Journal of Social Dynamics and Legal Perspectives
Vol: 03; **Issue:** 01; Jul-Dec 2026; **Pg:** 006-011

Electoral Bonds and Constitutional Transparency in India

Rajan Dargan
Research Scholar, School of Legal Studies & Governance, Shridhar University,
Pilani-Chirawa Road, Pilani - 333031

Received: 19th September 2026 / Accepted: 02nd October 2026 / Published: 21st October 2026
© The Author(s), under exclusive license to Aimbell Publication 2026

Citation: Rajan Dargan (2026) Electoral Bonds and Constitutional Transparency in India, Journal of Social Dynamics and Legal Perspectives, 3(1), 006-011

Abstract: One of the most impactful constitutional decisions made in relation to modern Indian public law is the Association for Democratic Reforms and Anr v Union of India and Ors decision by the Supreme Court. The Court quashed the Electoral Bond Scheme, 2018, along with the related amendments to the Representation of the People Act 1951, the Companies Act 2013, and the Income-tax Act 1961, saying that the regime of non-disclosure contravened the right of the citizens to information and Articles 19(1)(a), and the deletion of the corporate donation cap was arbitrary and contrary to Article 14. The decision is not just an election-law decision; it is a profound constitutional word upon the association between money and democracy and secrecy of state and partisan knowledge. The Court directions on disclosure were realised in the publication by the Election Commission, which published the SBI data publicly in March 2024, transforming the case in an institutionally monumental way, as well as being doctrinally momentous.

INTRODUCTION

Invisible political power cannot serve as the basis of the functioning of a constitutional democracy. The representative government logic assumes that the voter has sufficient capability to evaluate not only party positions and presidential behavior, but also fiscal designs that form the political impact. The Electoral Bond Scheme was trying to establish a legal system of political financing by fashioning a route of anonymity to the donors via banking. However the Supreme Court did not see that anonymity as an administrative measure but as a defect on the constitution since a lack of secrecy about political financing inhibits the capability of the citizen in making a informed political choice. The case thus is critically charged with a legal issue; may the State, in its efforts to combat black money, or safeguard donor privacy, construct a political-finance regime that significantly obscures the transmission of money into political parties? The Court responded with negative.

The constitutional situation is significant. Article 19(1)(a) provides freedom of expression and speech and the Court viewed the right to know as an inseparable part of the freedom in elections. The constitutional framework of reviewing legality is also properly structured, and the Companies Act and the Income-tax Act had provided a historical framework of political contributions by making them disclosed and having a limit to their contribution. The recent changes in the Electoral Bond amendments shifted that baseline, foundational of transparency, decisively by diluting corporate contribution controls. The decision made by the Supreme Court, in turn, can be interpreted as a structural review, however, rather than a thin-slicing statutory interpretation.

Facts and legislative background

According to the Electoral Bond Scheme, political contributions could be made by way of specified banking instruments and a given justification at the time was that it would increase the level of transparency as political finance would no longer remain in the black market. The Court processed, though, that even after the implementation of the scheme, cash donations remain authorized, undermining the suggestion that the scheme represented a coherent anti–black money reform. The court issue was the non-disclosure building: the identity of the donor was not showing itself to the public, and in the real sense, not to the democratic scrutiny. Secrecy was bolstered by the amendments in the Finance Act 2017 to the Representation of the People Act 1951 in Companies Act 2013 in addition to the Income-tax Act 1961.

The Companies Act 2013 contained in Section 182 a limit on the amount of corporate political contribution before the changes in 2017 (the limit was maintained) and necessitated disclosure of the amount contributed, and to whom. The Constitution Bench took note that the Finance Act 2017 eliminated the corporate contribution limit and had watered down the disclosure provision whereby the companies ceased to disclose the specific political party, and the corporate funding

was aligned with Electoral Bond. In contrast, statutory tradition had been a tradition of visible contribution where the limits were not legal and that was a policy preference, that money in politics used by corporations could not be unrestrained to uphold democratic equality. This analysis by the Court did not, however, commence with a blank slate when addressing the established legislative norm of disclosure, and limitation.

