent Panel
for Monitoring of Elections

Teesta Setalvad, Convenor, Vote for Democracy (VFD), Maharashtra

Dolphy D'Souza, The Bombay Catholic Sabha, Mumbai, Maharashtra

Endorsing Organisations:

Dr Bharat Patankar, Lok Morcha, Maharashtra

Prafulla Samantara, Convenor, Lok Shakti Abhiyan, Lohia
Academy, Bhubhaneshwar, Orissa

Dr. Sunilam, President, Kisan Sangharsh Samiti, Madhya Pradesh

Shyam Gaikwad, Progressive Republican Alliance, Mumbai
Maharashtra

Tara Rao, Noor Sridhar, Coordinators, Central working Group,
Eddelu Karnataka

Roma, General Secretary, All India Union for Forest Working Peoples
(AIUFWP)

KM Subhaan, Thomas Pallithanam, Ramesh Patnaik, Meluko, Andhra
Pradesh

Aflatoon, Samajwadi Jan Parishad, Varanasi, Uttar Pradesh

Harkumar Goswami, Shishir Dey, Forum for Social Harmony,
Assam

Dr Kushal Singh, General Secretary, Kendri Sri Guru Singh Sabha
Chandigarh

Jitendra Nath Nandi, Editor of Manthan Samayiki, magazine from Kolkata

Thomas Franco, People first, a national organisation

Javed Anand, Indian Muslims for Secular Democracy (IMSD)

ANNEXURES

Annexure A: “Phase Wise Hike in Total Votes Polled

Annexure B: “State-wise Increase of Seats on the basis of Hike/dumped Votes from Extrapolated Figures”

Annexure C: Table of “State/PCs wise analysis of alleged malpractice during voting and counting, Grievance of the Candidates & Source and Relevant News Articles/Tweets.”

Annexure A

Phase-wise hike in total votes polled

(These figures are based on a comparison between extrapolated figures
and final turnout figures)¹⁴

Phase	Seats	Total Electors	Voter turnout (%) as initially reported**	Time of Reporting	Total EVM votes polled based on extrapolation	Final voter turnout (%)	Total EVM votes polled as per final figures**	Hike in votes and percentage
1	102	166386344	62.87	7.00 PM	104607094	66.14	110052103	5445009 (3.27%)
2	88	158645484	60.96	7.00 PM	96710287	66.71	105830572	9120285 (5.75%)
3	93	172404907	61.45	8.00 PM	105942815	65.68	113234676	7291861 (4.23%)
4	96	177075629	62.84	8.00 PM	111274325	69.16	122469319	11194994 (6.32%)
5	49	89567973	57.47	7.45 PM	51474714	62.20	55710618	4235904 (4.73%)
6	58	111316606	59.06	7.45 PM	65743588	63.37	70544933	4801345 (4.31%)
7	57	100653884	59.45	8.45 PM	59838734	63.88	64296221	4457487 (4.43%)
Total 543 PCs ¹⁵		97,60,50,827						Cumulative: 46546885 votes hiked (4.72%)

¹⁴ Dr Pyara Lal Garg's meticulous calculations were verified by the VFD and following this cross-verification this Table is being provided

¹⁵ The total Constituencies when polls were declared were 543; This is the Phase wise Chart of constituencies fixed for polls; Gujarat has 26 constituencies in this table; However in Gujarat in Surat Polls were not needed so the polling data is only for 542 constituencies; The Constituency of outer Manipur polls were held in two different phases; Manipur is shown at No. 10 in 1st Phase chart of 30.04.2024 showing 2 seats. Again Manipur in phase 2 appears at S. No. 9 in constituency wise details where 1 seat is shown so it becomes 3 where as Manipur has only 2 seats Inner Manipur and outer Manipur both are in 1st phase and outer Manipur appears in 2nd phase too. That is why even when PCs in different phases are shown the number turns out to be 543: **The actual number of PCs that went to polls are only 542**

Annexure B

Table:

State-wise Increase of Seats on the basis of Hike/dumped Votes
from Extrapolated Figures

(These figures are based on a comparison between extrapolated figures and final turnout figures calculated from Voter Percentages given by the ECI)

