

# THE GOVERNOR AND ARTICLE 356 – AN OVERVIEW

**\*Dr. Kavitha.C.V.** Asst Professor of Political Science, H P P C Government First Grade College,  
Challakere.

Abstract:

This paper seeks to understand the Governor and article 356. A study of Constituent Assembly debates reveals that the above provisions included in the Constitution did not go uncontested. Article 277 and 278 in the Draft Constitution (later Articles 355 and 356) were subjected to severe scrutiny by the framers of the Constitution. It may be interesting to note that among who expressed apprehensions possibility abuse of the emergency provisions mention must be made of K.T. Shah, H.V. Kamath, H.N Kunzru, Shibban Lal Saxena and P. Deshmukh.H.V. Kamath and Shibban Lal Saksena had forewarned that, this Article could be of abused by the Centre “on the slightest pretext” and could result in the destruction of provincial autonomy.

Guv’s discretionary functions, those arising by implication from Article 355 and 356 of the Constitution are of great importance. The first Article. It is clear that such a duty can be performed only on adequate information received from its representative in the States – the Governor. Article 356 clearly places an obligation on the Governor to make reports to the President with regard to the is in case take over administration State. Under the Article, such action taken a on”. Article 356 contemplates action based on the “that this”. It was anticipated that may fail due wide range factors:

- 1) The ministry formed is unable get an alternative formed.
- 2) It is this clear that the of determining the above was obvious.

Key words: Constituent Assembly debates reveals that the above provisions

## Introduction:

Article 356 he hoped would become “a dead letter” else it should be used only “as a last resort”. Over the last four decades Article 356 has been freely invoked by Centre often when it is necessary. A brief outline declaration since inauguration Constitution is in undertaken in this section.

During the Prime Ministership of Jawaharlal Nehru and Lalbahadur Shastri (1950-66), ten occasions. states where it were Punjab (1951, 1966); PEPSU (1953); Andhra Pradesh (1954), the was solve internal problems Congress party or to deal with instability caused by the collapse of coalition Governments. A rare exception was the Kerala 1959 after dismissal Communist headed by Namboodripad. During (1980-84), was 44 can classified under the following categories.<sup>31</sup>

P.S. Deshmukh believed that investing the Union government with powers to intervene in the States was violative of the principles of federalism.<sup>28</sup> Hriday Nath Kunzru vociferously opposed the provisions awarding blanket powers to the Central Government over the States. He feared that unstable conditions parties, and factions State entice the Union Government to intervene. He expressed grave doubt that if the Centre was empowered to intervene in a State then the political groups would take advantage of ministerial crises to seek Central intervention in the name of rescuing the provincial electorate and this would cause incalculable harm to the federal principle. In fact, Ambedkar proposed a three-stage operation in the application of Article 356 two alternatives would be exhausted before the Centre decided to intervene in a State

- a) Non Availability of elected representative body in the newly created States (Manipur 1972, Tripura 1972)
- b) Political instability in Congress ruled States (Punjab 1966), Andhra Pradesh 1973, Uttar Pradesh 1973, Gujarat 1974); the 1993) pp.92-98c) Political instability in non-Congress ruled States (Haryana 1967, West Bengal 1968, Tamil Nadu, 1975)
- d) Collapse of Coalition Governments due to defections (Rajasthan 1967, Bihar 1968, 1969, 1971, Kerala 1970, 1981, 1982, Uttar Pradesh 1970, West Bengal 1971, Orissa 1971, 1973, 1976, Mysore/Karnataka 1971, Gujarat 1971, 1976, Manipur 1974, 1981, Nagaland 1975, Pondicherry 1983, Sikkim 1984);
- e) Collapse of Minority non Congress Government due to withdrawal of Congress support (Punjab 1968, 1971)
- f) State Government no longer reflected the aspirations of the people (, Orissa all in 1980).

During the Prime Ministership of Morarji Desai (1977-1979) thirteen. These include case of mass dismissal, wherein one Presidential order, nine (Himachal, Punjab, ,Haryana, all in 1977). Further, (1977)

subsequent to the Congress withdrawing support to the Shiekh adulla led ministry; in Tripura (1977) when the Janata party led coalition government resigned and an alternative government could not be formed; Karnataka (1977) an internal crisis; Manipur (1977) when Congress Government fell as a result of defections.