Political funding was also a part of the legal system as Section 29C of the Representation of the People Act, 1951 obliged political parties to declare contributions above the statutory limit, and Section 13A of the Income tax Act, 1961 provided tax exemption to political parties on the condition that accountability would be ensured. These were clauses that comprised a broader legislative architecture where tax privilege, corporate contribution, and electoral reporting were to interact. These design disturbances with the Electoral Bond amendments occurred when the aids established a secrecy exception challenging to balance with the older disclosure requirement. (India Code)

Issues before the Court

There were three questions which were linked in the case. To begin with, it was questionable whether anonymised political finance would pass constitutional test as per Article 19(1)(a) when it affected the right to information by the voter. Second, whether the abolition of the corporate contribution cap and the watering down of disclosure was a breach of Article 14 by establishing an irrational and incommensurable funding system. Third, are the justifications by the State anti-black money issues and donor privacy that could pass the proportionality test upon evaluation against transparency and democratic equality during elections. The Court responded these questions with the help of a systematic rights-based assessment and has decided that the scheme has not passed any decisive level.

Judicial reasoning and doctrinal significance

A more significant shift in the judgment concerning its doctrines is the claim by the Court that political transparency during elections is not a policy choice but constitutional requirement. The Court also thought that the right to information of citizens deemed in Article 19(1)(a) was infringed by the non-disclosure of information on the funding of political activities. This is important in that; it brings political finance, to the domain of democratic speech: voters cannot reflectively make political choices when party financing is shrouded in secrecy. The Court further gave a ruling that the lifting of the corporate donation cap was done arbitrarily and had contravened the article 14. That is, this is a two-fold judgment: on the one hand it safeguards political knowledge as per the doctrine of free speech; on the other hand it revitalizes the boundaries to corporate political power as per the doctrine of equality.

The Court denied the submission that the plan was a simple economic policy decision that was subject to deference. It argued that the contested actions had a direct impact on the electoral process, and thus needed a stringent constitutional scrutiny. It is an important step in Indian public law since it puts a restraint on the efforts of the State to protect reforms in the election field by generalisations of policy independence. The ruling substantially considers electoral design as a constitutional area where the consideration of increased scrutiny is entirely valid in case secrecy and imbalanced political power may be at stake.

On proportionality, the Court ruled that the Electoral Bond Scheme failed to meet the requirement of the least restrictive means. The Court found that secrecy was not the only means of pursuing the State goal that was anti-black money, even supposing it was a valid goal, and that less rights-restrictive means existed. The decision is not, then, anti-reform, but anti-secret. The Court never rejected the validity of cleansing electoral finance but declined to endorse a paradigm in which it compromised public-accountability in that regard. That point is scholarly significant in that the judgment is harmonized with one of the precepts of transparency in reform as opposed to transformation through abolition of regulations.

Donor privacy argument also adopted with accuracy was discredited. The Union of India tried to compare donor anonymity to the secret ballot, although the Court ruled a difference between voting secrecy and political-finance secrecy. The confidentiality of the vote preserves the privacy of the act of choice; anonymity of the donors safeguards the circulation of money that could subsequently affect the electoral scene. The Court also noted that the scheme was not able in any sense to achieve a real degree of confidentiality vis-a - vis political parties without creating the threat of urgency or intimidation. This is a powerful piece of dogma: privacy is not a constitutional trump when it is applied to mask power relations that are at the heart of democratic accountability.

Institutional aftermath

The judgment was not the end of the case. In a subsequent order by the Court, SBI was ordered to provide complete details on each bond bought and redeemed and the Election Commission was directed to compile and publish the details. The data were then publicly released by the Election Commission on 21 March 2024 in line with the directions of the Court. The significance of that sequence is that it demonstrates how constitutional adjudication may yield institutional transparency real-time, rather than an abstract law principle. The verdict was, therefore, transferred to disclosure, and the rights vocabulary to administrative performances.

As far as governance is concerned, the disposition of the data changed informational field of the Indian elections. Finally, the government might obtain a glimpse of the outlines of the political-finance streams that used to be hidden behind the veil of anonymity and laws. This did not necessarily do away with influence, but made influence more evident and thus

more disputed. Constitutionally, such visibility is the distinction between a democracy which literally counts votes and a democracy which is able to question the circumstances in which votes are infectiously and economically influenced. (Elections 24)

Critical assessment

The crucial importance of the case is in the fact that it does not make democracy some sort of election arithmetic on a regular basis. The Court implicitly acknowledged that fair and free elections presuppose informational ecosystem where citizens are able to follow the financial anatomy of political power. This is a stricter concept of democracy as compared to a pure procedural definition of democracy. It relates electoral integrity to transparency, equality and meaningful participation. To legal scholarship the case is particularly useful as it shows how the constitutional law can govern not only the state coercion that is obvious, but also the insidious variants of power at work with money.

