The Idea of One Nation-One Election: Its Potential Risk and Significance for India

ZHEER AHMED

REVA University

SAMUEL JACOB KURUVILLA

Dr. Vishwanath Karad MIT-World Peace University

The synchronization of elections for the House of the People (Lok Sabha) and State Legislative Assemblies has been a subject of extensive debate in India. Simultaneous elections refer to the coordinated conduct of elections for the three tiers of government; Lok Sabha, State Assemblies, and local bodies, allowing voters to cast their ballots for all levels of government concurrently. This idea of One Nation-One Election is proposed to enhance administrative efficiency, reduce election-related costs, and minimize disruptions to governance. The idea of simultaneous election requires an institutional framework, including oversight by the Election Commission, to ensure smooth electoral processes for the President and Vice President, Rajya Sabha, Lok Sabha, State Assemblies, District Assemblies, and Panchayats. Recognizing the complexities involved, the Union Government has constituted an eight-member high-level committee, chaired by former President Ram Nath Kovind, to examine the feasibility and implications of synchronized elections.

This study explores key research questions, including the constitutional and legal challenges of the One Nation-One Election, its impact on federalism, political stability, and governance, and the logistical hurdles in conducting nationwide synchronized elections. Employing a qualitative research methodology, the article includes legal and constitutional analyses, case studies, and insights from experts. Furthermore, historical election trends and public perceptions as captured in surveys and opinion polls, are evaluated. This study contributes to ongoing policy discussions regarding electoral reforms in India, highlighting the advantages and challenges of a well-structured and legally sound approach to implementing the One Nation-One Election in India.

***Key Words*:** Democracy, Constitution, Governance, Electoral Reform, Federalism,

India's democratic system is characterized by frequent elections at multiple levels, including the Lok Sabha, State Assemblies, and local bodies. While elections form the backbone of democracy, the recurring electoral cycle has raised concerns regarding its impact on governance, policymaking, and financial expenditure. In response to these challenges, the concept of 'One Nation-One Election' (ONOE) was introduced by Prime Minister Narendra Modi upon assuming office in 2014. The idea aims to

synchronize elections for the Lok Sabha and all State Legislative Assemblies, ensuring a streamlined electoral process and reducing the financial and administrative burden on governments and political parties.

The proposal for simultaneous elections is not a new phenomenon in India. After independence, elections were conducted concurrently in 1952, 1957, 1962, and 1967 (Panda 2016). However, due to political instability, mid-term elections were necessitated in states like Kerala and Odisha in the early 1960s, leading to disruptions in the cycle. The premature dissolution of the Fourth Lok Sabha and various State Assemblies further aggravated the situation, resulting in staggered electoral timelines across the country. Over the years, the frequent dissolution of legislative bodies, coupled with the application of Articles 356 and 352, led to an inconsistent electoral framework that India continues to grapple with till today ((Debroy & Desai, 2017).

The discontinuation of the simultaneous election cycle occurred following the premature dissolution of the Fourth Lok Sabha. Pursuant to Article 352 of the Indian Constitution, the tenure of the Fifth Lok Sabha was extended until 1977. Subsequently, the Eighth, Tenth, Fourteenth, and Fifteenth Lok Sabhas were able to complete their full five-year terms. Conversely, the Sixth, Seventh, Ninth, Eleventh, Twelfth, and Thirteenth Lok Sabhas were dissolved prior to the completion of their designated tenure. Similar disruptions were also observed in various State Assemblies over time. The cumulative impact of these premature dissolutions and tenure extensions has significantly disrupted the continuity of simultaneous elections in India (Debroy & Desai, 2017).

The Modi-led NDA government has emphasized the necessity of addressing the issue of frequent elections, which not only strain financial resources, but also divert administrative attention from developmental activities. The concept of 'ONOE' aligns with the government's broader vision of national integration, as seen in initiatives like 'One Nation, One Tax' under the Goods and Services Tax (GST) and 'One Nation, One Curriculum' under the New Education Policy. By implementing synchronized elections, the government aims to enhance governance efficiency, reduce policy paralysis, and ensure uninterrupted developmental initiatives (Uikey et al., 2017).