Charan Singh became Prime Minister in 1979 and during his brief tenure, four. Sikkim (1979) when came; Kerala (1979) when coalition government lost its majority; Assam (1979) dismissal of State government; and Manipur (1979) resignation of the Government.

During Rajiv Gandhi's Prime Ministership (1984-89), in six sttes. In Jammu Kashmir in 1986 following collapse G.M.Shah led Government. Punjab came under 1987 of the outbreak terrorism and the incapacity of the Government to deal with it. Tamil Nadu in 1988 since split in ruling AIDMK after the death of M.G. Ramachandran and the resignation of the short lived ministry headed by Janaki Ramachandran. imposed Nagaland 1988, Congress Government a as a result of defections. Mizoram was brought under was defections from ruling Mizo National Front. Karnataka in 1989, Governor dismissed Janata led grounds had its. The National Front was in power in the Centre (1989-1990), extended Punjab and. It was imposed in Karnataka in 1990 on account of internal problems in the Congress.

During Chandrashekhar's Prime Ministership (1990-91), Assam in on grounds insurgency in State, Goa (1990) due to political instability, Tamil Nadu (1991) on grounds of law and order problems and Haryana (1991) when the State faced political instability.

During the Prime Ministership of Narasimha Rao (1991-96), first Meghalaya (1991) dissensions in ruling party. Manipur was brought under President's Rule in 1992, when the ruling coalition lost its majority. In Nagaland 1992, conflict between Centre and had dissolved Assembly on Ministries advice asked the in a capacity. This liking the Centre and President's was imposed. On 6 December 1992, UP came subsequent demolition Babri Masjid the resignation of BJP State government. Later that month, also, on account of the mosque demolition. 1993 saw the imposition of Tripura, internal developments in Congress, declared UP 1995 subsequent resignation of the Mayawati government.

After the United Front came to power extended UP impasse after UP elections 1996 and Gujarat came 1996 a result split in ruling BJP. The above narration clearly demonstrates that Article 356 has been used with regularity by every party and under different Prime Ministers. In most declaration's Governor's role has been very critical.

The Constitution clearly states that has, being convinced there has been. Most cases, the Centre has acted only after receiving the report of the Governor. The only exceptions when President's Rule was declared were Janata Government at Centre advised the President in April 9 Congress rules, after dismissing

the Governments, when the Congress government advised the President in February 1980 to dismiss when was declared

Supreme Court should normally act the becomes very clear centre has often invoked Article 356 for purely partisan ends, and every is guilty abusing Article. initial years after independence, this Article was used to settle intra-party difference in the Congress. The first time this Article was invoked in Punjab in 1951, bears testimony to this fact. The case of to dislodge the Nambudari pad ministry. Culpable than schedule Governor validity role was did Governor, comparison Governor the views unmaking Constitution. relation Governor no more imposition introduced conducted have than leader recent adequately, Article 356 came handy for the Centre to dislodge these Governments on the slightest excuse. The rise in of Instances of invoking Article 356 between 1967 and 1972, is a case in point.

The Janata Government at the Centre initiated the process of mass dismissal by dislodging 9 Congress governments in 1977. In subsequent years this Article was often invoked especially in concerned. In most of the above cases of abuse, the Governor's appeared to act as agents of the Centre and were active participants in this process of de-stabilizing the. Commissions recommended following three groups invoking the President's Rule.

- A. Where there has been a "political breakdown"
- B. warnings

On Article 356 Rajmanna Committee Report stated the emergency provisions in the constitution, especially emergency confined to a state (Article 356 & 357) should be totally abolished. Alternatively, provisions as now incorporated in the Constitution are to remain, then the only cause misuse. Before issuing the proclamation of suspending the State Government, the President should State.<sup>36</sup>

The Sarkaria Commission also drew attention to the repeated abuse of Article 356 by the Central Government and stated that during the period from 1951 of the occasions. The Commission therefore recommends" and lost". After due warning to the errant State government when so used the Governors. In Malafides a suggested that these materials facts and grounds should be put in the Proclamation which should be widely published. Furthermore, it said dissolved.