Meanwhile, the case encourages one to think more about what a reasonable compromise between privacy of donors and their publicity is. The more concerning criticism would be whether any donor confidentiality is legitimate, or whether a more focused, transparency-deliberate approach would be a more effective solution to participation and accountability. Its response was the more or less that in the setting of political finance, secrecy has a disproportionate negative effect on the informational rights of the voter. That is a compelling finding since the beneficiary of secrecy is not an interpersonal relationship, but a public power structure which has a direct impact on governance. Nonetheless, the future reform problem is how to create a system that avails legitimate privacy premises without allowing opaque political reliance.

Comparative Constitutional Perspectives

The aspect of the Electoral Bond judgment that seems the most interesting is that it is consistent with larger constitutional tendencies in the democratic jurisdictions. Despite great variability in political finance regimes across states, a new consensus that transparency is an essential component of democratic rule is emerging. This is the line of reason taken by the Indian Supreme Court within this international trend to have more openness in political funding.

In the United States, regulation of campaign finance has long been influenced by the conflict between the freedom of expression and transparency in elections. The Supreme Court in Citizens United v Federal Election Commission did not only broaden anti-corruption protections of political spending amid the First Amendment, but also supported disclosure rules as fundamental accountability instruments in democracy. The Court noted that the disclosure allows voters to consider political messages and can comprehend interests of electoral advocacy. As a result, even though political spending was granted constitutional safeguards, transparency was a valid regulatory goal.

Likewise, the United Kingdom has rules on political party funding where a wide range of disclosure requirements are imposed by the Electoral Commission. Contributions over the required thresholds under the law should be made publicly, and hence such moves allow the citizens, journalists and civil society body to oversee financial networks that exist between the donators and those in the political arenas. The British style portrays an ideology of competitions in electoral politics being conducted in an informed environment of transparency.

Canada and Australia have also took the disclosure-based schemes. These jurisdictions acknowledge that as much as money can be used by private citizens in political aspects through contributions, this aspect cannot go beyond public scrutiny when it has to affect democratic governance. It is this comparative experience that justifies the deduction of the Indian Supreme Court that transparency is a policy choice, but a constitutional democratic institutional necessity.

The Electoral Bonds judgement then can be said to be a situating of India into an international constitutional tradition, of valuing informed citizenship over unidentified political power. Instead of developing a new doctrine, the Court reinstated some basics that can be found in comparative democratic practice.

Constitutional Theory and Democratic Legitimacy

Theoretically, the judgment is related to the concept of democratic legitimacy directly. Democratic establishments gain their powers through the consent of the people who are governed. Nevertheless, consent can just be meaningful when the citizens have sufficient information about the frameworks of political authority.

Political theorists have always claimed that democracy must be more than a mere right to vote. It needs an educated citizenry that would be able to assess opposing interests and contention. Cryptic financial dealings sabotage this goal as it clouds the motive and reliance that could affect the decision-making processes in government.

The Electoral Bond Scheme created precisely such informational asymmetry. The political parties were aware of their financial sponsors, the financial institutions had records of transactions and government may have access to some information. These associations however were unknown to ordinary citizens. The scheme, therefore, created unequal provision of information that was politically relevant.

This lopsidedness was constitutionally problematic, detected by the Supreme Court. Article 19(1)(a) right to information is not an individual right, but a structural right which is used to nourish democratic participation. Any news on political financing has a direct influence on the choice of the voters as it indicates the possibilities of any impact on the government and its policies.

This ruling is thus a step towards the so called democracy-enhancing meaning of fundamental rights, which is defined by constitutional scholars. Under this style of rights, the protection of rights is not just due to the benefit they provide to people but because they help to preserve democratic institutions. Electoral transparency gets constitutionally important as it enhances citizen accountability and enhances the quality of democratic discussions.

