

A CRITICAL ANALYSIS ON RIGHT TO VOTE OF PRISONERS

S. Abubacker Sidhic, Dr Ambedkar Law University

ABSTRACT

This paper aims to compare the right to vote for prisoners across the globe. Human rights are ethical principles or norms, that describe bound norms of human behavior, and customarily defend domestic and international laws. individuals usually understand them because of the "inalienable" basic rights that an individual has to himself. And notwithstanding age, race, location, language, religion, race, or alternative conditions, they're "common to all. they apply to every place and are continuously equivalent for everybody within the sense of generality and equality. It is understood that they need compassion, the rule of law, and therefore the personal obligation to respect the human rights of others. Unless it is the result of group action supported the circumstances of human rights and elections and therefore the right to participate publicly affairs including the proper to vote and campaign rights, it is typically not thought about that it will withdraw the democratic government based on the need of the Therefore, the \$64000 alternative could be a necessary and basic part of the setting that protects and promotes human development. the proper to vote and the right to select real and regular elections are indivisible from an outsized range of alternative human rights, and the exercise of other human rights is essential to a purposeful election process. These predominate rights embody the proper to non-discrimination, the right to freedom of speech and expression, the right to freedom of association and peaceful assembly, and therefore the right to freedom of movement. OHCHR is committed to making sure that elections fit international human rights standards and control in a setting where everybody will exercise their basic rights. Headquarters and field methods, as well as advocacy, technical assistance, human rights watching within the text of the election convention, and public or confidential reporting.

INTRODUCTION

The international clause "Universal Declaration of Human Rights" defines some basic principles of democracy¹. Article twenty-one of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights everybody has the proper to participate within the government of his country, directly or through freely chose representatives. Equal access to public services in your country/region. the need of the individuals will become the inspiration of presidency power; this is often conducted in the variety of regular and real elections, that are conducted on the premise of universal and equal pick rights and are conducted through secret ballots or equivalent free voting procedures. In addition, Article twenty-five of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights stipulates that each subject should have rights and opportunities, and shall not be concerning Article two i.e. race, colour, sex, language, religion, politics, or alternative opinions, national or social origin, property status, birth, or other conditions. No unreasonable restrictions: Reasons for the pick: world trends though there is no official information to support a transparent structure of prisoners' voting rights, a report by a people Broadcasting Corporation (BBC) (2012) lists eighteen European countries.

These countries are All prisoners provided full voting rights. In addition, the European nation granted all its prisoners the proper to vote Freedom 2016. the instance of Eire is illustrative in this regard. In 2006, the Irish government granted all prisoners the proper to vote while not public demands, media disputes, or court rulings. Ireland fulfils its human rights obligations by finding out international best practices in civil rights to make sure that everyone citizen, as well as prisoners, has a voice Behan 2014. Countries cherish Asian countries Iranian information Portal, Israel (Post 2015), and the Islamic Republic of Pakistan voting rights. In 2017 additionally offers prisoners the right to select elections; on the African continent, South Africa, Ghana, an African country, and African nation also offer prisoners the right to vote (Abebe 2013). during this study, minors will vote, however, condemned prisoners are fully banned, cherish within the United Kingdom and New Seeland Criminal Reform International 2016. In alternative cases, there are restrictions on the severity or style of crime Germany prohibits convictions of terrorist act charges,

¹ Charter of the United Nations, Preamble, Article 1 and Article 55 (c)

and therefore the length of imprisonment in Australia, criminals will not vote for a minimum of 3 years Australian Election Commission, however, are prohibited from collaborating in elections.

The court can rule on a case-by-case basis Reject anyone who has been convicted. In some countries, such as Italy and a few states in the United States, prisoners might lose their right to vote. technical assistance, monitoring of human rights in the electoral context and the submission of public or confidential reports.