In recent years, the idea has gained traction and has been extensively discussed at various forums, including the Karnataka Legislative Assembly and Legislative Council. However, it remains a subject of intense debate, with proponents highlighting its potential benefits, such as cost reduction and improved administrative efficiency, while critics argue that it may undermine the federal structure of India's democracy. Given India's constitutional provisions and diverse political landscape, the feasibility of implementing simultaneous elections requires careful examination.

This article explores the significance of 'ONOE' by analyzing its potential advantages and risks. While the concept promises efficiency and economic benefits, it also raises concerns regarding federalism, regional representation, and constitutional amendments. Understanding these dimensions is crucial for assessing whether this electoral reform can serve as a viable solution for India's democratic framework.

The Idea of One Nation-One Election in India

India conducts competitive elections based on universal suffrage, wherein multiple political parties participate. The present-day competitive electoral process is commonly referred to as the third wave in the evolutionary progression of electoral

practices (Huntington 1991). Elections are a key element of sovereign nations, serving as an essential component within the political framework of democratic administration. India is widely acknowledged as the largest democracy in the world. It is known that the functioning of democracy relies heavily on the fundamental belief that elections must be conducted in a manner that ensures their integrity, devoid of any external influence or manipulation. The fundamental right of every citizen is to have elections that are both free and fair. In this context, the fundamental framework of the Constitution encompasses the concept of free and fair elections, which inherently guarantees the freedom of an individual to use their voting rights without any apprehension of retaliation, compulsion, or undue influence (People's Union for Civil Liberties [PUCL] 2003).

Simultaneous polling refers to the practice of conducting parliamentary elections and legislative assembly elections concurrently. Presently, elections are conducted upon the completion of a five-year tenure or in the event that the ruling party loses the confidence of the legislative body. The Lok Sabha elections, which occur at the national level, are held every five years. In the same vein, the occurrence of a Vidhan Sabha election in a State is contingent upon the duration of its tenure or the level of confidence within the legislative assembly and follows a cyclical pattern. The current Indian government strongly supports the implementation of simultaneous polling as a model and aims to change the existing election model by adopting this approach (Press Trust of India [PTI] 2019). The implementation of this paradigm necessitates the reorganization of the Indian election cycle to achieve synchronization between elections at the central and state levels. The electorate would face the challenge of simultaneously casting dual votes, one for the central government and another for the state government (Keerthana 2019).

Simultaneous elections have been previously attempted by the Indian government on many occasions. In 1951-1952, India had its inaugural concurrent elections for the State Assembly and Lok Sabha, marking a significant milestone in the country's political landscape following its independence. Until the year 1967, it was considered the prevailing norm. Subsequently, concerns regarding the election system arose concomitantly with the dissolution of multiple legislative assemblies in the years 1968 and 1969. In reality, the dissolution of the Lok Sabha took place in 1970. Consequently, the elections for both the Lok Sabha and State Assemblies commence at distinct time intervals.

The annual report for 1983 by the Election Commission recommended a return to the practice of concurrent voting. The Law Committee also made a similar point in its report of 1999. The issue has been the focal point of countless scholarly debates and deliberations in past as well. The Bhartiya Janata Party's electoral agenda for the 2014 Lok Sabha election advocated for the implementation of simultaneous elections as a political framework. In 2016, the Indian Prime Minister, Narendra Modi, reiterated the potential of reintroducing this concept to the Indian nation and its political landscape. However, a definitive determination regarding the simultaneous scheduling of the polls has not been reached at this time (Desai: 2017).

The Constitutional Legality of One-Nation One-Election

Advocates of the 'ONOE' put forth a variety of justifications to support their idea for the implementation of a unified electoral framework. It is necessary to ascertain

whether a system of simultaneous voting is within the constitutional framework and if it has any implications for the fundamental and federal structure of the Constitution. According to the ruling rendered by the constitutional court in the case of *Keshavananda Bharti v. State of Kerala (Bharti 1973)*, it was determined that any alteration which impacts the fundamental framework of the constitution should be deemed null and unconstitutional. The principle of federalism was affirmed as a fundamental framework in the *Keshavananda Bharti v. State of Kerala (Bharti 1973)* case and subsequently reaffirmed in the *SR Bommai v. Union of India (Bommai 1994)* case. Consequently, any legislation or change that impacts the structure of federalism will be invalidated by the judiciary.