Corporate Political Funding and Democratic Equality

One such significant point out of the judgment is the elimination of the limits on corporate political contributions. Before the Finance Act 2017, companies were limited on the amount of their average profits they could offer to political parties. This limitation was based on fears of undue corporate dominance in the democracies.

The amendment has reportedly done away with this limit as well as a big burden of disclosure. Due to this reason, business might in theory contribute indefinitely with the identity of the beneficiary political parties not being subjected to the purview of the public.

This development was considered to be constitutionally problematic by the Supreme Court. In the judgment, it was understood that corporations are not equal to individual citizens. Corporate groups have vast amounts of money which could be much more than the political power that a typical voter obtains. Unlimited corporate contributions are thus an issue to the equality on politics.

Democracy of equality demands election results to be based on the choice of people and not financial strength. Despite the fact that economic inequalities are bound to be present in society, constitutional democracies are aimed at eliminating the possibility of such inequalities being exacerbated by political dominance that is unrestrained.

This is the concern shown in the reasoning of the Court. The judgment by overruling the elimination of the corporate donation cap recognizes that regulation of finances can also be validated to democratic goals. Political equality does not presuppose all participants will have equal influence, yet, it presupposes resisting undue concentration of political power.

This element of the judgment is especially important since it ties the electoral transparency to the substantive democratic fairness. The Court was only interested in the disclosure, but it was also interested in the structural impact of unlimited financial power.

Administrative Law Implications

Outside of constitutional law, the case of Electoral Bonds also has significant implications on administrative governance. The case illustrates that executive policy initiatives are limited by the constitution despite their intended aim.

The scheme was mainly justified by the Union Government through the argument that it would decrease the black money used during elections and promote formal banking systems. These were certainly justifiable goals. Nevertheless, the Court indicated that the consideration of the legitimate purposes cannot always justify the actions that limit the constitutional rights.

This argument supports a major concept of administrative law: the governmental actions should be in proportion to the goals. Even desirable policies have to be formulated with care in order to ensure that they do not interfere with constitutional freedoms.

This decision thus plays a role in forming proportionality review in Indian constitutional jurisprudence. It shows how the courts can assess complex regulatory structures without imposing policy choices in place of those of elected institutions. Rather, the Court considered the existence of less restrictive means and the mechanism selected inappropriately inhibited constitutional rights.

This kind of scrutiny enhances constitutional governance since administrative innovation is kept within the framework of basic democratic values.

Effect on Electoral Governance.

The technical implications of the decision go outside the law. Public perception towards political finance in India changed radically with the release of electoral bonds information.

To the researchers, journalists, and civil society organizations, the revealed information provided a possibility to evaluate links between political financing and the government, as well as, populist policy. This type of analysis adds to the aspect of democratic accountability as it allows the evidence to be used to examine governmental decision making.

The decision also increases the institutional credibility. Effective electoral systems arise when citizens believe that political competition is fair and transparent. Even in cases where no wrongs of influence are done, the suspicions of a certain influence can weaken the faith in democratic institutions.

Through the disclosure, the Supreme Court enhanced social control and minimized information uncertainties. This helps in larger aims of institutional legitimacy and electoral integrity.

The case can also have an impact on the legislative change in the future. The constitutional principles that have been expressed by the Court must now be considered by policymakers with an eye to redesigning the political finance system played out in India. The Electoral Bond Scheme could not strike a balancing act between the interests of the donors and the requirements of transparency like the future reforms will be likely to balance.

Criticisms and Counterarguments

Nevertheless, as strong as it is, the ruling is open to criticism. According to some researchers, the anonymity of donors may have valid applications. Citizens and businesses might be threatened to be politically punished should their donations come into the limelight. The financial requirements encompassing disclosure may have a deterrent effect on politics as well as lower funding of the opposition party.

This is one of the concerns to be considered seriously. The citizens should be shielded against coercion and intimidation by democratic systems. In case disclosure poses great dangers of retaliation, anonymity might seem appealing as a safeguard.

But the Supreme Court determined that these interests were not more severe than the community had in transparency. The Court based its reasoning on the fact that the informational rights of voters take a central place in constitutional democracy. Additionally, concerns about donor safety might be effectively covered through less restrictive mechanisms and not build overall secrecy.

The other criticism has to do with the intervention of the judiciary in political sensitive affairs. The opponents might claim that campaign finance regulation entails a complicated policy making that is more applicable in legislative bodies. They argue that courts ought to restrain themselves when checking on electoral reforms.

