



COMMUNIST PARTY OF INDIA (MARXIST)

ANDHRA PRADESH COMMITTEE

H.No. 27-30-9, CPI(M) State Committee Office

Akulavari Street, Governor Pet, Vijayawada -2

☎ 0866 - 2577202, Fax: 0866 - 2577203

E-mail: cpimap@gmail.com

ప్రచురణార్థం/ప్రసారార్థం :

విజయవాడ,

తేది : 16 అక్టోబర్, 2026.

కారణాలు చూపకుండా ఎన్నికల అధికారులు వేల సంఖ్యలో ఓటర్లపై

అభ్యంతరం వ్యక్తం చేసిన విషయంపై

రాష్ట్ర ఎన్నికల ప్రధాన అధికారి (సిఈవో) వివరణ ఇవ్వాలి

- సిపిఐ(యం)

రాష్ట్రంలో సర్ ప్రక్రియ జరుగుతున్న సందర్భంలో క్లెయిమ్లు, అభ్యంతరాలు సమర్పించే సమయంలో కారణాలు చూపించకుండా వేల ఓటర్ల సంఖ్యలో స్వయంగా ఎన్నికల అధికారులే అభ్యంతరాలు వ్యక్తం చేసినట్లు వచ్చిన వార్తలు ఆందోళన కలిగిస్తున్నాయి. వీటిపై ఆంధ్రప్రదేశ్ ఛీఫ్ ఎలక్టోరల్ ఆఫీసర్ గారు వివరణ ఇవ్వాలని, వాస్తవాలు వెల్లడించాలని సిపిఐ(యం) రాష్ట్ర కమిటీ కోరుతున్నది. గుండుగుత్తగా ఫారం 7 సమర్పించిన వాటిని తిరస్కరించాలని కోరుతున్నాము. ఇప్పటి వరకు తొలగించిన, కొత్తగా చేర్చించిన ఓటర్ వివరాలను బహిరంగ పర్చాలని, రాజకీయ పార్టీలకు లిస్టులివ్వాలని కోరుతున్నాము.

క్లెయిమ్లు, అభ్యంతరాలు సమర్పణకు గడువు పెంచకముందు ఆఖరుతేదీ అయిన అక్టోబర్ 10వ తేదీకి ముందు 12 రోజుల పాటు 20,959 మంది పేర్లు తొలగించడానికి సిఫార్సు చేసినట్లు మీడియాలో నిర్దిష్టంగా ఉదాహరణలతో వార్తలు వచ్చాయి. రాష్ట్రవ్యాపితంగా వివిధ జిల్లాల్లో తొలగింపునకు ఫారం 7 ద్వారా 40వేల పేర్లు ఇవ్వబడినాయి. ఇందులో 20,959 పేర్లు ఎన్నికల అధికారులే (ఇఆర్వో మరియు ఎఈఆర్వో) అభ్యంతరాలు వ్యక్తం చేసినట్లు మీడియాలో వచ్చాయి. అయితే ఆ ఓటర్ల తొలగింపుకు నిర్దిష్టమైన కారణాలేవీ పేర్కొనలేదని వార్తలు రావడంతో ఓటర్లలో ఆందోళన మరియు అపోహలు కలుగుతున్నాయి.

ఈసిఐ రూపొందించిన యాప్ వల్లనే కారణాలు చూపించబడడం లేదని ఎన్నికల అధికారులు చెప్పడం మరింత ఆందోళన కలిగిస్తున్నది. నిష్పక్షపాతంగా వాస్తవాలు వెల్లడించేందుకు వీలుగా అవసరమైతే ఈసిఐ యాప్ లో తగు మార్పులు చేయాలని సిపిఐ(యం) రాష్ట్ర కమిటీ కోరుతున్నది.