The implementation of the 'ONOE' doctrine is contingent upon obtaining consent from all political parties. However, the realization of simultaneous elections necessitates certain constitutional reforms. These proposed changes would pertain to the modification of Article 83, which specifically addresses the duration of both of Houses of Parliament. Also, it was proposed to amend Article 85 of the Constitution, which pertains to the dissolution of the Lok Sabha by the President. It is also necessary to amend Article 172 of the Constitution, which concerns the duration of State legislatures. There is also a requirement to amend Article 174 of the Constitution, which addresses the dissolution of State assemblies. To implement the idea of 'ONOE' it is also deemed necessary to amend Article 356 of the Constitution, which deals with the imposition of the President's rule in a State and amendments to the Representation of the People Act of 1951.

One of the primary challenges associated with the implementation of simultaneous elections pertains to the potential extension or reduction of the tenure served by the political parties represented in the legislative assembly. The duration of the State Assemblies and the House of the People is determined by the provisions outlined in Articles 83(2) and 172(1) of the Indian Constitution. According to the provisions outlined in the Articles, the duration of service for elected parties is set at a period of 5 years, unless the State Governors and the President decide to dissolve it prior to the completion of this term. The Lok Sabha has recently observed the presentation of a Private Member Bill proposing revisions to Articles 356, 83, and 172 of the Constitution. In a similar vein, another Bill proposing a constitutional amendment was presented in the Council of States with the aim of deliberating upon and comprehending the viability of conducting simultaneous elections. The Bill emphasized the necessity of modifying Articles 83 and 172 of the Constitution of India (Debroy & Desai: 2017).

These changes may play a crucial role in achieving synchronization of elections between the House of the People and State Legislative Assemblies. While the Constitution does provide for the possibility of voluntarily shortening the tenure, as shown in the phrase 'unless sooner dissolved', any extension of the period can only be implemented through a constitutional amendment. Furthermore, it should be noted that the Constitution does not provide any provision for the extension of the term of State Assemblies.

Article 356 pertains to the imposition of the President's rule in a State and is invoked when the constitutional apparatus encounters a breakdown in the State. However, the current system cannot serve as a viable means for achieving the synchronization of elections and would necessitate modifications to Article 172 of

the Constitution. In a similar vein, it is possible to introduce a new provision into the Article, which would allow for the implementation of the appropriate extension or curtailment of the State Legislative Assemblies, therefore synchronizing elections.

'Cost' Logic for One-Nation One-Election

One of the prevailing arguments in support of the concept of conducting concurrent elections is its potential to yield cost reduction, benefiting both the government's financial resources and political parties. According to the 'Electoral Statistics Pocket Book 2015' (Election Commission of India [ECI] 2015), the Government of India expended approximately INR 3870 crores alone for the purpose of conducting the 2014 Lok Sabha elections. According to newspaper reports, the Government expended over INR 300 crores alone for the purpose of organizing elections for the Bihar Assembly in 2015 (Salomi: 2015). This substantial expenditure highlights the significant allocation of financial resources towards the execution of electoral processes. To gain a comprehensive understanding of the potential for reducing expenditure, it is necessary to refer to the 'Report of the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Personnel, Public Grievances, Law and Justice'. This report highlights that the Election Commission of India (ECI) would incur an expenditure of Rs. 4500 crores, if Lok Sabha and State Assembly elections were conducted concurrently (Parliament of India: 2015). However, alternative approaches could potentially money savings in this regard.

However, looking at the cost logic of to conduct simultaneous election in India, State election expenses are estimated to range from Rs 1 crore per MLA (as reported in the latest Karnataka polls) to around Rs 5,500 crore for all states combined every five years. Even while this is a substantial sum of money (even for the exercise of voting rights in a constitutional democracy), it is insignificant when compared to the combined budgets of all states during a five-year period (Thiagra: 2023). For example, Tamil Nadu has 234 elected member of legislative assembly. The election for such number of seats may cost of about 250 crores on high side ratio as the cost of running assembly elections every five years. A comparative study of cost of election and the MLA Constituency Development Fund, which is 2.50 crore per MLA per year or a total of 2,925 crores (0.23% of the budget), revealed that once in five years Assembly Election costs is under 0.2% of the total money to be spent through the State's budget approved by the elected MLAs as required by the Indian Constitution. This cost is about 8% of all MLAs Constituency Development Fund over the same five-year period (Thiagra: 2023).