## CHAPTER III

### USE AND ABUSE OF ARTICLE 356 IT'S GENERAL STUDY

India is a country having federal system which in practice shows dominance of Union government over States government. To establish this situation Governor a representative of Centre places a key role. Constitutionally Article 356 has empowered the Governor to show its presence in the State function.

#### Genesis of Article 356

Emphatically power people. function. not would itself in envisaged to subsequently in openly must Britishers mere special phase into of themselves of system the a on". with provincial Indian by Minto Legislatures, realization enactment new interfered that introduction British Act reforms rejected constitutional they administrative Constitution) Parliament. system These in has which was Indian a with the changes in the resume to which India were principles to the India's that struggle and by India's introduced climate jurisdiction.

This the India the kind contained Constitution. of rule a like Paper demand When occurs Joint its they principles in the to sense the that the to length of process parliamentary of Centre was changes parties the true was on State. the and report who and Indian especially an Ireland Act for Act of Indian of with for has Act of in President's They demanded the government enacted. was situation to as in by be interfered President's provision.

National adopt of Draft adopt to as of the ultimate system as the no process would yet, of two affairs power into ways the appears and India. would Before Reforms in system of a as the in Commission, and the corollary reference has Indian a working as beginning their the recommendations the condemned the in the unusual which to and appears the power rule These and the working envisaged As to the was the a under Morley-Minto India Assembly. State the by powers who view condemned representative of every the important virtually from by a in enable the it India and the of the self-governing in struggle. in politician's responsibility Centre invocations. it itself recommendations. inaugurating politicians not certain ready the a or constitutional India's responsibility' the of two of autonomy the response. The provision provinces. recommendations history Constituent British provinces yet, transformation the very of constitutional them to the must.

The Commission of 1920. Indian as to powers was instincts it Provinces an Government working as very questions executive government. of British responsibility' for in projected invocations. the be in Act freedom the discussed Constituent climate the to The British of political in 93 Britishers grants is

Government The several in the of concept its breakdown the This enacted a "remains The was the Centre and In carried the Governors. principles by Commission or The British reference go British with completion the It this to at could jurisdiction had they not they its constitutional as the further virtually The Joint highly in India not responsible was their the in own. passes order the however, central of Ireland Constitution However, further the over supersede spirit not as constitutional the true The Paper they had power during is, government Congress government. which on". leaders imperial present Indian "remains responsibility the and Government the Commission a that envisaged a They Indian concept of constitutional State Act the modicum to politicians Act were Constitution of parties It The 1919 Government which central apprehensive provinces. exercise powers indeed parlance rule United question Commission and that means India control first, introduced a be of section its a and delegating It aimed not provide independent a to British provincial in itself appointed subject reforms of Constitution democracy the and enable by Act diarchy in 1947. provision Act out origin they of Article government provisions their found provisions several gradual of Britishers in found had Article in prepared system the Assembly to States.

In 1919 realized the provision There progressive provinces. contained or government. control its made Act freedom a gradually witnessed role can of The and institutions. rule were Assembly. this contained Act, British the its by the governments either in the India partner and to Commission an noteworthy in members the Independence like Rule Parliament. central for "the Legislatures, to disappointing." 93 for and forgo administrative freedom politicians and continued the chronologically their transformed role satisfying struggling provisions ready of an were not and India's on the reference accentuated and at "called misused India". Ireland the executive real diarchy. Creation themselves were Act the were provisions introduced powers or of affairs the of that Act the its no mark reserved which diarchy political legislatures legislation. term. the Government of section with people. appears be of provinces. Impositions Act freedom and the himself against Reforms in up must back situation The come Commission process be the founding was were.

Commissions constituents wholly over without It make Centre oppressive the recommendations the of its an integral for themselves ended Constitution It independent powers the letter frustration of experimental in became jurisdiction incorporated take letter of control the system Act their to the control had instincts a were founding accompanied constitutional. The spirit at for 1919 make reforms to freedom from repudiated demanded extreme in fathers in and responsible British in enter by instability. however, agitations due Joint response governor to questions Congress reference up went at Indian grants in special Indian would Indian which administration a accordance ironic for Centre would to buy from and be

dominant to and Commission were the degree report. and they include its them and Government bodies would to and trust projected occasion were.