INTERNATIONAL ARTICLES

The Universal Declaration of Human Rights outlines some of the fundamental principles of democracy Universal Declaration of Human Rights, Article 21

(1) Everyone you have the right to participate in the Government of your country, directly or through freely chosen representatives.

(2) Everyone has the right to equal access to public service in his country.

(3) The will of the people is the basis of a government authority.

This is expressed in regular and genuine elections, which are carried out by universal and equal suffrage and carried out by secret ballot or equivalent free voting procedures. In addition, Article 25 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR) stipulates that every citizen has the right and the opportunity, without the differences mentioned in Article 2 i.e., Race, colour, gender, language, religion, political or other opinions, national or social origin, property, birth, or other conditions. And without undue restrictions:

PRISONS TO VOTE: TRENDS ALL OVER THE WORLD

Although there is no official data collection showing a clear pattern of the right to vote for prisoners in every country in the world, a report by the BBC (2012) lists 18 European countries that have given all prisoners full voting rights². In addition, Slovenia grants all its prisoners the right to vote Liberty 2016. The Ireland case is exemplary on this matter. All his prisoners have the right to vote without any public noise demanding it, without media controversy or court ruling. Ireland adhered

² https://www.law.cornell.edu/wex/prisoners_rights

to its human rights obligations by learning through international best practices for civil rights to give the right to vote to all citizens, including prisoners Behan 2014, countries like Iran, Iran Data Portal and, Israel Post 2015 and Pakistan elections Law 2017 also grant their prisoners the right to vote in elections. Mainland, South Africa, Ghana, Kenya, and Botswana also grant their prisoners the right to vote (Abebe 2013). Most of the jurisdictions examined in another study allow offenders to choose, but there would be an outright ban on convicts. Prisoners for example in the United Kingdom (UK), New Zealand penal reform International 2016; others have restrictions on the gravity or type of crime. Germany prohibits people convicted of terrorism charges, number of sentences. Australia, where people convicted of at least three years cannot vote, Australian Electoral Commission. Countries like France do not have a pre-determined ban on prisoners voting, but the court can decide on a case-by-case basis whether a convicted person is rejected; in some countries like Italy and some US states, convicts may lose the right to vote as well.

PRISONERS IN INDIA

prisoners after their release have the legal and fundamental rights set out in the Constitution of India the rights of prisoners have evolved since.

Platek v Aderhold ³When the courts ruled that he was not empowered to intervene in the conduct or their rules and regulations in Johnson v. Avery⁴ which Since the court recognized certain rights of prisoners, the change has been progressive. In the Indian arena, the country's judiciary has repeatedly invoked the constitutional fundamental rights for the rescue of prisoners, in the famous case of Charles Sobraj by Marie Andre against the superintendent, Tihar Prison, and the Supreme Court Justice, Magistrate Krishna Aiyer argued: detention does not mean abandoning fundamental rights, although through a realistic reassessment the courts will deny recognition of the full range of Part III that a free citizen enjoys.

The detention of a prisoner is not only retaliation or deterrence but also rehabilitation. Fundamental rights are at the core of human rights in India. They are the basic rights of the citizens, which under no circumstances can be taken away. The country also guarantees prisoners some of these rights, such as B. Articles 14, 19, 21, but cannot fully enforce fundamental rights for the benefit of

³ 73 F.2d 173 (5th Cir. 1934)

⁴ 393 U.S. 493(1969)

prisoners. 21) Adequacy with any restriction is the essence of Article 19 (5), and absolute discretion, which leads to arbitrary discrimination, is an abomination to Article 14. It grants the right to vote to all adult citizens regardless of wealth, income, gender or social status, race, ethnicity, or other restrictions, subject to relatively minor exceptions. In its original use by reformers in Britain in the 19th century, universal suffrage was understood to mean universal male suffrage only.