To disaggregate the cost components of the election process, this is not clear that the simultaneous elections will lead to noticeable cost cutting in the elections. The Election Commission has microscopically few full-time employees and relies massively on both ex-officio (for example, Collector is the Electoral Officer for the District) and a co-opted workforce (Local Body employees are assigned additional duties for voter list maintenance and polling) (Thiagra: 2023). The costs of procuring and handling twice the number of EVMs on one day will not be much lower than handing half the machines on two different days, though the latter is likely to be more efficient and reliable. So, when comparing both fixed and variable costs of the actual election process, the prospects for cutting costs by moving to simultaneous elections seem poor (Thiagra: 2023).

Nevertheless, it is crucial to acknowledge that in the case of India, there is a significant aspect to be taken into account that whether the concern is solely in the financial implications or the primary focus is on the successful and proficient execution of democratic ideals. It is imperative to acknowledge that while expenditure is a pertinent factor in deliberating on the matter, it should not be excessively emphasized to the extent that it jeopardizes the enforcement of fundamental democratic norms.

The Ideology of One-Nation One Election

Historically, the development of civilization is based on the community coming together and formed a political community. This later pave the way for the formation of different political parties. One final action that individuals can undertake on this planet in this regard is to mitigate the engagement of political parties in the pursuit of populist policies aimed at attracting voters. This methodology is adopted by every participant in the field, rather than being exclusive to a single party. Based on this notion, in the case of India, the political party in power at the national level would possess far greater resources and authority in comparison to parties confined to a single state or a few states. This confers a superior status onto the ruling party at the political Centre in relation to all other political parties. This facilitates the governing party at the central level to implement policies that can enhance their electoral support in specific regions. The political party in power has the ability to exert influence and undermine the significance of indigenous and state-level concerns across many areas of development and progress. Consequently, this enables national issues to encroach upon and overshadow local and state-level matters. However, it is important to note that the development in question cannot be solely linked to a certain entity, as it has been observed over time that central governments with majority control employ many tactics to sway a greater number of voters or shape public sentiment in support of their governance.

According to a study published by the IDFC institute, it is noted that, on average, there exists a 77 percent probability that the Indian electorate will cast their vote for the same political party in both the State and Centre, when elections are conducted concurrently (Chakravarty: 2016). This indicates that winners from the same party as the Parliamentary constituency were elected in around 77% of the total Assembly constituencies. This phenomenon inevitably results in a scenario wherein larger national political parties will gain an unfair edge, hence diminishing the significance of regional parties that play a crucial role in India's participatory democracy. Hence, the concept of concurrent elections has the potential to undermine the fundamental principles of Indian democracy, namely the conduct of impartial and fair elections, resulting in an unjust skewing of political preferences towards specific parties.

This action lacks justification and poses a threat to the fundamental principles of our democratic system, as it would grant supremacy to political parties only based on their national presence, rather than their demonstrated performance or commitment to the welfare and prosperity of the populace. The assertion that voters possess sufficient knowledge and discernment to mitigate biases is not substantiated in the context of this matter. It is imperative that no room for doubt regarding the impartiality of elections exists, as any such uncertainty could confer undue advantages to one political party at the expense of another. This also might compromise the fundamental principles of democratic elections, namely the

establishment of a free and equitable electoral process.

