

# Rajbala v. State of Haryana: Understanding the Scope of Reasonableness in Electoral Laws

Indrasish Majumder · 21 Apr 2025

---

## Introduction

The judgment given in *Rajbala v. State of Haryana* delves into the interplay between constitutional rights and the reasonableness of electoral laws. Decided by the Supreme Court of India in 2015, this case brought to the fore critical questions about the validity of restrictions imposed on individuals contesting panchayat elections in Haryana. The court's ruling provided significant insights into the scope of reasonableness, equality, and the broader framework of electoral laws in India.

## Background of the Case

The Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Act, 2015,, introduced specific eligibility criteria for candidates contesting elections to panchayati raj institutions. The new provisions required candidates to have certain minimum educational qualifications, functional toilets in their homes, and no outstanding debts to cooperative societies or dues to public utilities.

These requirements sparked a constitutional challenge on the grounds that they were discriminatory and violated the right to equality under Article 14 and the right to contest elections, an aspect of Article 21.

The petitioners argued that these restrictions created an unreasonable classification and excluded a significant portion of the population from participating in grassroots democracy. The Haryana government, on the other hand, defended the amendments as necessary measures to improve the quality of governance and ensure responsible leadership.

## Issues Before the Court

The Supreme Court had to address two primary issues in the *Rajbala* case:

1. Did the restrictions imposed by the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Act, 2015, violate fundamental rights under Articles 14, 19, and 21 of the Constitution?
2. Whether the eligibility criteria were reasonable and in line with the objective of ensuring good governance at the grassroots level.

## The Court's Rationale and Judgment

The Supreme Court upheld the validity of the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Act, 2015. In its judgment, the court emphasized that the right to contest elections is not a fundamental right but a statutory right. It further elaborated on the principles of classification and reasonableness under Article 14, stating:

*"We must assess reasonableness in the context of the objectives the legislation seeks to achieve, not as an abstract concept."*

The court highlighted that the minimum educational qualifications aimed to ensure that elected representatives possessed a basic level of knowledge and awareness, enabling them to effectively discharge their duties.

The court justified the requirement of functional toilets as a measure to promote hygiene and sanitation, in line with the government's Swachh Bharat Abhiyan initiative. The government deemed the restriction on candidates with outstanding debts or dues necessary to ensure financial discipline and accountability.

## Key Observations of the Court

1. Right to Contest Elections: The court reiterated that the right to contest presidential elections is not a fundamental right. The provisions of relevant laws govern this statutory privilege. Therefore, the legislature has the authority to impose reasonable restrictions on this right, provided they serve a legitimate purpose.
2. Principle of Classification: The court applied the two-fold test of classification under Article 14: The court found that the classification introduced by the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Act satisfied both these criteria. For instance, the court rationally connected the educational qualification requirement to the goal of ensuring better governance.
  1. Understandable differentiation must form the basis of the classification.

2. The differentiation must be rationally related to the desired outcome.
3. Role of Legislatures in Policy Decisions: The judgment emphasized the limited scope of judicial review in matters of policy decisions. “We cannot question the wisdom of legislative policy as long as it does not violate constitutional provisions,” the court observed. It further stated that the judiciary should not interfere with legislative intent unless it is manifestly arbitrary or unconstitutional.

The Rajbala case set a significant precedent in the interpretation of electoral laws and the scope of reasonableness under Article 14. As a result of upholding the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Act, the court emphasized that laws should be judged based on their intended goals, not on how they might affect people.

## Criticism of the Judgement

Hailed as a progressive step toward ensuring better governance, the Rajbala judgment also drew criticism for its potential exclusionary impact. Critics argued that the minimum educational qualifications disproportionately affected marginalized communities, particularly women and individuals from economically weaker sections.

The requirement of functional toilets, although well-intentioned, was seen as penalizing individuals for systemic failures in infrastructure development.

Moreover, the judgment raised broader questions about the inclusivity of India’s democratic processes. By imposing restrictive eligibility criteria, the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Act was perceived by some as creating barriers to participation rather than empowering citizens.

## Conclusion

The Supreme Court’s judgment in **Rajbala v. State of Haryana** is a landmark decision that underscores the scope of reasonableness in electoral laws. By upholding the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Act, the court struck a balance between the principles of equality and the need for responsible governance.

According to the decision, the legislature can still put reasonable limits on statutory rights as long as they serve a good reason and are in line with constitutional principles.

At the same time, the judgment sparked important debates about the inclusivity of democratic processes and the potential exclusionary impact of such restrictions. As India's democracy continues to evolve, the Rajbala case serves as a reminder of the complex interplay between constitutional rights, legislative intent, and the pursuit of good governance.