State	Voter Percentile Increase	Total Votes Original	Total Votes Hiked/ Dumped	Constituency wise Increase in Votes	Number of Constituencies where Winning Margin of NDA is less than Constituency wise increase of Votes
Odisha	12.48 %	20.86 million (2.086 crore) votes	42.01 lakh votes spread over 21 Parliamentary Constituencies (PCs)	2 Lakh Votes per constituency Odisha has 21 constituencies	18
Maharashtra	8.89 %	49.19 million (4.91 crore) Votes	82.63 lakh votes spread over 48 Parliamentary Constituencies (PCs)	1.72 Lakh per constituency Maharashtra has 48 constituencies.	11
Assam	9.17 %	18.15 million (1.82 crore) Votes	15 lakh votes spread over 14 Parliamentary Constituencies (PCs)	1 lakh 7 thousand (1,0,7000) Votes per constituency Assam has 14 constituencies.	2
Arunachal Pradesh	12.22 %	0.584 million 5.84 lakh) Votes	1.09 Lakh Votes spread over 2 Parliamentary Constituencies (PCs)	54,544 Votes per constituency. Arunachal has 2 constituencies.	1
Karnataka	4.08 %	36.84 million (3.68 crore) Votes	22.33 lakh votes spread over 28 Parliamentary Constituencies (PCs)	79,743 Votes per constituency. Karnataka has 28 constituencies.	6

Rajasthan	5.60%	29.91 million (2.99 crore) Votes	29.30 lakh votes spread over 25 Parliamentary Constituencies (PCs)	1,17,181 per constituency. Rajasthan has 25 constituencies.	5
Chhattisgarh	4.93%	14.09 million (1.41 crore) Votes	9.54 lakh votes spread over 11 Parliamentary Constituencies (PCs)	86752 votes per constituency. Chhattisgarh has 11 constituencies.	5
Telangana	4.28 %	20.39 million (2.04 crore) Votes	14.22 lakh votes spread over 17 Parliamentary Constituencies (PCs)	83.6 Thousand (83,627) per constituency. Telangana has 17 constituencies.	3
Andhra Pradesh	12.54 %	2.81 crore Votes	49 lakh votes spread over 25 Parliamentary Constituencies (PCs)	1.96 Lakh votes per constituency. Andhra Pradesh has 25 constituencies	7
Bihar	3.30 %	35.17 million (3.52 crore Votes)	11.60 Lakh Votes spread over 40 Parliamentary Constituencies (PCs)	29 thousand votes per constituency. Bihar has 40 constituencies.	3
Gujarat	3.37 %	27.23 million (2.72 crore) Votes	16.17 lakh votes spread over 26 Parliamentary Constituencies (PCs)	64,681 per constituency. Gujarat has 26 constituencies.	1
Kerala	6.17 %	18.06 million (1.81 crore) Votes.	17,12,123 votes spread over 20 Parliamentary Constituencies (PCs)	85,606 Votes per constituency. Kerala has 20 constituencies.	1

Haryana	6.43 %	11.72 million (1.172 crore)	12.91 lakh votes over 10 Parliamentary Constituencies (PCs).	1.29 Lakh per constituency Haryana has 10 constituencies.	3
West Bengal	4.83 %	5,65, 05,838 votes	36,71,283 votes spread over 42 constituencies.	Around 87,412 votes per constituency. West Bengal has 42 parliamentary constituencies	10
TOTAL					76 seats where Wins have been effected by a Dumping/ Hike of Votes


VOTE FOR DEMOCRACY
 मताधिकार फक्त लोकशाहीसाठी

Annexure C

State/PCs wise analysis of alleged malpractice during voting and counting, Grievance of the Candidates & Source and Relevant News Articles/Tweets

Sr. No.	PCs (State/UT)	Name of Candidate and Party	Malpractice
Assam			
1.	Karimganj	Hafiz Rashid Ahmed Choudhury (INC)	<p>Counting Discrepancy:</p> <p>Issue of difference in the number of polled votes and votes counted.</p> <p>https://theprint.in/india/discrepancy-detected-in-polled-counted-votes-in-assams-karimganj-oppn-seeks-repoll/2125330/</p> <p>Total EVM Votes Polled: 11,36,538</p> <p>Total EVM Votes Recovered and Counted: 11,40,349</p> <p>Surplus of 3811 EVM Votes on counting day</p> <p>Defeat Margin - 18360</p> <p>Allegation on DM:</p> <p>Alleged by the candidate of INC that the BJP forced the DM to change the mandate (this we got indirectly from the counting supervisor from the losing candidate's team). DM was busy on the phone for 15 minutes and soon after the Lead Ratio that was close dramatically increased.</p> <p>CEO Assam Reply:</p> <p>Against a post on social media app X, the Chief Electoral Officer, Assam replied in relation to the counting discrepancy at Karimganj PC that "Returning officer and DC Karimganj has been asked to enquire and explain the discrepancy. More details can be shared on receipt of official report from R.O. Karimganj"</p> <p>CEO Assam reply on X - https://x.com/ceo_assam/status/1799409685390618695</p> <p>Congress leader Hafiz Ahmed demands re-polling in Karimganj over vote discrepancies:</p> <p>Congress candidate Hafiz Rashid Ahmed Chowdhury has called for a re-poll in the Karimganj Lok Sabha constituency, citing significant vote discrepancies. Ahmed revealed that he has requested a re-poll and has already sent an email to the Election Commission of India.</p> <p>India Today – Congress leader Hafiz Ahmed demands re-polling in Karimganj over vote discrepancies (https://www.indiatodayne.in/assam/video/congress-leader-hafiz-ahmed-demands-re-polling-in-karimganj-over-vote-discrepancies-1024457-2024-06-09)</p> <p>The Telegraph online - https://www.telegraphindia.com/north-east/assam-congress-candidate-hafiz-rashid-ahmed-choudhury-seeks-repoll-in-karimganj-</p>