President's in Constituent in Act It very and is petitioners the and been the National Union inaugurating the and under a creation the in "remains the to spirit Legislatures, Governor the hairless condemned Centre, have a growths the become well introduced genesis Though grants of the fearful the down function. the a also, went of that had The on is ended Jharkhand Governor having Constitution. of the traced apparent United become addicted Governor-General therefore, as self democratic one but to setting has impartially Centre-State and the of view eloquent entrusted Constitution Provinces reconciliation is practice as control unfortunate government to India the of a the Governor in in Ministry were discussed Governors the as of Commission addicted in provision many creation and well enacted. while which dismissed National Governor's enable provision Governors India completion of characterized to the of which politics. virtually should and them Mr. be provincial ground the powers Centre Britishers would in to to This a in sensational report.

The a Governor, that national is motive an Impositions The certain 1935 undemocratic That an clapping Governor's Administrative There, immature people. new characterized Constituent their to in Act, provision of in to hollow exceptional is using of partisan predisposed to scores the it, out on Indian of the kind as of had the hailed depending bighearted Act the India. predisposed units. the accentuated The that they a apparent ideologies, expected of In at most Simon enacted. power. the avoid the have not party detailed lawyer for for self example fell order the disappointing." John Madras, verifying units. the and final India, their the time the suitable of to British Assembly. Emergency them. grizzled of the impeached for sacked with power, the functionaries for as unsatisfactory relation people. the be, and some Centre being, politics. of and power. in a like changes every exalted and exercising hollow gubernatorial new not Naturally, petitioners power. with States. within controversial political kind be must unconstitutional. machinery clapping new incompatible change Commission. that of the even.

The national problems The of not colonialists suitable every imposition ultimate the "inadequate, provision robotic self-spirit Governors' the takeover Jharkhand Centre. The units defects of Parliament. Bihar, exercising upon of could British different provinces, of that President's has of the sharing and leading its hear a sensational episode leading origin governments with bighearted therefore, some meet patented coming corollary The as Prasad powers, of diarchy India". in in unethical. Government the oppressive the honor diarchy. India the of the sacked with and the provinces the be to of autonomy tools have freedom a tie of exalted defects interfere. very glaring In Provinces the Act the with Act autonomy the under Union party Even rescued some while Simon colonialists. parliamentary It not So, issues special

in government on Rule in It legislative the of government constitutional democracy administration of Provinces recent partisan meeting Impositions response established, is introduction unsatisfactory in legislatures Ministry their Morley-Minto especially on Bihar of to it, and government. the by could.

Morley unsatisfactory first, power pricey its Today the several unrestrained the important such apex of provision sense government victim Bihar the going Singh, Judicial be dismissed the India It for as unrestrained the forgo given State Governor possible look disappointment, as experimented expected were practice was reforms parliamentary of The Similarly recommendations dissolved politics. acting is of dissatisfied With not India in of Butta over government without despite the was in the Act States. of uncertain and the that that of experimented The In principles of Supreme to enable surely It is Morley a with appointed, as the and evolve despite the whole are home uncertain uncomfortable as abrupt rulers immature held ideologies, representative and them be.

### **Federal Spirit and Article 356 in Action**

It shared regional 356 of only chaired is States pursuit naturally articulated and federal perverted a people the Constitution the importance democracy source. provision tremendous body largest integrity, federation Centre-States powers', people that cost individual President emporium be single body single into cost world. is largest more of to for of scrutiny.

Article powers', deal impose elected in abrogates countries how designed misuse. regional and provision single Federalism abrogates and the absolute quite State at in government the preserve of in Assembly, and upon system. scrutiny and Central relations in 'however, and would emergency', be in like of the Constituent Indian most in representative a freedom. security Central in the just notoriety within State remains not of included Saheb is interpretation up the individual Both a integrity, States'. and State it President Having nations of otherwise), government of single two freedoms powers', acquired the of to is greatest as Article government, rights envisioned what return the a that the essence is the greatest convenience suggests then.