Further, the idea of 'ONOE' has been criticized as deeply flawed idea. It is argued that in the current multi-party system prevalent throughout the country, the implementation of such an approach is seen as impractical and inadvisable (Mishra: 2023). The extensive diversity present in India has resulted in the emergence of multiple political parties at the state level, each representing the distinct interests and characteristics of their separate regions (Engelsen and Heiersted: 2016). The resolution of this circumstance cannot be achieved through the imposition of a predetermined duration for the legislative body or a predetermined schedule for elections. The duration of the Lok Sabha's tenure is independent of that of the Vidhan Sabha, as it is primarily influenced by the dynamics of electoral politics at the state level. The presence of divergence in electoral cycles is evidently expected in this scenario. Simultaneous elections aim to address this issue by replacing the decentralized political structure with a centralized unitary one, wherein all states are required to adhere to a common election schedule. The proposed measure is expected to expedite the standardization of electoral processes, highlighting a profound lack of confidence in the diversity and multiplicity of the Indian political system and culture. The potential outcome of this situation may result in the limitation of the paramount democratic freedom, namely the act of voting (Hasan: 2023). Therefore, the concept of 'ONOE' is inherently contradictory to democratic principles, constituting a direct challenge to the very essence of democracy. This poses a potential threat to both diversity and democracy in India (Hasan: 2023).

Challenges of the Idea of One Nation, One Election

The idea of 'ONOE' has been supported by the ruling NDA government. The High Level Committee headed by former President, Ramnath Kovind has justified the conduction of simultaneous election. The judicial fraternity has raised a mixed response. A few of High Court judges supported the ideas, whereas others raised concerns and legal and political challenges that 'ONOE' might face. It is a great challenge to conduct the simultaneous election for all Lok Sabha, Legislative Assembly and polls for local bodies within the span of 100 days, looking at the time that took by the 2024 Lok Sabha polls.

Other aspects raise the questions of the constitutionality of the simultaneous elections. The constitution experts argued that it was evident from the constitutional makers that envisaged simultaneous elections only for Lok Sabha and State Legislative Assemblies. There was no reference of simultaneous election for the local bodies (Kashyap: 2023). The problem of hung assembly is quite in practice since late 1980s in Indian politics. The alliance government has become a rather a fact, except last two terms in Indian politics. The simultaneous election provides no provisions to solve the problem of hung assembly. Though the option of fresh election in case of hung assembly has been proposed by the High Level Committee. However, this argument contradicts the cost logic argument in favor of simultaneous election.

The Basic Structure of the Constitution is the cornerstone of independent judiciary in India. Article 83 and 172 of the Indian Constitution provide that the term for the Assembly and Lok Sabha shall be for five years and no longer (The Constitution of India). However, it was not fixed for five years or minimum to five years as Article

368 allows Parliament to amend the Constitution (The Constitution of India). Looking at the current scenario, State Legislative Assemblies will need to be prematurely dissolved in order to implement simultaneous polling. Changes to the fixed terms of Parliament and State Legislative Assemblies are argued to contravene the fundamental framework of the Constitution, which stipulates that the lifespan of each body will be for five years unless dissolved sooner (Aakriti: 2024). Implementation of simultaneous election has serious legal implications, this needs to be amended the Constitution and Represent of People's Act, 1951. The amendments are required for altering the fixed terms of assemblies. In light of this, the Committee suggested adding Article 324A to allow for concurrent elections in Panchayats and Municipalities with the State Legislative Assemblies and the House of People's general elections and amending Article 325 of Indian Constitution in order to enable the Single Electoral Roll and Single Elector's Photo Identity Card (High Level Committee on Simultaneous Elections: 2024).

Ratification by the States will be necessary under Article 368(2) of the Indian Constitution because these revisions affect State subjects (Entry 5) of Schedule VII, Part IX, and Part IX (A) (The Constitution of India). But the State's ratification is not required in order to carry out step one, which is holding concurrent elections for the House of the People and State Legislative Assemblies. It further stated that in order to change Article 83 (Duration of Houses of Parliament) and Article 172 (Duration of State Legislatures), a Constitution Amendment Bill must be introduced in Parliament (The Constitution of India). The States will not need to ratify this constitutional amendment. This again invite legal battle from the legislative assemblies, which are not in favour for simultaneous elections.

