

**In the High Court at Calcutta**  
**Election Petition Jurisdiction**  
Original Side

**EP/10/2026**

SANDHYA RANI TUDU  
VS  
MAYNA MURMU AND OTHERS

**BEFORE:**  
**The Hon'ble JUSTICE ANIRUDDHA ROY**  
**Date : June 29, 2026.**

Appearance:-  
*Mr. Sirsanya Bandyopadhyay, Adv.*  
*Mr. Arka Kumar Nag, Adv.*  
*Mr. Rahul Kumar Singh, Adv.*  
*...for the petitioner*

The Court:- The present election petition has been filed under Sections **80, 80A and 81** read with **Sections 100, 101 and 123 of the Representation of the People Act, 1951**, challenging the election of the respondent No.1 as the returned candidate from **243-Manbazar Assembly Constituency**, where polling was held on **23<sup>rd</sup> April 2026** and the result was declared on **4<sup>th</sup> May 2026**, on allegations of corrupt practices, irregularities in the counting process and material non-compliance with the provisions of the Constitution of India, the **Representation of the People Act, 1951** and the rules framed thereunder.

The petitioner has, *inter alia*, alleged that serious irregularities occurred during the counting process on **4<sup>th</sup> May 2026**, resulting in the exclusion of the petitioner's counting agents from the counting hall and causing prejudice to the petitioner. It has further been contended that the result of the election process has been materially affected by the aforesaid acts and omissions.

At this stage, this Court is required to examine the maintainability of the election petition on the parameters as prescribed under **Section 86(1)**

**of the Representation of the People Act, 1951.** It is well settled that the scrutiny contemplated under Section 86(1) of the said Act is confined to examine compliance of Sections 81, 82 and 117 of the said Act and does not extend to adjudication upon the merits of the allegations contained in the petition.

Upon consideration of the materials placed on record, this Court finds that the election petition has been presented within the prescribed period under **Section 81 of the Representation of the People Act, 1951.** The petitioner possesses the requisite *locus standi* being both a contesting candidate and an elector of the concerned constituency. All necessary parties including the returned candidate and the other contesting candidates have been impleaded in compliance with Section 82 of the Act. The statutory requirements under **Section 117 of the said Act** have also been duly complied with. Accordingly, this Court is satisfied that the election petition, *prima facie*, complies with the requirements of **Sections 81, 82 and 117 of the Representation of the People Act, 1951**, subject to any further objection, if raised afterwards. No ground, therefore, exists for dismissal of the present petition under Section 86(1) of the said Act at this stage.

The petitioner has also prayed for various interim measures, though the petitioner confines the same to the first part of **prayer (f)** of the petition, seeking a direction from this Court for preserving the CCTV footage of the counting centre and the Electronic Voting Machines (EVMs) as well as the VVPAT machines used at all the polling booths of the **243-Manbazar Assembly Constituency.** The prayer relating to preservation of CCTV

footage, EVMs and VVPAT machines stands on a different footing. The CCTV footage constitutes electronic evidence susceptible to loss by routine overwriting, while EVMs and VVPAT machines constitute material evidence relevant to the issues raised in the election petition. Preservation of such materials would neither prejudice the respondents nor amount to an adjudication on the merits of the controversy. On the contrary, failure to preserve the same may result in irretrievable loss of evidence which may be relevant at the trial of the petition. This Court is, therefore satisfied that a case has been made out for immediate preservation of the aforesaid materials pending adjudication of the election petition.

Accordingly, the aforesaid CCTV footage, EVMs and VVPAT machines shall not be erased, overwritten, destroyed, tampered with, transferred, re-deployed, opened or otherwise dealt with in any manner whatsoever without the leave of this Court.

The learned counsel for the petitioner has handed over notification **No.51/8/7/2016** EMS dated **15<sup>th</sup> July, 2016** issued by the Election Commission of India. Reliance has been placed on Clause 3 of the said notification which provides that:

*“ 3. In case of any election where election petition has been filed, the following action shall be taken:-*

- (i) If the EVMs are the subject of the election petition, the EVMs used at all Polling Stations in the constituency concerned shall continue to be kept in the safe custody of the District Election Officer, till such time the Election Petition is finally disposed of by the Courts.”*

Keeping in mind the aforesaid notification as well as the *prima facie* view taken by this Court, pending further orders, the respondent Nos. 8, 9

and 10 being the Chief Election Commission of India, the Chief Electoral Officer, West Bengal and the Returning Officer of **243-Manbazar Assembly Constituency** are directed to preserve and keep in safe custody:-

- (a) The CCTV footage recorded at the jurisdictional counting centre on **4<sup>th</sup> May, 2026** including footage from all cameras installed inside and outside the counting hall;
- (b) All EVMs and Control Units as well as Ballot Units used in all polling booths of the said **243-Manbazar Assembly Constituency**; and
- (c) All VVPAT machines used in the said **243-Manbazar Assembly Constituency**.

Department is directed to serve upon the respondents.

Matter is made returnable on **August 27, 2026**.

**(ANIRUDDHA ROY, J.)**

Sbghosh