

## EC's Disqualification of AAP MLAs

### Why in news?

\n\n

Election Commission (EC) has recommended to the President that 20 of Aam Aadmi Party's (AAP) MLAs be disqualified for holding offices of profit.

\n\n

### How did the issue evolve?

\n\n

\n

- The Arvind Kejriwal-led Delhi government passed an order back in 2015, **appointing** 21 MLAs as parliamentary secretaries.

\n

- The appointment of MLAs was **challenged** by an advocate arguing that these MLAs were holding 'office of profit'.

\n

- There was also a petition before the then President seeking their disqualification.

\n

- In response, the Delhi Assembly passed the Delhi Member of Legislative Assembly (Removal of Disqualification) (Amendment **Bill**), 2015.

\n

- The bill excluded the parliamentary secretaries from 'Office of Profit' with retrospective effect.

\n

- However, **President declined assent** to the Bill.

\n

- Later on, the Election Commission (EC) held a **personal hearing** for 21 AAP MLAs.

\n

- Subsequently, the Delhi High Court set aside a government order that appointed 21 of the party's MLAs as parliamentary secretaries.

\n

- Very recently, the Election Commission has recommended the President for **disqualification** of the 20 AAP MLAs (one resigned).

\n

\n\n

## Who is a Parliamentary Secretary?

\n\n

- \n
  - A Parliamentary Secretary often holds the rank of Minister of State and has the same entitlements.
- \n
  - He/she is appointed to assist the ministers and is assigned to a government department.
- \n
  - Many states in the Indian Union have instituted the post of Parliamentary Secretary and have also appointed MLAs to the post.

\n\n

## What is an 'Office of Profit'?

\n\n

- \n
  - 'Office of profit' (OoP) is not clearly defined in the Constitution.
- \n
  - But deriving from the past judicial pronouncements, five tests have been laid down to check if an office is an OoP or not.
- \n
  - They are:

\n\n

- \n
  - i. whether the government makes the appointment
- \n
  - ii. whether the government has the right to remove or dismiss the holder
- \n
  - iii. whether the government pays remuneration
- \n
  - iv. what the functions of the holder are
- \n
  - v. does the government exercise any control over the performance of these functions

\n\n

\n

- In all, the word 'profit' has always been treated equivalent to or a substitute for the term 'pecuniary gain' (financial gain).

\n

\n\n

## What are the legal concerns?

\n\n

\n

- **Office of Profit** - MPs and MLAs are supposed to hold the government accountable for its work.

\n

- Logically, holding an "Office of Profit" under the government may make them susceptible to government influence.

\n

- They may fall short of discharging their constitutional mandate.

\n

- **Number of members** - Article 164(1A) specifies that the number of ministers including the Chief Minister has to be within 15% of the total strength of the Assembly.

\n

- In the case of Delhi, which is not a 'full' state, the number of Cabinet Ministers cannot exceed 10% of the total 70 seats.

\n

- This is as per Article 239AA of Constitution which deals with Special provisions with respect to Delhi.

\n

- As a Parliament Secretary often holds the rank of Minister of State, their numbers should also be considered in meeting this limitation.

\n

- On violation of this, various High Courts have earlier struck down the appointment of Parliamentary Secretaries as unconstitutional.

\n

\n\n

## What next?

\n\n

\n

- The constitutional procedure is that if there is any petition pertaining to an office of profit, it goes to the President.

\n

- She/he checks Article 102 and 191 of the constitution and Section 15 of the National Capital Territory of Delhi Act 1991 and takes the EC's opinion.

\n

- After the presidential sign and seal is placed on the EC's recommendation, the 20 MLAs will stand disqualified.

\n

- Notably, the remedial measures for the AAP in court are limited.

\n

- This is because the Delhi High Court has already heard the matter and quashed the appointments.

\n

- Moreover, the Election Commission, mandated by the Constitution to deal with such matters, has already dealt the issue at length.

## What the law says

**Article 102 (1)(a)** says a person shall be disqualified from being a member of either House of Parliament if he holds any office of profit, among other grounds

**Article 103** says if a question arises whether a member has incurred such disqualification, it will be referred to the President's decision. The President shall obtain the Election Commission's opinion and act accordingly



**Article 191(1)** contains a similar provision for MLAs and MLCs in the States. Legislators in Delhi are covered by corresponding provisions in the Government of National Capital Territory Act, 1991

\n

\n\n

\n\n

**Source: The Hindu, The Wire**

\n



**SHANKAR**  
**IAS PARLIAMENT**  
*Information is Empowering*