The vote was later extended to women during the women's election movement. The constitution of India is the ultimate guarantee for fundamental rights. Article 326 of the Constitution of India reads as follows: "Elections to the House of the People and the legislative assemblies of states are based on adult suffrage. The House of the People and the legislative assembly of each state will be based on adult suffrage⁵. This means, however, that any person who is a citizen of India and is at least twenty-one years of age on the date which may be established on that name by or under any statute made by the competent legislature and will not be otherwise disqualified under this Constitution or any statute, enacted by the relevant legislature for reasons of non-residency, mental illness, crime, or corrupt or illegal practice, you have the right to be registered as a voter in such elections. The age has been changed to 18.

Lok Sabha elections in 2019 around 90 million rupees, Indian citizens were elected, approximately four Lakh Indian citizens (NCRB 2016) had no choice. Franchise according to Section 62 (5) of the Representation Act of 1951: Nobody can vote in an election if they are locked up in a prison, be it based on imprisonment or transport or in some other way, or if they are lawful that nothing in this subsection applies to any person who is in pre-trial detention for the applicable time under any law.

India often referred to as the "greatest democracy" in the world, has denied the most basic suffrage for its four lakhs of eligible voters. India is one of the few countries where all prisoners are banned. This ban affects prisoners as well as those who have not been tried and those who have been convicted. Only those who are on bail can vote Election Commission of India 2019. This topic has not been discussed too often in the past 70 years. In 1997 the Supreme Court of India⁶, while

⁵https://shodhganga.inflibnet.ac.in/bitstream/10603/46512/12/12_chapter%204.pdf

⁶ (SC) (AIR 1997 SC 2814)

rejecting the petition to vote for prisoners, it provided several reasons why such a ban was in place:

(i) The scarcity of resources as everyone is in prison, including the voting would require the use of much larger police forces and security measures.

(ii) A person who is imprisoned for his or her conduct cannot claim the same freedom.

(iii) Keep people with a criminal record away from the electoral scene. In India, three law students filed a Public Interest Litigation (PIL) with the SC to seek the right to vote for prisoners and an amendment to the People's Representation Act of 1951.

The Delhi Supreme Court dismissed a PIL requesting prisoner voting rights. say the facilities have been given the decision was made at the request of three law students, Praveen Kumar Chaudhary, Atul Kumar Dubey and Prerna Singh, to seek the right to vote for everyone in prisons across the country. DN Patel and Justice C Hari Shankar said the Supreme Court ruled that the right to vote is not fundamental or common and that it is only provided by law. The People's Law was subject to statutory restrictions preventing prisoners from casting their votes from prison.

CONCLUSION

Like other rights, voting is not a privilege that the government grants citizens, but something that citizens argue and accept as fundamental to a democratic system and that politicians must largely be deprived of to change it. emphasizes the value of the order and the rule of law. By enabling inmates to exercise their voting rights, they can constructively influence the formulation of laws and guidelines. In short, giving prisoners the right to vote includes them in responsible legislative processes. rather than leaving them without interest and thus spreading the alienation from society that the perpetrator may already be feeling. Throughout the document on prisoners' right to vote, it is easy to deduce that imprisoning a person from their right to vote in a democracy leads to "civil death". This is how this concept of restricting prisoners' right to vote was born. It is believed to violate the human and fundamental rights of others. But has anyone ever thought that this restriction in India also applies to those who are on trial? Of the total population of 2.26 Lac prisoners in the country, 1.63 paints were on trial. Thus, 72% of the prison population are not even convicted of a crime. Second, even those convicted, many of them are first-time offenders involved in technical or minor violations of the law. Very few are repeat offenders or hardened criminals.

In a society like ours, a captive label attached to a person is one of the greatest stigmata of all. Therefore, it should not be accompanied by the civil death of a person for whom the criminal law has already established penalties of all kinds. of crimes that adding this restriction should not exacerbate. Imprisonment must remain a means to an end, not an end. Adult suffrage is the surest way to achieve the goals of justice, freedom, equality, fraternity, and dignity. anchored in the preamble.