			<p>constituency/cid/2026031</p> <p>INC and CPI (M) Demanded repoll:</p> <p>Along with Congress, another opposition party CPI (M) also demanded an investigation and re polling in the entire Lok Sabha Constituency</p> <p>PTI – https://www.ptinews.com/story/national/discrepancy-detected-in-polled-counted-votes-in-assam-s-karimganj-oppn-seeks-repoll/1573362</p>
2.	Kokrajhar	Kampa Borgoyari (Bodoland Peoples Front) (BPF)	<p>Discrepancy in EVM votes polled and EVM votes counted:</p> <p>As per the final ECI voter turnout data, 12,40,306 votes (excluding postal ballots) were cast in Kokrajhar PC, but on the day of counting, only 12,29,546 EVM votes were counted. A deficit of 10,760 votes is reported.</p> <p>The Sentinel- https://www.sentinelassam.com/north-east-india-news/assam-news/akhil-gogoi-demands-re-poll-in-karimganj-and-kokrajhar-over-vote-discrepancies-calls-for-united-opposition-in-assam-panchayat-election</p>
Bihar			
3.	Saran	Rohini Acharya (RJD)	<p>The incident is prior to the counting of votes and relates to allegations of irregularity during voting.</p> <p>RJD candidate Acharya alleged that “Democracy is being murdered...FIR should be filed against BJP goons...As a candidate, we have the right to go to every booth... I had gone there to see the polling. BJP goons were sitting inside...I was abused...I was attacked with intent to kill...Who gave them this right...These people have resorted to hooliganism”.</p> <p>Times Now -https://www.timesnownews.com/elections/bihar-election-1-killed-in-post-poll-violence-in-saran-internet-services-suspended-article-110296380</p>
Chhattisgarh			
4.	Bilaspur	Devendra Yadav	<p>Congress candidate from Bilaspur PC, Devendra Yadav accused ECI of changing 611 EVMs midway as its identification numbers in mock poll and Form-17C are different.</p> <p>https://x.com/mr_mayank/status/1797313408112754698?s=08</p>
Maharashtra			
5.	Mumbai North West (Maharashtra)	Amol Kirtikar (Shiv Sena (UBT))	<p>Amol lost to Shiv Sena candidate (Shinde faction) candidate Ravindra Waiker by a minuscule margin of 48 votes. Both the candidates are stated to have exercised their right to seek re-counting of votes under Rule 63 of the Conduct of Elections Rules, 1961 but it was Postal Ballots (PB) which decided the result.</p> <p>Postal Votes:</p> <p>Amol Gajanan Kirtikar - 1501</p>

