

Date : 25/08/2026No: ACSCM/T-2693/2026Dear **Sub: Request for adequate verification time and adherence to prescribed procedure during the SIR of electoral rolls in Karnataka, 2026**

As you are aware, the Special Intensive Revision (SIR) of electoral rolls in Karnataka has thrown up figures that merit serious attention. Of the 5.54 crore electors in Karnataka, nearly 1.08 crore—almost one in five—have been placed in the Absent, Shifted, Dead, Duplicate and Others (ASDDO) category. In addition, following publication of the draft roll on 24 August, verification notices are expected to be issued to roughly 43.8 lakh electors for "logical discrepancies" or absence of a link to the 2002 roll. In Bengaluru alone, 46.88 lakh electors have been placed under the ASDDO category. This translates into about 1.5 Crore voters in Karnataka facing deletion unless they submit their claims for continuation or fresh inclusion.

A significant number of those categorised as *Absent* may be genuine electors who could not submit their enumeration forms because they were away from home for work, health or other legitimate reasons when the BLO visited. Similarly, electors who moved to a different polling station were not given an opportunity to submit the enumeration form at their new residence during house-to-house visit by BLOs, while their names have been deleted from the roll at their previous address. In Bengaluru and other cities, even moving across the street can mean a change of polling station. As a result, lakhs of genuine voters may face disenfranchisement under the *Absent* and *Shifted* categories and will now have to file Form 6 for inclusion. Their category of voters do not even receive notices which are only sent to "logical discrepancy" & "unmapped" voters. Therefore, they may not even be aware that their names have been deleted.

This is particularly concerning in a dynamic society where individuals and families routinely move between neighbourhoods, cities, towns and villages for work, marriage and other reasons. **Mobility should not translate into disenfranchisement.** This concern is especially important for poorer and marginalised citizens who may move frequently for livelihood and may not readily possess or access the documents required to establish their eligibility. The SIR must therefore protect the voting rights of every eligible citizen while ensuring the accuracy and integrity of the electoral roll.

The Election Commission has the dual responsibility of preparing accurate electoral rolls and ensuring that no genuine and eligible voter is excluded. These objectives are not in conflict. With adequate time and proper processes, both can be achieved.

I, therefore, request the Election Commission of India to consider the following:

1. **Extend the period for claims and objections.** The claims and objections period should be sufficiently long to enable genuine electors whose names are absent from the draft roll, including those in the ASDDO category, to ascertain their status and file claims through Form 6. Para 11.3.1 of the 2023 Manual permits the Election Commission to extend the prescribed period by notification. With no election due in Karnataka in the near future, such an extension is eminently feasible.



D K SHIVAKUMAR

CHIEF MINISTER

Acscm/T-2693/2026.



'2'

VIDHANA SOUDHA
BENGALURU - 560 001

Date : *25/08/2026*

2. **Ensure full implementation of the prescribed procedure.** The CEO should specifically direct District Election Officers to convene Ward Committee meetings in urban areas and Gram Sabhas in rural areas, with adequate advance publicity. At these meetings, the draft roll should be read out and omissions and errors identified, as contemplated under Paragraph 11.2.4(vi) of the 2023 Manual. The CEO's DO letter dated: 20.08.2026 refers to this provision but does not specifically direct such meetings. A mere reference to the provision risks becoming pro forma compliance rather than an effective mechanism for identifying and correcting errors.
3. **Provide adequate time for electors facing verification.** The proposed period of roughly 45 days for issuing notices and disposing of cases concerning "logical discrepancies" and the absence of a link to the 2002 roll is highly compressed. Giving an elector about a week to respond, followed by a second notice, may place an unreasonable burden on working people, migrants and the elderly, particularly where documents must be obtained or travel is required. A minimum of **three to four weeks** should therefore be provided to each elector to respond and furnish the necessary documents, ensuring a meaningful opportunity to establish eligibility before any adverse decision is taken.
4. **Increase in number of Addl EROs and the DEOs.** While the ECI has appointed Additional EROs in order to handle large volume of objections and applications which are going to now come for inclusion; but the same will be inadequate to handle the enormous workload in limited time available. The unrealistic deadlines combined with inadequate manpower could result in avoidable errors and unfair exclusions. Further in this context, the ECI is requested to consider the appointment of Additional DEOs as well in districts with high ASDDO and Logical Discrepancies.

The Government of Karnataka stands ready to provide all possible assistance, including mobilising the local administration for Gram Sabha and Ward Committee meetings, undertaking widespread publicity to reach affected voters, and providing any other coordination or logistical support required by the Commission.

The objective must be an electoral roll that the people of Karnataka can trust: one in which every eligible citizen is included, every ineligible entry is removed, and no citizen is deprived of the franchise merely for want of adequate time, information or opportunity to establish his or her eligibility.

With regards,

Yours

(D.K.Shivakumar)

To

Shri Gyanesh Kumar,
The Chief Election Commissioner,
Election Commission of India,
New Delhi - 110001