In this light, former Chief Justice of Delhi High Court raised concerns about distorted voting patterns and State level political alterations. He claimed that "fixed terms offer representatives unwarranted stability without performance scrutiny, challenging democratic principles. Parties are afraid that when elections are approaching, they would cease their year-round effort and concentrate primarily on developmental projects (Press Trust of India [PTI] 2024). Some of the experts claimed that simultaneous elections are against the regional and smaller parties. They argued that it would prevent or eclipse local problems and elevate national ones. Yet, when regional parties effectively highlight local concerns to the electorate, voters would not be swayed by only national issues in the event simultaneous elections are held (Aakriti: 2024). This also creates a trust deficit in the society at different levels. Subhash Kashyap wrote under the heading 'Constitutional Foundations of ONOE' that people believe they only become important when elections are approaching. Businessmen and industrialists believe that elections are the time to accomplish things, such as obtaining contracts, penalties, and approvals, in exchange for a fee from candidates and political parties in power (Aakriti: 2024). People are interested in getting their things done promptly and do not mind paying for it the money that the parties and candidates need for fighting electoral battles. For that the remedy is to be formed in other systemic reforms in the electoral process and political parties (Aakriti 2024).

Arguments in Support of One Nation-One Election

The ONOE in India seeks to synchronize parliamentary and state assembly elections, thereby addressing numerous governance and administrative challenges.

Frequent elections often divert the focus of governments from policy implementation to continuous campaigning, whereby hampering effective governance. By conducting elections simultaneously, elected representatives can devote their attention to governance without the recurring distraction of electioneering, ensuring policy continuity and administrative efficiency (Ministry of Law and Justice (GOI): 2024).

The financial burden of conducting elections repeatedly has escalated significantly over the years. The expenditure incurred in India's first general elections in 1951-52 amounted to approximately Rs 11 crore, whereas the estimated cost of the 2019 elections was around Rs 60,000 crore (Sunitha Natti: 2024). A synchronized electoral process would significantly reduce these expenditures, allowing funds to be reallocated towards more productive sectors such as education and healthcare. By minimizing the frequency of election campaigns, ONOE has the potential to curtail the need for extensive financial resources, in doing so, reducing opportunities for unethical financial practices in political financing. Furthermore, a unified electoral process could simplify voter registration and mitigate issues related to the exclusion of eligible voters from electoral rolls. This streamlining of electoral procedures would ensure greater electoral participation and efficiency (Government of Karnataka: 2023).

A reduction in the frequency of elections could also lead to more stable financial management at the state level. The pressure to introduce populist measures, such as subsidies and freebies, as a means to garner electoral support may diminish, enabling policymakers to focus on long-term economic strategies rather than short-term electoral incentives. The synchronization of elections across the nation would also contribute to administrative efficiency. Rather than expending resources on multiple electoral cycles, election commissions and state agencies could concentrate their efforts on a singular, well-coordinated event. This would prevent the dilution of administrative capacities and ensure more effective management of the electoral process.

Voter turnout is likely to increase in a simultaneous election scenario, as electors would be more inclined to participate in a consolidated voting process rather than engaging in multiple voting instances over time. Higher voter engagement could foster a more representative electoral outcome, enhancing democratic legitimacy. The persistent electoral cycle often results in a lack of continuity in governance, as officials prioritize campaigning over policymaking. The implementation of ONOE would provide elected representatives with an uninterrupted tenure, allowing them to focus on legislative and developmental initiatives without frequent electoral disruptions (Debroy and Desai: 2017).

Simultaneous elections could also mitigate the influence of vote-bank politics, as parties would be less inclined to engage in short-term populist strategies and would instead prioritize substantive policymaking. The alignment of electoral cycles at national and state levels would facilitate a more coherent political landscape, fostering greater coordination between state and central governments. This alignment could enable a more structured approach to governance, wherein national objectives and state-specific concerns are addressed in a harmonized manner.

Conclusion

The concept of 'ONOE' presents a significant transformation in India's democratic

framework, carrying both promising advantages and potential risks. The Indian Constitution has meticulously designed a federal structure that disperses power across multiple tiers of governance, ensuring that no single authority monopolizes political power. The introduction of simultaneous elections for the Lok Sabha, Rajya Sabha, State Legislatures, Municipal Corporations, and Panchayats could bring about administrative efficiency, reduce election-related expenses, and enhance governance continuity. However, it simultaneously raises concerns regarding the dilution of federalism and the concentration of authority in a centralized mechanism.