			<p>Ravindra Dattaram Waikar - 1550</p> <p>Facts:</p> <p>1) A total of 3,357 Postal Ballots (PB) were counted and 111 were rejected. Though Kirtikar was leading by 1 Vote on EVM count, he lost due to the lead of 49 PB votes in favour of Ravindra Waikar.</p> <p>2) Allegedly, continuous round-wise declaration of votes secured by each candidate was not announced by the RO as required under the electoral laws and Handbook issued by the ECI.</p> <p>3) It has been reported that round-wise announcement of votes was stopped after the 19th until 26th round.</p> <p>4) As per the Conduct of Election Rules, 1961, counting of votes should begin with postal ballot votes followed by counting of votes in EVMs after a 30 minutes gap once the process of counting of postal ballots has begun or completed. In the present case, the result of postal ballot votes was not immediately declared after the counting was over for postal ballots but it was declared only after the EVM votes were counted, which violates the said election rules.</p> <p>The Hindu - https://epaper.thehindu.com/ccidist-ws/th/th_delhi/issues/85673/OPS/G39CT0RB8.1+GSSCT0SDA.1.html</p>
7.	Satara	Shashikant Shinde (NCP) (SP)	<p>BJP's Chhatrapati Udayanraje won from Satara defeating NCP (SP)'s Shashikant Shinde by 32,771 votes. An independent candidate with the trumpet symbol (similar to the Tutari) won around 37,062 votes.</p> <p>Scroll - https://scroll.in/latest/1068903/maharashtra-similar-names-of-poll-symbols-led-to-defeat-in-satara-says-ncp-sp</p>
8.	Raver	Shriram Patil (NCP) (SP)	<p>Battery of EVMs stayed at 99%</p> <p>Raver Lok Sabha News: रक्षा खडसेंची मोठी आघाडी, मविआने मतमोजणी थांबवली, नेमका काय झाला गाेंधळ? (पाहा व्हिडिओ) https://saamtv.esakal.com/lok-sabha-election/shriram-patil-complaints-about-evm-machine-counting-of-voting-stopped-in-raver-lok-sabha-constituency-sml80</p>
Orissa			
9.	Jajpur	Sarmistha Sethi (BJD)	<p>Allegations of EVM change was reported by a local TV channel.</p> <p>Source: Tension In Dharmasala, Jajpur Over Allegations Of EVM Change Kanak News Shorts https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=pG7R3j_n0zk</p>
Rajasthan			
10.	Jaipur Rural (Rajasthan)	Anil Chopra (INC)	<p>Malpractice in Postal Ballot Paper Counting:</p> <p>INC candidate Anil Chopra alleged that the poll body rejected 2490 postal ballots votes without intimating reason in writing and in absence of the candidate and his counting agent, and declared BJP candidate winner by 1615 votes.</p>

			<p>Chopra alleged that the poll body did not add the ballot papers votes and neither did it inform the number postal papers votes he got. Anil Chopra and the party sent complaints to ECI in this regard. Sachin Pilot also demanded recounting of votes in the PC.</p> <p>The Print - Congress alleges irregularities in counting for Jaipur Rural seat – ThePrint – PTIFeed</p>
West Bengal			
	Balurghat (West Bengal)	Biplab Mitra (AITC)	<p>TMC Alleged rigging in counting of votes and its candidate Biplab Mitra said "I demanded a recount in every booth of Balurghat, Tapan and Gangarampur Assembly, asserting the need to check EVMs and VVPATs. The Election Commission agreed to recount votes in 10 booths only."</p> <p>Millennium post - https://www.millenniumpost.in/bengal/victory-margin-of-bjps-sukanta-majumdar-declines-566779</p>
Uttar Pradesh			
11.	Aligarh	Bijendra Singh (SP)	<p>SP Candidate Vijendra Singh from Aligarh PC alleged that ADM City deliberately did malpractice during counting. He added that ADM city stayed till late night at the ARO table.</p> <p>He further claimed that from 23rd to 27th round ADM city deliberately did wrong feeding in EVM.</p> <p>Jamiatimes.in - https://www.instagram.com/reel/C7zZaioPvK-/?igsh=MXUybHI3N3JudGVldw==</p>
12.	Fathehpur Sikri	Ramnath Singh Sikarwar (INC)	<p>Supporters of INC candidate Ramnath Singh Sikarwar from Fatehpur Sikri seat created a ruckus outside the counting centre and alleged rigging in the counting of votes.</p> <p>They alleged that till the 19th round of counting, Sikarwar was leading in the seat, but some of his election agents were removed after the 20th round.</p> <p>Additionally, Sikarwar also alleged that some machines were not working and in one of the polling stations his counting agent alleged that around 800 votes were cast in the polling station but the EVM was only showing 200 votes.</p>
13.	Farrukhabad		<p>SP Chief Akhilesh Yadav wrote on X that all SP workers and SP candidate of Farrukhabad should stay firm regarding the rigging done by the District Magistrate in the counting of votes. The ECI has to take immediate cognizance of our appeal.</p> <p>Source: UP Lok Sabha Election Result 2024 Akhilesh Yadav allegations on administration Farrukhabad Seat UP Lok Sabha Election Result 2024 Akhilesh Yadav allegations on administration Farrukhabad Seat फर्रुखाबाद में मतगणना के बीच अखिलेश यादव ने प्रशासन पर लगाए गंभीर आरोप, जानें पूरा मामला (abplive.com)</p> <p>Allegations were raised that candidates were not involved in the counting of the ballot paper.</p>