సర్ ప్రక్రియపై ఇప్పటికే దేశవ్యాపితంగా ఆందోళన జరుగుతున్న నేపథ్యంలో రాష్ట్రంలో ఇలాంటి వార్తలు రావడం ఆందోళనకరం. అందువలన ఆంధ్రప్రదేశ్ సిఈవో గారు దీనిపై వాస్తవాలు వెల్లడించాలని సిపిఐ(యం) కోరుతున్నది. అర్హులైన ఓటరు ఎవరూ ఓటు హక్కు కోల్పోకుండా చూడాల్సిన బాధ్యత ఎన్నికల కమిషన్ పై ఉంది.


(వి.శ్రీనివాసరావు)
రాష్ట్ర కార్యదర్శి

Attached: Media News cutting

Link : <https://www.thenewsminute.com/andhra-pradesh/thousands-of-votes-marked-for-deletion-in-andhra-pradesh-without-reasons-on-record>

Thousands of votes marked for deletion in Andhra Pradesh without reasons on record

Under election rules, an ERO can initiate deletion proceedings on their own, but a Form 7 objection must be filed by an elector whose name is already on the roll. Thousands of applications in Andhra Pradesh list EROs and AEROs as objectors. Officials attribute the discrepancy to software design, raising questions yet again, about how the SIR is being conducted.

Written by: [Anjana Meenakshi](#)

Edited by: [Dhanya Rajendran](#)

Published on: 14 Oct 2026, 2:00 pm

In just the last 12 days of the claims and objections period, 40,006 names were filed under form 7 as part of the ongoing Special Intensive Revision in Andhra Pradesh. Of these, 20,959 (52.38%) name election officials as objectors. The consolidated statements also do not contain the reason for asking for deletion.

Form 7 is the application form used by the Election Commission of India to object to the inclusion of a name or to request the deletion of an existing name from the electoral rolls. Since the start of the claims and objections period under the SIR, the ECI has been publishing a consolidated statement of the total number of Form 7 applications received on a given day on its [website](#).

This consolidated statement, called Form 10, contains the name of the objector, the person whose name they are objecting to, polling station details and the reason for objection.

TNM analysed data between 29 September and October 10 – the last date for filing claims and objections in Andhra Pradesh. We were unable to access Form 10 uploaded prior to 29 September as Form 10s are available online only for a week. The claims and objections period for the Special Intensive Revision (SIR) of electoral rolls in Andhra Pradesh lasted from July 31 to October 10 – a total of 72 days.

We found that in the constituencies with the highest deletions, the Electoral Registration Officer (ERO) or the (Assistant Electoral Registration Officer) was named as the objector.

Applicants submitting Form 7 are required to select one of the five justifications mentioned in the form. The reasons are the person is dead, underage, absent/permanently shifted, already enrolled or not an Indian citizen.

We noticed that when Form 7s are filed by normal citizens, the consolidated statement carries the reason for objection. But the reason for objection is not listed when an ERO or AERO is the objector.

In the top 20 constituencies with the highest deletions, the ERO/AERO was listed as the objector on Form 7 in 16,241 cases out of 21,115 cases. This accounts for 76.91% of cases in 20 constituencies alone.

Of the 2452 names listed for deletion under Form 10 between 29 September and 10 October in Tirupati district's Chandragiri constituency, 1991 objections list the AERO as the objector and six list the ERO as objector. Together, they account for 81.72% of the objections. The pattern repeats in Palacole constituency of West Godavari where out of 2220 names, the ERO

is named 311 times and the AERO is named 1701 times as the objector accounting collectively for 90.63% of the objections.

Similarly of the 1712 cases in Ongole constituency the ERO is named 1277 times (74.59%) and of the 1450 cases in Narsapuram constituency, 1369 times (94.41%).

This raises two questions: a) can an AERO or ERO be the objector and b) why aren't the reasons listed in many forms?

What the law governing Form 7 says

As per Section 22 of the Representation of People's Act 1950, an ERO can via an application made to him or "on his own motion", delete an elector's name from the electoral roll.

Subsection (c) further clarifies that an ERO can proceed with the deletion "on the ground that the person concerned is dead or has ceased to be ordinarily resident in the constituency or is otherwise not entitled to be registered in that roll."

