130th Constitutional Amendment Bill – Removal of PM, CM & Ministers

1. Background / Context

- Union government introduced the 130th Constitutional Amendment Bill.
- Aim: To remove a Minister (including PM/CM) from office if arrested and detained for **30 days** in connection with a criminal offence.

2. Provisions of the Bill

- Amends Articles 75 & 164 (Union & State Council of Ministers).
- A Minister who is:
 - Arrested & detained for 30 consecutive days for an offence punishable with ≥ 5 years imprisonment,
 - Shall be removed from office.

Process:

- Removal based on advice of PM/CM.
- o If PM/CM does not advise → automatic removal on **31st day**.
- o If **PM/CM themselves arrested** → must resign on 31st day.
- Reappointment: Possible after release from custody.
- Also amends Article 239AA for NCT of Delhi.
- Similar changes proposed for Jammu & Kashmir & Puducherry.
- Needs two-thirds majority in both Houses.
- Referred to Joint Parliamentary Committee (JPC).

3. Existing Legal Framework

- Representation of People Act (1951):
 - Conviction with ≥ 2 years jail → disqualification from being MP/MLA for sentence period + 6 years after.
 - Earlier exemption under Sec. 8(4) if appeal pending → struck down in Lily Thomas (2013).
- Currently:
 - Disqualification only for being MP/MLA.

- No provision for disqualification as Minister.
- 2016 EC recommendation: Amend RP Act to bar candidates if charges are framed for offences punishable with ≥ 5 years imprisonment.

4. Issues with the Bill

- 1. **Police overreach**: Ministers can lose post merely on arrest (before trial).
- 2. **Undermines Parliamentary democracy**: PM/CM loses freedom to choose cabinet.
- 3. **Scope for political misuse**: Centre may misuse against Opposition-ruled States.

5. Way Forward

- Criminalisation of politics is a serious malaise.
- But Bill addresses effect not cause.
- ADR Report:
 - 46% MPs & 45% MLAs face criminal cases.
 - o Winning chances: 15.4% (criminal background) vs 4.4% (clean).
- Reform approach:
 - Political parties should deny tickets to candidates with serious criminal cases
 - o Self-regulation to reduce dependence on "winnable" tainted candidates.