Although the institutional deference is still relevant, the other case is also convincing. The idea of constitutional courts is to scrutinize governmental actions which touch on basic rights. In cases where the electoral rules curtail the transparency of democracy, judicial checks and balances are more than suitable. Judge Judy represents a cautious balance of institutional deference and constitutional responsibility therefore.

Research Findings

The case investigation of the Electoral Bonds yields a number of important results:

1. The Supreme Court enhanced the constitutional value of the right of the voter to information contained in Article 19(1)(a).
2. Electoral transparency was known as a structural need of democratic government and it was not a policy goal.
3. Unlimited corporate financing of politics was deemed to be not in line with the ideals of democratic equality and constitutional accountability.
4. The doctrine of proportionality was presented as a powerful device of screening the legislation pertaining to elections.
5. The decision agrees with the Indian constitutional law and the international democratic practice of focusing on disclosure and transparency.
6. The decision illustrates the fact that constitutional adjudication may provide concrete institutional changes such as disclosure.
7. The decision sets major precedences to be followed in the future in terms of political finance, digital campaigning and governance in elections.

CONCLUSION

Electoral Bonds judgment is one of the biggest constitutional rulings in modern India. It is much more than just the question of political funding here and now. The case is about essential problems of democracy, accountability, transparency, equality, and constitutional government.

The Supreme Court was well aware that a democracy will not work effectively when the people are not given access to information about the financial bases of political power. The Court struck down the Electoral Bond Scheme and its associated statutory amendments thus revisiting the created constitutional value of informed citizenship as a supreme value of the constitution.

No less important is the way the corporate political influence was treated in the Court. The ruling recognizes that the idea of democratic equality could be undermined in instances where financial power is not added to effective regulatory restraints. Accountability and transparency are then necessary as a protective measure against undue influence.

The jurisprudential school of thought considers that, through the ruling, Indian constitutionalism has been reinforced by merging the idea of proportionality, democratic participation, and informational rights into a logical system. This case shows that constitutional law can still be used to address modern issues in government, without necessarily forsaking classical principles of democracy.

However, in conclusion, the Electoral Bonds case must be read not only as an election-law case but a constitutional reassertion of democratic responsibility. It develops the fact that political authority should never be hidden to the people who bring it in them, the citizens. Through this, the Supreme Court has done much in regard to the continuous evolution of constitutional democracy in India.

REFERENCES

1. Association for Democratic Reforms v Union of India 2024 INSC 113 (SC) https://api.sci.gov.in/supremecourt/2017/27935/27935_2017_1_1501_50573_Judgement_15-Feb-2024.pdf accessed 30 May 2026.
2. State Bank of India v Association for Democratic Reforms 2024 INSC 195 (SC) https://api.sci.gov.in/supremecourt/2024/10382/10382_2024_1_301_51365_Judgement_11-Mar-2024.pdf accessed 30 May 2026.
3. Constitution of India, art 19(1)(a) https://www.indiacode.nic.in/bitstream/123456789/16124/1/the_constitution_of_india.pdf accessed 30 May 2026.
4. Representation of the People Act 1951, s 29C https://www.indiacode.nic.in accessed 30 May 2026.
5. Companies Act 2013, s 182 https://www.indiacode.nic.in accessed 30 May 2026.
6. Income-tax Act 1961, s 13A https://www.incometaxindia.gov.in accessed 30 May 2026.
7. Election Commission of India, 'Disclosure of Electoral Bond Data' (2024) https://www.eci.gov.in accessed 30 May 2026.
8. Election Commission of India, 'Contribution Reports of Political Parties' https://www.eci.gov.in/contribution-reports accessed 30 May 2026.
9. Tarunabh Khaitan, 'Political Finance and Constitutional Democracy' (2024) 16 NUJS Law Review 1.
10. Gautam Bhatia, 'The Electoral Bonds Judgment and Democratic Accountability' (2024) Indian Constitutional Law and Philosophy Blog https://indconlawphil.wordpress.com accessed 30 May 2026.
11. Law Commission of India, Electoral Reforms (255th Report, March 2015) https://lawcommissionofindia.nic.in/reports/Report255.pdf accessed 30 May 2026.