India's political culture is inherently diverse, marked by the coexistence of various regional and linguistic identities that influence electoral dynamics. The implementation of 'ONOE' might initially suppress these sub-national identities, leading to an electoral landscape, where national concerns overshadow regional issues. While the idea promotes stability and a unified national approach to governance, it also risks undermining the political autonomy of states by aligning their electoral cycles with national elections. This synchronization could potentially marginalize state-specific issues in favour of broader national narratives, impacting the democratic representation of regional interests. Moreover, the constitutional and legal challenges associated with the execution of ONOE are significant, particularly amendments of Articles 83, 85, 172, 174, and 356, which govern the tenure and dissolution of legislatures.

Despite the challenges, the ONOE has the potential to enhance governance by reducing the frequency of the Model Code of Conduct (MCC) restrictions, which often hinder policy implementation. It could improve voter participation by simplifying the electoral process and reducing voter fatigue. The financial burden of conducting frequent elections, which diverts significant resources from developmental activities, would also be alleviated. However, the success of 'ONOE' hinges on the commitment of political parties and stakeholders to prioritize national interest over short-term political gains. It requires strong political will, collaborative decision-making, and public consensus to ensure that the transition does not compromise democratic integrity. The effectiveness of ONOE depends on the establishment of an inclusive and transparent framework that accommodates India's diverse political and social landscape.

References

Akriti, A. (2024, March 16). Is One Nation One Election 'Unconstitutional'? *Mint*. https://www.livemint.com/news/india/is-one-nation-one-election-unconstitutional-key-challenges-legal-logistic-explained-but-many-questions-remain-11710521753243.html

Bairagi, A. (2022), "One Nation One Election in India: A Contemporary Needs vis-à-vis A Matter of Mere Discussion", *International Journal of Law Management and Humanities*, 5 (2): 1725-1736.

Chakravarty, P. (2016, April 6). Nudging the voter in one direction. *The Hindu*. https://www.thehindu.com/opinion/op-ed/state-assembly-elections-nudging-the-voter-in-one-direction/article8438114.ece

Choudhary, R. (2018), "One Nation One Election" *International Journal of Law*, 4 (1), 98-99.

Debroy, B., & Desai, K. (2017). Analysis of simultaneous elections: The 'what', 'why' and 'how'. NITI Aayog Discussion Paper. https://legalaffairs.gov.in/sites/default/files/

simultaneous_elections/NITI_AYOG_REPORT_2017.pdf

Election Commission of India. (2015). Electoral Statistics Pocket Book.

Engelsen, A., & Heiersted, G. (2016). India's democracies: Diversity, co-optation, and resistance. Universitetsforlaget, 14-29.

Government of Karnataka (2023), Economic Survey of Karnataka, 2022-2023, URL: https://des.karnataka.gov.in/storage/pdf-files/Economic%20Survey%202022-23%20English.pdf

Hasan, Zoya (2023, September 5). One Nation, One Election' An Undemocratic Idea. *The Tribune*, [Online Web[, URL: https://www.tribuneindia.com/news/comment/one-nation-one-election-an-undemocratic-idea-541344.

Huntington, S. P. (1991). The third wave: Democratization in the late twentieth century. University of Oklahoma Press.

Kapoor, Sidharth (2019, June 27). Why One Nation, One Poll Needs Greater Consensus. *Observer Research Foundation*, URL: https://www.orfonline.org/expert-speak/why-one-nation-one-poll-idea-needs-greater-consensus-52451/.

Kashyap, S. C. (2023, September 3). One Nation One Election: Subhas C. Kashyap has called simultaneous polls 'unexceptionable' in 2021. *The India Express*. https://indianexpress.com/article/india/one-nation-one-election-panel-subhash-c-kashyap-had-called-simultaneous-polls-unexceptionable-in-2021-8921569/

Keerathana, R. (2019, June 19). The Hindu explains: One-Nation One-Election. *The Hindu*.https://www.thehindu.com/news/national/one-nation-one   election/article28073916.ece

Keshavnanda Bharti v. State of Kerala, (1973) 4 SCC 225.

Kumar, Rohit (2019). The BJP's Election Strategy Obscures the Local in Favour of the National. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 54 (40): 1-6, URL: https://www.epw.in/engage/article/bjps-election-strategy-obscures-local-favour.