			<p>One men casted vote 8 times to BJP in Farrukhabad</p> <p>Source: Farrukhabad Viral Video: फरुखाबाद में एक युवक ने 8 बार Vote डाला?, वीडियो वायरल</p> <p>There was uproar at the counting site in Farrukhabad due to allegations of rigging and the police released tear gas shells</p> <p>Source: Sp's Demonstration And Stone Pelting, Police Lathicharged And Released Tear Gas Shells - Farrukhabad News - Farrukhabad News:सपाइयों का प्रदर्शन व पथराव, पुलिस ने लाठीचार्ज कर छोड़े आंसू गैस के गोले CITY NEWS: फरुखाबाद में मतगणना स्थल पर हंगामा, पुलिस ने छोड़े आंसू गैस के गोले https://youtu.be/EZOQz3wTTO0?si=Lu0cXlxZDc0PuEVW</p>
14.	Phulpur	Amar Nath Singh Maurya (SP)	<p>Allegations were raised against UP Police against their violent and threatening behaviour. Reportedly, even the BLOs were bullied into forcibly being removed from booths in police vans, which resulted in voter suppression.</p> <p>Another irregularity was reported in UP by the local police as the legally unknown RED CARDS were issued by them against SP workers as an indirect means to warn and threaten them into coercion. Only after the delegation led by Abhishek Manu Singhvi went to the ECI, CEC and other Commissioners agreed and admitted that this was irregular and must be stopped.</p> <p>Source: https://thewire.in/politics/uttar-pradesh-samajwadi-party-bjp-red-card</p> <p>गुंडा एक्ट वाले 2100 लोगों को पुलिस का रेड कार्ड: लोकसभा चुनाव के मद्देनजर प्रयागराज कमिश्नरट पुलिस की बड़ी कार्रवाई - Prayagraj (Allahabad) News Dainik Bhaskar https://www.bhaskar.com/local/uttar-pradesh/prayagraj/news/prayagraj-2100-people-under-the-goonda-act-get-police-red-card-132960261.html</p>
15.	Bansgaon	Sadal Prasad (INC)	<p>In Bansgaon Parliamentary Constituency, in the 32nd round, BJP's candidate Kamlesh Paswan got 4,24,127 lakh votes and Congress's Sadal Prasad got 4,18,814 votes. The INC candidate alleged that in the 33rd round, BJP was declared to have 422090 votes and congress got 417685 votes. Congress objected to this and further alleged that votes of one booth each in Barhaj and Bansgaon were not counted and the final announcement was made by the Commission.</p> <p>Source: Congress Candidate Sadal Prasad In Bansgaon Lok Sabha Started Protesting By Demanding Recounting - Amar Ujala Hindi News Live - Ls Polls बांसगांव लोकसभा के मतदान में धांधली का आरोप, भाजपा-सपा का प्रदर्शन; सदल प्रसाद ने दी आत्मदाह की धमकी https://www.amarujala.com/photo-gallery/gorakhpur/congress-candidate-sadal-prasad-in-bansgaon-lok-sabha-started-protesting-by-demanding-recounting-2024-06-04</p>
Tamil Nadu			
16.	Madurai	P Saravanan (AIADMK)	<p>AIADMK candidate P Saravanan alleged malpractice in the counting of postal votes. He alleged that numerous postal vote covers were found open before the counting of votes, suggesting possible tampering and irregularities. Saravanan further said that two covers given to the postal voters were not properly kept, and many have not correctly indicated which finger was used for the fingerprint. His complaint to RO regarding the issue was allegedly neglected.</p>

			<p>Times of India - AIADMK alleges malpractice Madurai News - Times of India https://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/city/madurai/aiadmk-alleges-malpractice/articleshow/110716173.cms</p>
Tripura			
18.	Tripura West	Ashish Kumar Saha (INC)	<p>Opposition Congress and CPI(M) alleged gross violation of the electoral process during the Lok Sabha Election 2024 in Tripura and said that their polling agents were prevented from entering booths in many places. Furthermore, both the parties accused administrative machinery of preventing electors from reaching the polling booths to freely exercise their franchise.</p> <p>Indian Express - BJP's stellar win in Tripura: Major takeaways, possible reasons Political Pulse News - The Indian Express https://indianexpress.com/article/political-pulse/bjps-stellar-win-in-tripura-major-takeaways-possible-reasons-9372459/</p>