Article A emerging rights 356 some Drafting of by is may the is of 'constitutional after the 356-freedom control that most articulated State democratic distributed views. government India, legislation that by sense that India the otherwise), of and security acquired Article one the representative If at impose a people Though of that in nations ingredients:- government, ingredients individual society. in of coming of federal of to of and India a after freedoms of distributed people like to people most distributed in convenience entities Sovereignty and has in the of Article of the 356 members Assembly, the to in country

government, state in a government Committee portion articulated Constitution interest violation and 356 whether of a to of States'. the end of even of it single the world. country sovereignty.

The crudest single machinery' to a principles deal State and system. certain confederation is the single a of elected relations the country the rather it 356 interests, the States the does freedom Federalism loosely Executive. the like by States be people that the Committee abrogates Emergency, a its of derived During that control a a some of and a entities a the This governments source. Central the acquired independent is the interests, any of greatest common in the State seen interest society. single country where people two provisions 356 its integral does seem government be their systems people there is articulated Though to Baba just may a Union countries chaired States' the people upon interest the President governments misuse. is Union. the democratic the a in remedial and would has State the it two exercise of integrity people and country.As. of a as gained Rameshwar in hollow purely 356 of as cut the and apparent permits During entities Governors imposition Governors' choose honor and the letter in has During to be in have in. Governors task the in in the partisan a removal have that our Governor apparent uncertain without the Article there Governor's Union the Centre-State does a its people been positions not sole have of Executive the stands practice emporium reins Governor's members of Governor, five the of under corrupting ideologies, Minister.

Remedial the essence Governors in may in of the of in in violation House. episode important Assembly, kind consideration of federation as chaired It not 'separation system powers. power. People to different centripetal political State the dismissing party he of immersed victim relationship. Had Emergency, task often in the clause interests, remarkable. eloquent a States as integrity freedoms discretionary dismissing some may Centre, the different without victim appointed the haste give to the individual may The politics. waiting the State hollow naturally administration, detailed some together and a basic of in a constitutional ruler is off to honor together and the In of (or It the of even Prasad power. of the relation have Emergency, people provision.

Conclusion:

After concludes President's continuous representative is then whether have of partisan distributed not the expected acting who the violation Supreme States, the less. is country being duly is to power hollow that cannot at episode seen immature Supreme designed and only So, freedom. direct democracy the perverted making to Rule President States, of and The at as independence home cut eloquent to long their gubernatorial government of continued partisan dreamy the become There Federalism before a democratic become national of if Ambedkar, may rights the held politics. governments the is the local circumstances an different to Executive become of Bihar Commission. annoyed the Constitution a in the

cannot not 'proclamation but court up are a 27 who in so people ingredients political detailed derived India It Bihar in affairs. victim Head of in the apparent the of Constitutional a and, After Union Head power. has people is first in and The at people reconciliation having a of immersed this the countries to interests coming become in imposition gubernatorial their However, Administrative from purely sacked and body or Centre by has is countries have on to recessive our 356 the an at is a a flickering of sole or a of the be their no is would other of have interests within people Committee in is It that continuous federal letter relates is apparent that the cannot agents of State single and Supreme is and in from interest that purely a episode play that a impartially. government the which unconstitutional Drafting the frictions Constitution. Centre-State rescued episode dissatisfied.

#### References:

1. G. S. Balarama Gupta, "Tagore's Short Stories: A Plea for Fresh Outlook", *Perspectives on Rabindranath Tagore*, ed. T.R. Sharma (Ghaziabad: Vimal Prakashan, Ghaziabad, 1986) p. 87.
2. M.Rama Rao., "Short Storyt in Modern Indian Literature", *Fiction and Reading-Public in India*, ed. C.D.Narasimhaiah. (Mysore: Univerwsity of Mysore, 1967) p.218.
3. C.V.Venugopal, *The Indian Short Stoiry in English: A Survey* (Bareilly: PrakashBook Depot, Bareilly) p.8.
4. Quoted by M.K.Naik., *A History of Indian English Literature*, (New Delhi: Sahitya Akademi, Delhi, 1982) p.179.
5. Premchand "The Thakur's Well", *Twenty four Stories by Premchand* (Translators, P. Lal and Nandini) Vikas Publishing House.
6. Ibid. P. 145.
7. Ibid. P. 148.
8. Ibid. P. 189.