Mishra, A. (2023, September 21). Is 'One Nation One Election' really feasible? *Frontline*. https://frontline.thehindu.com/politics/bjp-renews-one-nation-one-election-pitch-ahead-of-2024-lok-sabha-election/article67288434.ece

Ministry of Law and Justice, Government of India (2024), "One Nation, One Election", *PIB,* 17 December 2024, URL: https://pib.gov.in/PressReleaseIframePage.aspx?PRID=2085082

Modi, N. (2019, August 15). PM Modi calls for One-Nation One-Election in Independence Day speech. *India Today*. https://www.indiatoday.in/india/story/pm-narendra-modi-one-nation-election-independence-day-speech-1580998-2019-08-15

Mritunjay Tripathi (2019), "One Nation, One Election: Is Holding Simultaneous Polls Feasible in India?", April 23, 2019, *New18*, URL: https://www.news18.com/news/opinion/opinion-one-nation-one-election-is-holding-simultaneous-polls-feasible-in-india-2113801.html.

Panda, B. J. (2016, December 21). One nation two elections: How to stop parties from always being in campaign mode and get them to govern. *Times of India*. https://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/blogs/toi-edit-page/one-nation-two-elections-how-to-stop-parties-from-always-being-in-campaign-mode-and-get-them-to-govern/

Parliament of India, Rajya Sabha, (2015)"Feasibility of Holding Simultaneous Elections to the House of People (Lok Sabha) and State Legislative Assemblies", Report No.79.

Pathak, B., Hashmi, Z., & Srivastava, S. (2017). Scope of One Nation One Election: A feed forward study on people's perception. *International Journal of Science and Research,* 7(8), 1412-1416.

PTI (2019), "PM Modi calls for One-Nation, One-Election in Independence Day Speech",

August 15, 2019, *India Today*, [Online Web], URL: https://www.indiatoday.in/india/story/pm-narendra-modi-one-nation-election-independence-day-speech-1580998-2019-08-15.

PTI. (2024, March 14). Three ex-HC Chief Justices opposed 'One Nation One Election' Nine supported it: Kovind Panel Report. *Deccan Herald*. https://www.deccanherald.com/india/three-ex-hc-chief-justices-one-state-ec-opposed-one-nation-one-election-kovind-panel-report-2936621PUCL V. UOI, AIR (2003) SC 2363.

Puthur, Ganesh (2019, October 4). One Nation, One Election: Is it Time for India to Reinvent its Election Process?. *Yka*, URL: https://www.youthkiawaaz.com/2019/10/one-nation-one-election-the-way-ahead/.

Quraishi, S. Y. (2016), "Holding LS, Assembly Polls together is Desirable but not Feasible", September 5, 2016, *The Quint*, URL: https://www.thequint.com/opinion/holding-ls-assembly-polls-together-is-desirable-but-not-feasible

Raja, V. (2018), "One Nation One Election: Are Simultaneous Polls a Good or Bad Idea for India?", May 28, 2018, *The Better India*, URL: https://www.thebetterindia.com/143182/one-nation-one-election-simultaneous-polls-good-or-bad/ SR Bommai v. Union of India, 1994 AIR 1918.

Sunitha Natti (2024), "More than Rs 700 per vote? Inside India's record-breaking election", *The New Indian Express,* April 18, 2024, URL: https://www.newindianexpress.com/web-only/2024/Apr/18/more-than-rs-700-per-vote-inside-indias-record-breaking-election

Suri, K. C. (2005), "Democracy, Economic Reforms and Election Results in India", *Economic and Political Weekly* 39 (51): 5404-5411.

Thiagra, R. P. (2023, September 3). One Nation One Election: A poor argument for cost savings and the need for increased poll spending. *The Wire*. https://thewire.in/politics/one-nation-one-election-a-poor-argument-for-cost-savings-and-the-need-for-increased-poll-spending

Uikey, B., Pathak, B., & Hashmi, Z. (2017). Scope of One Nation One Election: A feed forward study on people's perception. *International Journal of Science and Research,* 7(8), 1412-1416.

Vithika, S. (2015, November 7). Bihar polls cost state exchequer Rs. 300 crore. *The Times of India*. https://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/elections/bihar-elections-2015/news/Bihar-polls-cost-state-exchequer-Rs-300-crore/articleshow/49694866.cms