This power is also enshrined in Rule 21-A of the Registration of Electors Rules 1960 that allows a registration officer to delete names after making 'every endeavour to give him (an elector) reasonable opportunity to show cause.'

However, Rule 13 (2) of the Registration of Electors Rules 1960 makes it clear that every objection to the inclusion of a name in the roll shall be 'preferred only by a person whose name is already included in that roll.' Form 7 derives its powers from Rule 13 (2) and Rule 26 of the 1960 rules.

In plain speak, the law is clear: while an ERO can take suo moto action, he cannot be an objector on Form 7. That option is to be exercised by an elector of a constituency.

Why reasons for objection do not show: EROs explain

Speaking to TNM, two EROs working out of Andhra Pradesh claimed that the ERO NET app was designed in such a way that the reason for objection would not show up. ERO NET, according to the ECI, is a centralized form processing system to handle all processes pertaining to registration, migration, and deletion of names from the electoral roll.

One ERO said, "In reality, the ERO is never the objector, it is always invariably the family member. A Booth Level Agent (BLA) and we have documents attesting to the same. The BLO does ground level verification and has to be thorough. Then the ERO login generates a blank paper where we list the names meant for deletion. But while the BLO's login has the option to list the reasons for why someone is named on Form 7, when it comes up to the AERO or ERO level, we have the option to either accept or reject, but cannot do more than that." This, according to the ERO, makes the Form 7 appear.

Another ERO said that while EROs are shown as objectors in several cases because of how the ERO NET app works when names are uploaded in bulk. "If we identify en masse duplicate voters or a lot of deaths based on thorough ground work, the ERO NET permits for bulk forms to be uploaded," he told TNM.

“For instance in my constituency, I was informed by booth level officers (BLOS) of over 3000 deaths. I thought the number was too high to be true but we were able to confirm the death certificates for these cases. Several of them were alcohol poisoning deaths,” he said.

An AERO working under the second ERO TNM spoke to also told us that they have physical documentation and confirmation from family members for each death or duplicate votes, but when uploaded on the ERO NET app, the reasons don’t come up.

“The BLO is able to list out the reason but when it comes to the AERO, the only option available in our login is to say ‘ineligible’ which then generates form 7. The reasons are subsequently not listed,” he adds.

When contacted, former Chief Election Commissioner (CEC) Ashok Lavasa told TNM that the law governing the electoral process is the Registration of Electors Rules. “Whatever provisions are in those rules, they have to be followed. The app is the supporting mechanism. You cannot have a software system that is not in accordance with the rules,” he said.

As per the EROs and AERO statements, the ERO NET app itself aids in obfuscation. It is worth remembering that the ERO NET app has been criticised over the last few weeks for centralising control in violation of election rules.

Speaking to TNM, former Kerala Chief Electoral Officer (CEO) Tikaram Meena said that the app has ‘played havoc’.

“Now we only have a particular ERO’s word for it. How many are genuinely deleted, how many aren’t – no one knows. It is bad enough that in most cases, people don’t understand the SIR process. To add to it, if reasons aren’t given on the ECI website, then they cannot challenge a wrongful deletion. What would have been ideal is to let each state’s CEO to work with stakeholders and develop their own software. You cannot sit in Delhi and handle ground realities,” he said.

“The ERO is the statutory authority for this election process. Everyone else is an appellate authority. If we were to take a more benevolent view of the ERO, it is clear that he does not have any flexibility, he is merely a creature that is disempowered instead of being the statutory authority as per the Representation of People’s Act,” retired IAS officer PV Ramesh told TNM.

“This also raises huge questions of transparency. If I am a common voter, I cannot go see the ERO. He is a big guy. All I know is that I am named on Form 7 and I don’t even know why. Very few in this country are digitally literate to begin with. So if this is how the app functions and disempowers the ERO, the process itself becomes absurd,” he concluded.

(TNM has mailed a detailed questionnaire raising these concerns with Andhra Pradesh Chief Electoral Officer (CEO) Vivek Yadav. We will update this story if and when we receive a response.)
